

Required fields are shown with yellow backgrounds and asterisks.

Page 1 of * <input style="width: 40px;" type="text" value="34"/>	SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION WASHINGTON, D.C. 20549 Form 19b-4	File No.* SR - <input style="width: 40px;" type="text" value="2012"/> - * <input style="width: 40px;" type="text" value="29"/> Amendment No. (req. for Amendments *) <input style="width: 40px;" type="text"/>															
Proposed Rule Change by NYSE Amex LLC 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"/>															
<table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 33%; border: none;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Section 19(b)(2) *</td> <td style="width: 33%; border: none;"><input type="checkbox"/> Section 19(b)(3)(A) *</td> <td style="width: 33%; border: none;"><input type="checkbox"/> Section 19(b)(3)(B) *</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3" style="text-align: center; border: none;">Rule</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="border: none;"><input type="checkbox"/> 19b-4(f)(1)</td> <td style="border: none;"><input type="checkbox"/> 19b-4(f)(4)</td> <td style="border: none;"></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="border: none;"><input type="checkbox"/> 19b-4(f)(2)</td> <td style="border: none;"><input type="checkbox"/> 19b-4(f)(5)</td> <td style="border: none;"></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="border: none;"><input type="checkbox"/> 19b-4(f)(3)</td> <td style="border: none;"><input type="checkbox"/> 19b-4(f)(6)</td> <td style="border: none;"></td> </tr> </table>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Section 19(b)(2) *	<input type="checkbox"/> Section 19(b)(3)(A) *	<input type="checkbox"/> Section 19(b)(3)(B) *	Rule			<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)	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Section 19(b)(2) *	<input type="checkbox"/> Section 19(b)(3)(A) *	<input type="checkbox"/> Section 19(b)(3)(B) *															
Rule																	
<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)																
Pilot <input type="checkbox"/>	Extension of Time Period for Commission Action * <input type="checkbox"/>	Date Expires * <input style="width: 80px;" type="text"/>															
Exhibit 2 Sent As Paper Document <input type="checkbox"/>	Exhibit 3 Sent As Paper Document <input type="checkbox"/>																
Description Provide a brief description of the proposed rule change (limit 250 characters, required when Initial is checked *). <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; min-height: 30px;"> proposing to amend Commentary .07 to NYSE Amex Options Rule 904 to eliminate position limits for options on the SPDR SP 500 exchange traded fund which list and trade under the symbol SPY </div>																	
Contact Information 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 style="width: 200px;" type="text" value="Theodore"/>	Last Name * <input style="width: 200px;" type="text" value="Lazo"/>																
Title * <input style="width: 550px;" type="text" value="General Counsel NYSE Regulation Inc"/>																	
E-mail * <input style="width: 550px;" type="text" value="tlazo@nyx.com"/>																	
Telephone * <input style="width: 100px;" type="text" value="(202) 661-8949"/>	Fax	<input style="width: 100px;" type="text" value="(202) 347-4372"/>															
Signature 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 style="width: 80px;" type="text" value="05/02/2012"/>																	
By <input style="width: 200px;" type="text" value="Janet McGinness"/>	<input style="width: 300px;" type="text" value="Corporate Secretary"/>																
(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.																	
<div style="border: 1px solid gray; background-color: #cccccc; padding: 5px; display: inline-block;"> NYX Janet McGinness, </div>																	

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) NYSE Amex LLC (“NYSE Amex” or the “Exchange”) is proposing to amend Commentary .07 to NYSE Amex Options Rule 904 to eliminate position limits for options on the SPDR® S&P 500® exchange-traded fund (“SPY ETF”),¹ which list and trade under the symbol SPY. The text of the proposed rule change is attached as Exhibit 5. A copy of this filing is available on the Exchange’s website at www.nyse.com, at the Exchange’s principal office and at the Public Reference Room of the Securities and Exchange Commission (“Commission”).
- (b) The Exchange does not believe that the proposed rule change will have any direct effect, or any significant indirect effect, on any other Exchange rule in effect at the time of this filing.
- (c) Not applicable.

2. Procedures of the Self-Regulatory Organization

Senior management has approved the proposed rule change pursuant to authority delegated to it by the Board of the Exchange. No further action is required under the Exchange’s governing documents. Therefore, the Exchange’s internal procedures with respect to the proposed rule change are complete.

The persons on the Exchange staff prepared to respond to questions and comments on the proposed rule change are:

Theodore R. Lazo
Senior Vice President & General Counsel
NYSE Regulation
(202) 661-8949

Michael Babel
Managing Director
NYSE Euronext
(212) 656-4744

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

(a) Purpose

The purpose of the proposal is to amend Commentary .07 to NYSE Amex Options Rule 904 to eliminate position limits for SPY options.

¹ “SPDR®,” “Standard & Poor’s®,” “S&P®,” “S&P 500®,” and “Standard & Poor’s 500” are registered trademarks of Standard & Poor’s Financial Services LLC. The SPY ETF represents ownership in the SPDR S&P 500 Trust, a unit investment trust that generally corresponds to the price and yield performance of the SPDR S&P 500 Index.

Background

Position limits serve as a regulatory tool designed to address potential manipulative schemes and adverse market impact surrounding the use of options. The Exchange understands that the Commission, when considering the appropriate level at which to set option position and exercise limits, has considered the concern that the limits be sufficient to prevent investors from disrupting the market in the security underlying the option.² This consideration has been balanced by the concern that the limits “not be established at levels that are so low as to discourage participation in the options market by institutions and other investors with substantial hedging needs or to prevent specialists and market-makers from adequately meeting their obligations to maintain a fair and orderly market.”³

SPY options are currently the most actively traded option class in terms of average daily volume (“ADV”).⁴ The Exchange believes that, despite the popularity of SPY options as evidenced by their significant volume, the current position limits on SPY options could be a deterrent to the optimal use of this product as a hedging tool. The Exchange further believes that position limits on SPY options may inhibit the ability of certain large market participants, such as mutual funds and other institutional investors with substantial hedging needs, to utilize SPY options and gain meaningful exposure to the hedging function they provide.

The Exchange believes that current experience with the trading of SPY options, as well as the Exchange’s surveillance capabilities, has made it appropriate to consider other, less prophylactic alternatives to regulating SPY options, while still seeking to ensure that large positions in SPY options will not unduly disrupt the options or underlying cash markets. Accordingly, the Exchange proposes to eliminate the position limits on SPY options – currently 900,000 contracts on the same side of the market.⁵ In proposing the elimination of position limits on SPY options, the Exchange has considered several factors, including (1) the availability

² See Securities Exchange Act Release No. 40969 (January 22, 1999), 64 FR 4911, 4912-4913 (February 1, 1999) (SR-CBOE-98-23) (citing H.R. No. IFC-3, 96th Cong., 1st Sess. at 189-91 (Comm. Print 1978)).

³ *Id.* at 4913.

⁴ SPY ADV was 2,156,482 contracts in April 2012. ADV for the same period for the next four most actively traded options was: Apple Inc. (option symbol AAPL) – 1,074,351; S&P 500 Index (option symbol SPX) – 656,250; PowerShares QQQ TrustSM, Series 1 (option symbol QQQ) – 573,790; and iShares® Russell 2000® Index Fund (option symbol IWM) – 550,316.

⁵ See Commentary .07 to NYSE Amex Options Rule 904. See also Securities Exchange Act Release No. 64966 (July 26, 2011), 76 FR 45899 (August 1, 2011) (SR-NYSEAmex-2011-50).

of economically equivalent products and their respective position limits, (2) the liquidity of the option and the underlying security, (3) the market capitalization of the underlying security and the related index, (4) the reporting of large positions and requirements surrounding margin, and (5) the potential for market on close volatility.

Economically Equivalent Products

The Exchange has considered the existence of economically equivalent or similar products, and their respective position limits, if any, in assessing the appropriateness of proposing an elimination of position limits for SPY options.

For example, AM-settled options on the S&P 500 Index, which list and trade exclusively on the Chicago Board Options Exchange (“CBOE”) under the symbol SPX, are currently not subject to position limits.⁶ Moreover, SPX options are 10 times the size of SPY options, so that a position of only 90,000 SPX options is the equivalent of a position of 900,000 SPY options, which is the current position limit for SPY options.⁷

Similarly, the C2 Options Exchange (“C2”) has recently introduced a PM-settled S&P 500 cash settled contract (“SPXPM”), which also is not subject to position limits.⁸ This contract, unlike the existing SPX contract, is cash-settled based on the closing value of the S&P 500 Index. In this respect, SPXPM is very much like SPY options in that it is settled at the close, albeit into cash as opposed to shares of the underlying like SPY options.

The Exchange believes that, because SPX, SPXPM, and SPY options are ultimately derivative of the same benchmark – the S&P 500 Index – they should be treated equally from a position limit perspective. As a practical matter, investors utilize SPX, SPXPM, and SPY options and their respective underlying instruments and futures to gain exposure to the same benchmark index: the S&P 500. Further, because the creation and redemption process for the underlying SPY ETF allows large investors to transfer positions from a basket of stocks comprising the S&P 500 index to an equivalent number of ETF shares (and the

⁶ See Securities Exchange Act Release No. 44994 (October 26, 2001), 66 FR 55722 (November 2, 2001) (SR-CBOE-2001-22). Position limits were also eliminated for options on the S&P 100 Index (option symbol OEX) and the Dow Jones Industrial Average (option symbol DJX).

⁷ The Exchange notes that the reduced-value option on the S&P 500 Index (option symbol XSP) is the equivalent size of SPY options and, similar to SPX options, is not subject to position limits. See Securities Exchange Act Release No. 56350 (September 4, 2007), 72 FR 51878 (September 11, 2007) (SR-CBOE-2007-79).

⁸ See Securities Exchange Act Release No. 65256 (September 2, 2011), 76 FR 55969 (September 9, 2011) (SR-C2-2011-008) (“SPXPM Approval”).

reverse) with relative ease, there is no reason to disadvantage options overlying the one versus the other. The Exchange believes that this view is supported by the recent expansion of various exemptions from position limits, such as the Delta-Based Equity Hedge Exemption⁹ for positions of a member, member organization or non-member affiliate that are delta neutral, which allows SPY option positions to be delta-hedged by positions in SPX options. Given that SPX options are not subject to position limits, a member or member organization (or non-member affiliate thereof) could theoretically establish a position in SPY options far in excess of the current 900,000 contract limit, provided that the position is hedged with SPX options. The Exchange believes that this situation accurately reflects the economic equivalence of SPX and SPY options, supporting the Exchange's proposal to further acknowledge this equivalence by eliminating position limits in SPY options.

The Exchange also believes that Commission findings in approving the SPXPM options further support treating SPY options in the same manner as SPX and SPXPM options for purposes of position limits. In particular, the Commission noted in approving SPXPM options that "C2's proposal will offer investors another investment option through which they could obtain and hedge exposure to the S&P 500 stocks," and that "C2's proposal will provide investors with the ability to trade an option on the S&P 500 index in an all-electronic market, which may better meet the needs of investors who may prefer to trade electronically."¹⁰ The Commission also noted that "C2's proposal will provide investors with added flexibility through an additional product that may be better tailored to meet their particular investment, hedging, and trading needs."¹¹ The Exchange believes that these Commission findings apply equally to SPY options. In this respect, SPY options with no position limit will (1) offer investors another investment option through which they could obtain and hedge significant levels of exposure to the S&P 500 stocks, (2) be available to trade on the Exchange (and presumably all other U.S. options exchanges) electronically, and (3) provide investors with added flexibility through an additional product that may be better tailored to meet their particular investment, hedging, and trading needs, because, among other things, they are PM-settled.

The Exchange notes that, with respect to competition amongst economically equivalent products, a 2005 paper by Hans Dutt and Lawrence Harris that set forth a model to determine appropriate position limits for cash-settled index derivatives observed that "markets and their regulators should take a closer look at the underlying economic rationale for the levels at which they currently set their position limits to ensure that the limits adequately protect markets from manipulation and that inconsistent position limits do not produce competitive

⁹ See Commentary .10 to NYSE Amex Options Rule 904.

¹⁰ See SPXPM Approval at 55975.

¹¹ *Id.*

advantages and disadvantages among contracts.”¹² On this point, the Exchange believes that if no position limits have been found to be warranted on both SPX and SPXPM options, then such treatment should be extended to SPY options so that inconsistent position limits do not produce competitive advantages and disadvantages among contracts.

In addition, the Exchange notes that the Dutt-Harris Paper focuses its attention on the concerns relating to manipulation of cash-settled derivatives, stating that “[a]lthough several scholars have argued that cash settlement may increase the risk of market manipulation, until recently, the theoretical problems arising from potential cash settlement manipulation has been considered minor, as evidenced by the lack of academic interest in this area.”¹³ The paper further noted that “[t]he reason for this may arise from the fact that most exchange-traded derivative index contracts that are cash settled are broad-based, and each of the underlying components typically possesses ample liquidity,” and that “manipulation of the underlying components would likely be extremely costly to the would-be manipulator.”¹⁴ This suggests that whatever manipulation risk does exist in a cash-settled, broad-based product such as SPXPM, the corresponding manipulation risk in a physically-settled, but equally broad-based product such as SPY, is likely to be equally low, if not lower.

Similarly, the Exchange notes that in the Dutt-Harris Paper the authors observed that the lack of scholarly interest in the cash-settlement manipulation problem may have been “due to the fact that, until recently, most U.S. exchange-traded cash-settled derivative contracts were based on broad indices of very liquid stocks,” and that “[m]anipulation of such instruments require very large trades that are costly to make and easy to detect through conventional surveillance.”¹⁵ This observation applies equally to SPY options, which are based on a broad index of very liquid stocks and can easily be created by submitting a position in the underlying securities. Moreover, it provides additional support for the Exchange’s view that the enhanced reporting and surveillance for SPY options discussed below adequately address concerns about manipulation.¹⁶

¹² *The Journal of Futures Markets*, Vol. 25, no. 10, 945-965, 949 (2005) (“Position Limits for Cash-Settled Derivative Contracts,” by Hans R. Dutt and Lawrence E. Harris) (“Dutt-Harris Paper”). In the paper, the authors examined existing position limits to determine whether they were consistent with the model the authors developed, and found that the results indicated that existing limits were not correlated with the limits suggested by their model.

¹³ *Id.* at 946.

¹⁴ *Id.*

¹⁵ *Id.* at 948.

¹⁶ The authors of the Dutt-Harris Paper further posited that “position limits need only apply during the period when cash settlement takes place.” *Id.* at 964. The

Liquidity in the Option and the Underlying Security

The Exchange has also considered the liquidity of SPY options and the underlying SPY ETF in assessing the appropriateness of proposing an elimination of position limits for SPY options.

In approving the elimination of position and exercise limits on SPX options, the Commission noted that the deep, liquid markets for the securities underlying the S&P 500 Index reduced concerns regarding market manipulation or disruption in the underlying markets.¹⁷ The Commission further noted that removing position limits for SPX options could also bring additional depth and liquidity, in terms of both volume and open interest, without increasing concerns regarding intermarket manipulations or disruptions of the options or the underlying securities.¹⁸ The Exchange similarly believes that this would be the case if position limits for SPY options were eliminated.

In this regard, both the SPY ETF and SPY options similarly exhibit deep, liquid markets. However, SPY options are not as active as SPX options when adjusted for the difference in their notional size.¹⁹ As described below, the Exchange believes that this is partly due to the existence of position limits for SPY options. The table below compares the ADV in both SPX and SPY options, and includes an “implied SPY volume” figure that reflects theoretical SPY ADV without the constraint of position limits:

Date Range	Trade Days	SPX Option ADV	SPY Option ADV	Implied SPY Option ADV	Implied SPY Option ADV Shortfall
Jan 1, 2011 to Dec 31, 2011	252	1,567,535	5,789,511	15,675,353	9,885,842
Jan 1, 2012 to Apr 19, 2012	75	1,343,735	4,525,709	13,437,353	8,911,644

Exchange notes that no such period exists with respect to SPY options, which are physically settled.

¹⁷ See *supra* note 2 at 4913.

¹⁸ *Id.*

¹⁹ SPX options have a notional value 10 times greater than SPY options (i.e., one SPX contract equals 10 SPY contracts).

The Exchange believes that certain factors may result in SPX options – adjusted for their larger notional size – currently trading with greater volume than SPY options.²⁰ In this regard, the Exchange believes that, based on input from various market participants, the existence of position limits in SPY options is reason in itself to instead utilize SPX options. Anecdotally, market participants perceive value in avoiding the regulatory risk of exceeding the SPY option position limit by instead using SPX options for their hedging needs. The Exchange also believes that, while exemptions are available with respect to position limits for SPY options, such exemptions, and the regulatory burden attendant therewith, may dissuade investors from using SPY options when they can instead use an SPX option without the need for such an exemption. Because SPY and SPX options are economically equivalent products, an investor deciding between the two would generally trade the product with the least barriers or requirements to engage in such activity. In this respect, SPX options are currently the easier product to trade.

As a further comparison, the following table sets forth certain data for both the SPY ETF and the combined volume for the component securities upon which the S&P 500 Index is based:

Date Range	S&P 500 Index Underlying Component ADV²¹	S&P 500 Index Underlying Component Average Daily Value Traded	SPY ETF ADV	SPY ETF Average Daily Value Traded
Jan. 1, 2011 to Dec. 31, 2011	3,289,595,675	\$4,149,726,217,456	218,227,747	\$27,297,097,993
Jan. 1, 2012 to Apr. 19, 2012	2,851,457,600	\$3,860,704,307,080	145,164,527	\$19,684,577,239

This data shows that there is tremendous liquidity in both SPY ETF shares and the component securities upon which the S&P 500 Index is based. While the ADV for the components underlying the S&P 500 Index is greater than the ADV for the SPY ETF, the Exchange believes that SPY ETF volume has been, is currently and

²⁰ The Exchange notes that the “Implied SPY Option ADV Shortfall” has narrowed over time and at an accelerated rate, which the Exchange believes is a direct result of the implementation of the Delta-Based Equity Hedge Exemption that allows SPY options to be hedged via SPX options.

²¹ The data considers the aggregate volume for all component stocks of the S&P 500 Index.

will likely continue to be within a range that the Commission has previously determined to be a deep, liquid market.²²

Market Capitalization of the Underlying Security and the Related Index

The Exchange has also considered the market capitalization of the SPY ETF and the S&P 500 Index in assessing the appropriateness of proposing an elimination of position limits for SPY options.

The Exchange understands that the Commission similarly considered the market capitalization of the underlying index when it approved the elimination of position limits in SPX options. Accordingly, the Exchange believes that the capitalization of and the deep, liquid markets for the underlying SPY ETF reduces concerns regarding market manipulation or disruption in the underlying market. The table below shows the market capitalization of the SPY ETF and the S&P 500 Index:

Date Range	Average S&P 500 Index Market Cap	Average SPY ETF Market Cap
Jan.1, 2011 to Dec. 31, 2011	\$11,818,270,341,270	\$89,533,777,897
Jan. 1, 2012 to Apr. 19, 2012	\$12,547,946,920,000	\$99,752,986,022

This data shows the enormous capitalization of both the SPY ETF and the component securities upon which the S&P 500 Index is based. While the capitalization for the components underlying the S&P 500 Index is greater than that for the SPY ETF, the Exchange believes that the SPY ETF capitalization has nonetheless been, is currently and will likely continue to be at a level consistent with that which the Commission has previously determined to be enormously capitalized.²³

The Exchange notes that the theoretical limit on one's ability to hedge both SPX and SPY options is the full market capitalization of the S&P 500 Index itself. This similarly contributes to the Exchange's determination that it is appropriate for position limits on SPY options to be eliminated.

²² See *supra* note 2 at n. 13. The ADV for the components of the indexes underlying the options for which position limits were eliminated were 94.77 million shares (DJX), 244.3 million shares (OEX), and 757.5 million shares (SPX).

²³ See *supra* note 7 at 51879. Specifically, the market capitalization of the component securities of the Russell 2000 Index ("RUT") of \$1.73 trillion was determined to be enormously capitalized.

Large Position Reporting and Margin Requirements

The Exchange has also considered the reporting of large option positions and related margin requirements in assessing the appropriateness of proposing an elimination of position limits for SPY options.

The Exchange notes that the Large Option Position Reporting (“LOPR”) requirement in NYSE Amex Options Rule 906 would continue to apply. Rule 906 requires members and member organizations to file a report with the Exchange with respect to each account in which the member or member organization has an interest; each account of a partner, officer, director, trustee or employee of such member organization; and each customer account that has established an aggregate position (whether long or short) that meets certain determined thresholds (e.g., 200 or more option contracts if the underlying security is a stock or Exchange-Traded Fund Share). Rule 906 also permits the Exchange to impose a higher margin requirement upon the account of a member or member organization when it determines that the account maintains an under-hedged position.

Monitoring accounts maintaining large positions provides the Exchange with the information necessary to determine whether to impose additional margin and/or whether to assess capital charges upon a member organization carrying the account. In addition, the Commission’s net capital rule, Rule 15c3-1 under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the “Act”),²⁴ imposes a capital charge on members to the extent of any margin deficiency resulting from the higher margin requirement, which should serve as an additional form of protection.

In approving SPXPM, the Commission addressed concerns about the lack of a position limit by noting that CBOE will rely on its enhanced surveillance requirements and procedures for SPX options to monitor trading activity in SPXPM options.²⁵ Similarly, the Exchange notes that certain option products are currently traded on the Exchange without position limits (e.g., the NASDAQ® 100 Index option (option symbol NDX) and the Russell 2000® Index option (option symbol RUT)), and believes that the reporting, surveillance and monitoring mechanisms in place for these products are effective and could easily accommodate SPY options if position limits thereon are eliminated.

Market on Close Volatility

The Exchange has also considered the potential for resulting or increased market on close volatility in assessing the appropriateness of proposing an elimination of position limits for SPY options.

²⁴ 17 CFR 240.15c3-1.

²⁵ See SPXPM Approval at 55972.

SPY options are American-style, physically settled options that can be exercised at any time and settle into shares of the underlying SPY ETF. A key characteristic of the SPY ETF is that the number of shares outstanding is limited only by the number of shares available in the component securities of the S&P 500 Index, which can be used to create additional SPY ETF shares as needed. This in-kind creation and redemption mechanism has proven to be quite robust, as evidenced by the SPY ETF's close tracking of its benchmark index and the relatively small premiums or discounts to Net Asset Value ("NAV") that it has historically exhibited.²⁶ Additionally, the ability to hedge with SPX options against the stocks underlying the S&P 500 is limited to the shares outstanding for those stocks – the same limit that applies to hedging with SPY options. Accordingly, the Exchange believes that the risk of distortions to the market resulting from the elimination of position limits in SPY options is no greater than the risk presented by SPX options not being subject to position limits.

As a physically-settled option, SPY options can be easily hedged via long or short positions in SPY ETF shares, which, as noted above, can be easily created or redeemed as needed. With a physically-settled contract such as SPY options, once a hedge in the form of a long or short position is obtained, that hedge can only be lost if the underlying security becomes hard to borrow and the short position is bought in.²⁷ The Exchange believes that this ability to hedge with shares of the SPY ETF is very important, and reduces the likelihood of market on close volatility in the component securities underlying the S&P 500 Index (i.e., a market participant can remain fully hedged through expiration via shares of the SPY ETF), which should also be the case if position limits for SPY options are eliminated. At the same time, the Exchange believes that the elimination of position limits for SPY options would not increase market volatility or facilitate the ability to manipulate the market. The Exchange believes that any potential concern regarding volatility at the closing that could result from an elimination in the position limits for SPY options is further alleviated by the current trading environment, including that there are markets for individual securities on more than one exchange, via unlisted trading privileges, that there is wide dispersion of trading across multiple exchanges, and that exchange procedures and systems are designed to facilitate orderly closings, even when there is volatility.²⁸

²⁶ See SPDR[®] S&P 500[®] ETF Trust, Annual Report (September 30, 2011), available at <https://www.spdrs.com/library-content/public/SPY%20Annual%20Report%202009.30.11.pdf>.

²⁷ As noted, the in-kind creation and redemption process allows for short term imbalances in supply and demand to be resolved readily, which in turn reduces the likelihood of getting "bought in" on a short position in SPY. Since the implementation of Regulation SHO, SPY has never been on the threshold security list, which further evidences the efficacy of the in-kind creation and redemption process in resolving imbalances in supply and demand.

²⁸ See, e.g., Rule 123C – NYSE Amex Equities (The Closing Procedures).

Implementation

In addition to Commission approval, the implementation of this proposed rule change will be contingent on other factors, including the completion of any changes that may be necessary to the Exchange's regulatory and surveillance program. The Exchange will announce the implementation of the elimination of position limits on SPY options through a notice to ATP holders after any Commission approval of this proposed rule change.

(b) **Statutory Basis**

The proposed rule change is consistent with Section 6(b)²⁹ of the Act, in general, and furthers the objectives of Section 6(b)(5),³⁰ in particular, in that it is designed to prevent fraudulent and manipulative acts and practices, to promote just and equitable principles of trade, to foster cooperation and coordination with persons engaged in facilitating transactions in securities, to remove impediments to and perfect the mechanism of a free and open market and a national market system and, in general, to protect investors and the public interest. The Exchange believes that the proposed rule change would be beneficial to market participants, including market makers, institutional investors and retail investors, by permitting them to establish greater positions when pursuing their investment goals and needs. The Exchange also believes that economically equivalent products should be treated in an equivalent manner so as to avoid regulatory arbitrage, especially with respect to position limits. Treating SPY and SPX options differently by virtue of imposing different position limits is inconsistent with the notion of promoting just and equitable principles of trade and removing impediments to perfect the mechanisms of a free and open market. At the same time, the Exchange believes that the elimination of position limits for SPY options would not increase market volatility or facilitate the ability to manipulate the market.

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

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

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

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

²⁹ 15 U.S.C. 78f(b).

³⁰ 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(5).

6. Extension of Time Period for Commission Action

The Exchange does not consent at this time to an extension of any time period for Commission action.

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

The proposed rule change is based on CBOE Rule 24.4.

9. Exhibits

Exhibit 1 – Form of Notice of Proposed Rule Change for Publication in the Federal Register

Exhibit 5 – Text of the Proposed Rule Change

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION
 (Release No. 34- ; File No. SR-NYSEAmex-2012-29)

[Date]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; NYSE Amex LLC; Notice of Filing of Proposed Rule Change Amending Commentary .07 to NYSE Amex Options Rule 904 to Eliminate Position Limits for Options on the SPDR® S&P 500® Exchange-Traded Fund (“SPY ETF”),¹ Which List and Trade Under the Symbol SPY

Pursuant to Section 19(b)(1)² of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the “Act”)³ and Rule 19b-4 thereunder,⁴ notice is hereby given that, on May 2, 2012, NYSE Amex LLC (the “Exchange” or “NYSE Amex”) filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (the “Commission”) the proposed rule change as described in Items I, II, and III below, which Items have been prepared by the self-regulatory organization. The Commission is publishing this notice to solicit comments on the proposed rule change from interested persons.

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

The Exchange proposes to amend Commentary .07 to NYSE Amex Options Rule 904 to eliminate position limits for options on the SPDR® S&P 500® exchange-traded fund (“SPY ETF”),⁵ which list and trade under the symbol SPY. The text of the proposed rule

¹ “SPDR®,” “Standard & Poor’s®,” “S&P®,” “S&P 500®,” and “Standard & Poor’s 500” are registered trademarks of Standard & Poor’s Financial Services LLC. The SPY ETF represents ownership in the SPDR S&P 500 Trust, a unit investment trust that generally corresponds to the price and yield performance of the SPDR S&P 500 Index.

² 15 U.S.C.78s(b)(1).

³ 15 U.S.C. 78a.

⁴ 17 CFR 240.19b-4.

⁵ “SPDR®,” “Standard & Poor’s®,” “S&P®,” “S&P 500®,” and “Standard &

change is available at the Exchange, the Commission's Public Reference Room, and www.nyse.com.

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

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

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

1. Purpose

The purpose of the proposal is to amend Commentary .07 to NYSE Amex Options Rule 904 to eliminate position limits for SPY options.

Background

Position limits serve as a regulatory tool designed to address potential manipulative schemes and adverse market impact surrounding the use of options. The Exchange understands that the Commission, when considering the appropriate level at which to set option position and exercise limits, has considered the concern that the limits be sufficient to prevent investors from disrupting the market in the security underlying

Poor's 500" are registered trademarks of Standard & Poor's Financial Services LLC. The SPY ETF represents ownership in the SPDR S&P 500 Trust, a unit investment trust that generally corresponds to the price and yield performance of the SPDR S&P 500 Index.

the option.⁶ This consideration has been balanced by the concern that the limits “not be established at levels that are so low as to discourage participation in the options market by institutions and other investors with substantial hedging needs or to prevent specialists and market-makers from adequately meeting their obligations to maintain a fair and orderly market.”⁷

SPY options are currently the most actively traded option class in terms of average daily volume (“ADV”).⁸ The Exchange believes that, despite the popularity of SPY options as evidenced by their significant volume, the current position limits on SPY options could be a deterrent to the optimal use of this product as a hedging tool. The Exchange further believes that position limits on SPY options may inhibit the ability of certain large market participants, such as mutual funds and other institutional investors with substantial hedging needs, to utilize SPY options and gain meaningful exposure to the hedging function they provide.

The Exchange believes that current experience with the trading of SPY options, as well as the Exchange’s surveillance capabilities, has made it appropriate to consider other, less prophylactic alternatives to regulating SPY options, while still seeking to ensure that large positions in SPY options will not unduly disrupt the options or underlying cash markets. Accordingly, the Exchange proposes to eliminate the position

⁶ See Securities Exchange Act Release No. 40969 (January 22, 1999), 64 FR 4911, 4912-4913 (February 1, 1999) (SR-CBOE-98-23) (citing H.R. No. IFC-3, 96th Cong., 1st Sess. at 189-91 (Comm. Print 1978)).

⁷ *Id.* at 4913.

⁸ SPY ADV was 2,156,482 contracts in April 2012. ADV for the same period for the next four most actively traded options was: Apple Inc. (option symbol AAPL) – 1,074,351; S&P 500 Index (option symbol SPX) – 656,250; PowerShares QQQ TrustSM, Series 1 (option symbol QQQ) – 573,790; and iShares® Russell 2000® Index Fund (option symbol IWM) – 550,316.

limits on SPY options – currently 900,000 contracts on the same side of the market.⁹ In proposing the elimination of position limits on SPY options, the Exchange has considered several factors, including (1) the availability of economically equivalent products and their respective position limits, (2) the liquidity of the option and the underlying security, (3) the market capitalization of the underlying security and the related index, (4) the reporting of large positions and requirements surrounding margin, and (5) the potential for market on close volatility.

Economically Equivalent Products

The Exchange has considered the existence of economically equivalent or similar products, and their respective position limits, if any, in assessing the appropriateness of proposing an elimination of position limits for SPY options.

For example, AM-settled options on the S&P 500 Index, which list and trade exclusively on the Chicago Board Options Exchange (“CBOE”) under the symbol SPX, are currently not subject to position limits.¹⁰ Moreover, SPX options are 10 times the size of SPY options, so that a position of only 90,000 SPX options is the equivalent of a position of 900,000 SPY options, which is the current position limit for SPY options.¹¹

⁹ See Commentary .07 to NYSE Amex Options Rule 904. *See also* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 64966 (July 26, 2011), 76 FR 45899 (August 1, 2011) (SR-NYSEAmex-2011-50).

¹⁰ *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 44994 (October 26, 2001), 66 FR 55722 (November 2, 2001) (SR-CBOE-2001-22). Position limits were also eliminated for options on the S&P 100 Index (option symbol OEX) and the Dow Jones Industrial Average (option symbol DJX).

¹¹ The Exchange notes that the reduced-value option on the S&P 500 Index (option symbol XSP) is the equivalent size of SPY options and, similar to SPX options, is not subject to position limits. *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 56350 (September 4, 2007), 72 FR 51878 (September 11, 2007) (SR-CBOE-2007-79).

Similarly, the C2 Options Exchange (“C2”) has recently introduced a PM-settled S&P 500 cash settled contract (“SPXPM”), which also is not subject to position limits.¹² This contract, unlike the existing SPX contract, is cash-settled based on the closing value of the S&P 500 Index. In this respect, SPXPM is very much like SPY options in that it is settled at the close, albeit into cash as opposed to shares of the underlying like SPY options.

The Exchange believes that, because SPX, SPXPM, and SPY options are ultimately derivative of the same benchmark – the S&P 500 Index – they should be treated equally from a position limit perspective. As a practical matter, investors utilize SPX, SPXPM, and SPY options and their respective underlying instruments and futures to gain exposure to the same benchmark index: the S&P 500. Further, because the creation and redemption process for the underlying SPY ETF allows large investors to transfer positions from a basket of stocks comprising the S&P 500 index to an equivalent number of ETF shares (and the reverse) with relative ease, there is no reason to disadvantage options overlying the one versus the other. The Exchange believes that this view is supported by the recent expansion of various exemptions from position limits, such as the Delta-Based Equity Hedge Exemption¹³ for positions of a member, member organization or non-member affiliate that are delta neutral, which allows SPY option positions to be delta-hedged by positions in SPX options. Given that SPX options are not subject to position limits, a member or member organization (or non-member affiliate thereof) could theoretically establish a position in SPY options far in excess of the current

¹² See Securities Exchange Act Release No. 65256 (September 2, 2011), 76 FR 55969 (September 9, 2011) (SR-C2-2011-008) (“SPXPM Approval”).

¹³ See Commentary .10 to NYSE Amex Options Rule 904.

900,000 contract limit, provided that the position is hedged with SPX options. The Exchange believes that this situation accurately reflects the economic equivalence of SPX and SPY options, supporting the Exchange's proposal to further acknowledge this equivalence by eliminating position limits in SPY options.

The Exchange also believes that Commission findings in approving the SPXPM options further support treating SPY options in the same manner as SPX and SPXPM options for purposes of position limits. In particular, the Commission noted in approving SPXPM options that "C2's proposal will offer investors another investment option through which they could obtain and hedge exposure to the S&P 500 stocks," and that "C2's proposal will provide investors with the ability to trade an option on the S&P 500 index in an all-electronic market, which may better meet the needs of investors who may prefer to trade electronically."¹⁴ The Commission also noted that "C2's proposal will provide investors with added flexibility through an additional product that may be better tailored to meet their particular investment, hedging, and trading needs."¹⁵ The Exchange believes that these Commission findings apply equally to SPY options. In this respect, SPY options with no position limit will (1) offer investors another investment option through which they could obtain and hedge significant levels of exposure to the S&P 500 stocks, (2) be available to trade on the Exchange (and presumably all other U.S. options exchanges) electronically, and (3) provide investors with added flexibility through an additional product that may be better tailored to meet their particular investment, hedging, and trading needs, because, among other things, they are PM-settled.

¹⁴ See SPXPM Approval at 55975.

¹⁵ *Id.*

The Exchange notes that, with respect to competition amongst economically equivalent products, a 2005 paper by Hans Dutt and Lawrence Harris that set forth a model to determine appropriate position limits for cash-settled index derivatives observed that “markets and their regulators should take a closer look at the underlying economic rationale for the levels at which they currently set their position limits to ensure that the limits adequately protect markets from manipulation and that inconsistent position limits do not produce competitive advantages and disadvantages among contracts.”¹⁶ On this point, the Exchange believes that if no position limits have been found to be warranted on both SPX and SPXPM options, then such treatment should be extended to SPY options so that inconsistent position limits do not produce competitive advantages and disadvantages among contracts.

In addition, the Exchange notes that the Dutt-Harris Paper focuses its attention on the concerns relating to manipulation of cash-settled derivatives, stating that “[a]lthough several scholars have argued that cash settlement may increase the risk of market manipulation, until recently, the theoretical problems arising from potential cash settlement manipulation has been considered minor, as evidenced by the lack of academic interest in this area.”¹⁷ The paper further noted that “[t]he reason for this may arise from the fact that most exchange-traded derivative index contracts that are cash settled are broad-based, and each of the underlying components typically possesses ample liquidity,”

¹⁶ *The Journal of Futures Markets*, Vol. 25, no. 10, 945-965, 949 (2005) (“Position Limits for Cash-Settled Derivative Contracts,” by Hans R. Dutt and Lawrence E. Harris) (“Dutt-Harris Paper”). In the paper, the authors examined existing position limits to determine whether they were consistent with the model the authors developed, and found that the results indicated that existing limits were not correlated with the limits suggested by their model.

¹⁷ *Id.* at 946.

and that “manipulation of the underlying components would likely be extremely costly to the would-be manipulator.”¹⁸ This suggests that whatever manipulation risk does exist in a cash-settled, broad-based product such as SPXPM, the corresponding manipulation risk in a physically-settled, but equally broad-based product such as SPY, is likely to be equally low, if not lower.

Similarly, the Exchange notes that in the Dutt-Harris Paper the authors observed that the lack of scholarly interest in the cash-settlement manipulation problem may have been “due to the fact that, until recently, most U.S. exchange-traded cash-settled derivative contracts were based on broad indices of very liquid stocks,” and that “[m]anipulation of such instruments require very large trades that are costly to make and easy to detect through conventional surveillance.”¹⁹ This observation applies equally to SPY options, which are based on a broad index of very liquid stocks and can easily be created by submitting a position in the underlying securities. Moreover, it provides additional support for the Exchange’s view that the enhanced reporting and surveillance for SPY options discussed below adequately address concerns about manipulation.²⁰

Liquidity in the Option and the Underlying Security

The Exchange has also considered the liquidity of SPY options and the underlying SPY ETF in assessing the appropriateness of proposing an elimination of position limits for SPY options.

¹⁸ *Id.*

¹⁹ *Id.* at 948.

²⁰ The authors of the Dutt-Harris Paper further posited that “position limits need only apply during the period when cash settlement takes place.” *Id.* at 964. The Exchange notes that no such period exists with respect to SPY options, which are physically settled.

In approving the elimination of position and exercise limits on SPX options, the Commission noted that the deep, liquid markets for the securities underlying the S&P 500 Index reduced concerns regarding market manipulation or disruption in the underlying markets.²¹ The Commission further noted that removing position limits for SPX options could also bring additional depth and liquidity, in terms of both volume and open interest, without increasing concerns regarding intermarket manipulations or disruptions of the options or the underlying securities.²² The Exchange similarly believes that this would be the case if position limits for SPY options were eliminated.

In this regard, both the SPY ETF and SPY options similarly exhibit deep, liquid markets. However, SPY options are not as active as SPX options when adjusted for the difference in their notional size.²³ As described below, the Exchange believes that this is partly due to the existence of position limits for SPY options. The table below compares the ADV in both SPX and SPY options, and includes an “implied SPY volume” figure that reflects theoretical SPY ADV without the constraint of position limits:

Date Range	Trade Days	SPX Option ADV	SPY Option ADV	Implied SPY Option ADV	Implied SPY Option ADV Shortfall
Jan 1, 2011 to Dec 31, 2011	252	1,567,535	5,789,511	15,675,353	9,885,842
Jan 1, 2012 to Apr 19, 2012	75	1,343,735	4,525,709	13,437,353	8,911,644

²¹ See *supra* note 2 at 4913.

²² *Id.*

²³ SPX options have a notional value 10 times greater than SPY options (i.e., one SPX contract equals 10 SPY contracts).

The Exchange believes that certain factors may result in SPX options – adjusted for their larger notional size – currently trading with greater volume than SPY options.²⁴ In this regard, the Exchange believes that, based on input from various market participants, the existence of position limits in SPY options is reason in itself to instead utilize SPX options. Anecdotally, market participants perceive value in avoiding the regulatory risk of exceeding the SPY option position limit by instead using SPX options for their hedging needs. The Exchange also believes that, while exemptions are available with respect to position limits for SPY options, such exemptions, and the regulatory burden attendant therewith, may dissuade investors from using SPY options when they can instead use an SPX option without the need for such an exemption. Because SPY and SPX options are economically equivalent products, an investor deciding between the two would generally trade the product with the least barriers or requirements to engage in such activity. In this respect, SPX options are currently the easier product to trade.

As a further comparison, the following table sets forth certain data for both the SPY ETF and the combined volume for the component securities upon which the S&P 500 Index is based:

Date Range	S&P 500 Index Underlying Component ADV²⁵	S&P 500 Index Underlying Component Average Daily Value Traded	SPY ETF ADV	SPY ETF Average Daily Value Traded
-------------------	--	--	--------------------	---

²⁴ The Exchange notes that the “Implied SPY Option ADV Shortfall” has narrowed over time and at an accelerated rate, which the Exchange believes is a direct result of the implementation of the Delta-Based Equity Hedge Exemption that allows SPY options to be hedged via SPX options.

²⁵ The data considers the aggregate volume for all component stocks of the S&P 500 Index.

Jan.1, 2011 to Dec. 31, 2011	3,289,595,675	\$4,149,726,217,456	218,227,747	\$27,297,097,993
Jan. 1, 2012 to Apr. 19, 2012	2,851,457,600	\$3,860,704,307,080	145,164,527	\$19,684,577,239

This data shows that there is tremendous liquidity in both SPY ETF shares and the component securities upon which the S&P 500 Index is based. While the ADV for the components underlying the S&P 500 Index is greater than the ADV for the SPY ETF, the Exchange believes that SPY ETF volume has been, is currently and will likely continue to be within a range that the Commission has previously determined to be a deep, liquid market.²⁶

Market Capitalization of the Underlying Security and the Related Index

The Exchange has also considered the market capitalization of the SPY ETF and the S&P 500 Index in assessing the appropriateness of proposing an elimination of position limits for SPY options.

The Exchange understands that the Commission similarly considered the market capitalization of the underlying index when it approved the elimination of position limits in SPX options. Accordingly, the Exchange believes that the capitalization of and the deep, liquid markets for the underlying SPY ETF reduces concerns regarding market manipulation or disruption in the underlying market. The table below shows the market capitalization of the SPY ETF and the S&P 500 Index:

Date Range	Average S&P 500 Index Market Cap	Average SPY ETF Market Cap
Jan.1, 2011 to Dec. 31, 2011	\$11,818,270,341,270	\$89,533,777,897

²⁶ See *supra* note 2 at n. 13. The ADV for the components of the indexes underlying the options for which position limits were eliminated were 94.77 million shares (DJX), 244.3 million shares (OEX), and 757.5 million shares (SPX).

Jan. 1, 2012 to Apr. 19, 2012	\$12,547,946,920,000	\$99,752,986,022

This data shows the enormous capitalization of both the SPY ETF and the component securities upon which the S&P 500 Index is based. While the capitalization for the components underlying the S&P 500 Index is greater than that for the SPY ETF, the Exchange believes that the SPY ETF capitalization has nonetheless been, is currently and will likely continue to be at a level consistent with that which the Commission has previously determined to be enormously capitalized.²⁷

The Exchange notes that the theoretical limit on one's ability to hedge both SPX and SPY options is the full market capitalization of the S&P 500 Index itself. This similarly contributes to the Exchange's determination that it is appropriate for position limits on SPY options to be eliminated.

Large Position Reporting and Margin Requirements

The Exchange has also considered the reporting of large option positions and related margin requirements in assessing the appropriateness of proposing an elimination of position limits for SPY options.

The Exchange notes that the Large Option Position Reporting ("LOPR") requirement in NYSE Amex Options Rule 906 would continue to apply. Rule 906 requires members and member organizations to file a report with the Exchange with respect to each account in which the member or member organization has an interest;

²⁷ See *supra* note 7 at 51879. Specifically, the market capitalization of the component securities of the Russell 2000 Index ("RUT") of \$1.73 trillion was determined to be enormously capitalized.

each account of a partner, officer, director, trustee or employee of such member organization; and each customer account that has established an aggregate position (whether long or short) that meets certain determined thresholds (e.g., 200 or more option contracts if the underlying security is a stock or Exchange-Traded Fund Share). Rule 906 also permits the Exchange to impose a higher margin requirement upon the account of a member or member organization when it determines that the account maintains an under-hedged position.

Monitoring accounts maintaining large positions provides the Exchange with the information necessary to determine whether to impose additional margin and/or whether to assess capital charges upon a member organization carrying the account. In addition, the Commission's net capital rule, Rule 15c3-1 under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the "Act"),²⁸ imposes a capital charge on members to the extent of any margin deficiency resulting from the higher margin requirement, which should serve as an additional form of protection.

In approving SPXPM, the Commission addressed concerns about the lack of a position limit by noting that CBOE will rely on its enhanced surveillance requirements and procedures for SPX options to monitor trading activity in SPXPM options.²⁹ Similarly, the Exchange notes that certain option products are currently traded on the Exchange without position limits (e.g., the NASDAQ® 100 Index option (option symbol NDX) and the Russell 2000® Index option (option symbol RUT)), and believes that the reporting, surveillance and monitoring mechanisms in place for these products are

²⁸ 17 CFR 240.15c3-1.

²⁹ See SPXPM Approval at 55972.

effective and could easily accommodate SPY options if position limits thereon are eliminated.

Market on Close Volatility

The Exchange has also considered the potential for resulting or increased market on close volatility in assessing the appropriateness of proposing an elimination of position limits for SPY options.

SPY options are American-style, physically settled options that can be exercised at any time and settle into shares of the underlying SPY ETF. A key characteristic of the SPY ETF is that the number of shares outstanding is limited only by the number of shares available in the component securities of the S&P 500 Index, which can be used to create additional SPY ETF shares as needed. This in-kind creation and redemption mechanism has proven to be quite robust, as evidenced by the SPY ETF's close tracking of its benchmark index and the relatively small premiums or discounts to Net Asset Value ("NAV") that it has historically exhibited.³⁰ Additionally, the ability to hedge with SPX options against the stocks underlying the S&P 500 is limited to the shares outstanding for those stocks – the same limit that applies to hedging with SPY options. Accordingly, the Exchange believes that the risk of distortions to the market resulting from the elimination of position limits in SPY options is no greater than the risk presented by SPX options not being subject to position limits.

As a physically-settled option, SPY options can be easily hedged via long or short positions in SPY ETF shares, which, as noted above, can be easily created or redeemed as

³⁰ See SPDR[®] S&P 500[®] ETF Trust, Annual Report (September 30, 2011), available at <https://www.spdrs.com/library-content/public/SPY%20Annual%20Report%2009.30.11.pdf>.

needed. With a physically-settled contract such as SPY options, once a hedge in the form of a long or short position is obtained, that hedge can only be lost if the underlying security becomes hard to borrow and the short position is bought in.³¹ The Exchange believes that this ability to hedge with shares of the SPY ETF is very important, and reduces the likelihood of market on close volatility in the component securities underlying the S&P 500 Index (i.e., a market participant can remain fully hedged through expiration via shares of the SPY ETF), which should also be the case if position limits for SPY options are eliminated. At the same time, the Exchange believes that the elimination of position limits for SPY options would not increase market volatility or facilitate the ability to manipulate the market. The Exchange believes that any potential concern regarding volatility at the closing that could result from an elimination in the position limits for SPY options is further alleviated by the current trading environment, including that there are markets for individual securities on more than one exchange, via unlisted trading privileges, that there is wide dispersion of trading across multiple exchanges, and that exchange procedures and systems are designed to facilitate orderly closings, even when there is volatility.³²

Implementation

In addition to Commission approval, the implementation of this proposed rule change will be contingent on other factors, including the completion of any changes that

³¹ As noted, the in-kind creation and redemption process allows for short term imbalances in supply and demand to be resolved readily, which in turn reduces the likelihood of getting “bought in” on a short position in SPY. Since the implementation of Regulation SHO, SPY has never been on the threshold security list, which further evidences the efficacy of the in-kind creation and redemption process in resolving imbalances in supply and demand.

³² See, e.g., Rule 123C – NYSE Amex Equities (The Closing Procedures).

may be necessary to the Exchange's regulatory and surveillance program. The Exchange will announce the implementation of the elimination of position limits on SPY options through a notice to ATP holders after any Commission approval of this proposed rule change.

2. Statutory Basis

The proposed rule change is consistent with Section 6(b)³³ of the Act, in general, and furthers the objectives of Section 6(b)(5),³⁴ in particular, in that it is designed to prevent fraudulent and manipulative acts and practices, to promote just and equitable principles of trade, to foster cooperation and coordination with persons engaged in facilitating transactions in securities, to remove impediments to and perfect the mechanism of a free and open market and a national market system and, in general, to protect investors and the public interest. The Exchange believes that the proposed rule change would be beneficial to market participants, including market makers, institutional investors and retail investors, by permitting them to establish greater positions when pursuing their investment goals and needs. The Exchange also believes that economically equivalent products should be treated in an equivalent manner so as to avoid regulatory arbitrage, especially with respect to position limits. Treating SPY and SPX options differently by virtue of imposing different position limits is inconsistent with the notion of promoting just and equitable principles of trade and removing impediments to perfect the mechanisms of a free and open market. At the same time, the Exchange believes that the elimination of position limits for SPY options would not increase market volatility or facilitate the ability to manipulate the market.

³³ 15 U.S.C. 78f(b).

³⁴ 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(5).

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

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

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

No written comments were solicited or received with respect to the proposed rule change.

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

Within 45 days of the date of publication of this notice in the Federal Register or 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:

- (A) by order approve the proposed rule change, or
- (B) institute proceedings to determine whether the proposed rule change should be disapproved.

IV. Solicitation of Comments

Interested persons are invited to submit written data, views, and arguments concerning the foregoing, including whether the proposed rule change is consistent with the Act. Comments may be submitted by any of the following methods:

Electronic comments:

- Use the Commission's Internet comment form (<http://www.sec.gov/rules/sro.shtml>); or
- Send an e-mail to rule-comments@sec.gov. Please include File Number SR-

NYSEAMEX-2012-29 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-NYSEAMEX-2012-29. This file number should be included on the subject line if e-mail is used. To help the Commission process and review your comments more efficiently, please use only one method. The Commission will post all comments on the Commission's Internet Web site (<http://www.sec.gov/rules/sro.shtml>). Copies of the submission, all subsequent amendments, all written statements with respect to the proposed rule change that are filed with the Commission, and all written communications relating to the proposed rule change between the Commission and any person, other than those that may be withheld from the public in accordance with the provisions of 5 U.S.C. 552, will be available for inspection and copying in the Commission's Public Reference Section, 100 F Street, NE, Washington, DC 20549-1090. Copies of the filing will also be available for inspection and copying at the NYSE's principal office and on its Internet Web site at www.nyse.com. 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-NYSEAMEX-2012-29 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.³⁵

Kevin M. O'Neill
Deputy Secretary

³⁵ 17 CFR 200.30-3(a)(12).

Additions are underlined;
 Deletions are [bracketed].

Rules of NYSE Amex LLC

* * * * *

Trading of Option Contracts

Section 1. General Rules Relating to Options

* * * * *

Rule 904. Position Limits

* * * * *

••• Commentary -----

.01 - .06 No change.

.07 The position limit shall be 250,000 contracts for options:

* * * * *

In addition, the position limit for the options contracts set forth below are as follows:

Option	Position Limits
PowerShares QQQ Trust SM , Series 1 (QQQ)	900,000 contracts
SPDR [®] S&P 500 [®] ETF (SPY)	[900,000 contracts] <u>None</u>
iShares [®] Russell 2000 [®] Index Fund (IWM)	500,000 contracts
SPDR [®] Dow Jones Industrial Average SM ETF Trust (DIA)	300,000 contracts

.08 - .13 No change.

* * * * *