

## Drop The Pilot

Regarding the Equity Market Structure Advisory Committee's recommendation for an Access Fee Pilot Program

April 27, 2016

I can't say I was ever really a fan of Joan Armatrading, but her 1983 hit "Drop the Pilot" comes to mind following the Equity Market Structure Advisory Committee's (EMSAC) recommendation for an Access Fee Pilot Program.

Maker-taker pricing refers to the practice whereby exchanges charge customers an 'access fee' for removing liquidity and pay a rebate to customers who provide liquidity. Maker taker pricing was first developed in the late 1990's and championed by ECNs (whose quotes were not protected then) as a way to attract liquidity to their order book. Exchanges followed suit and the practice became ubiquitous by 2005 when Regulation NMS set access fee caps at 30 cents per hundred shares - implicitly constraining rebates also which would necessarily be less than that for exchange trading to be profitable.

The maker-taker system has been criticized for years for distorting the market by incentivizing broker routing strategies to preference rebates over best execution, giving rise to market making strategies that focus on capturing rebates over liquidity provision, and for driving certain types of trading into dark pools. So while I am glad that the topic is being seriously debated within the SEC, the way the proposed pilot is being constructed, it is likely to be a costly experiment that will do little to drive meaningful, positive reform of equities market structure. More specifically:

- The proposed pilot does not in fact address maker-taker pricing - the system whereby makers receive a rebate and takers pay a fee. According to the memorandum released by EMSAC the proposal will instead create four buckets of pilot securities with a different access fee cap applying to each bucket. There is no restriction on the rebate side of the equation, so maker-taker will continue to exist albeit in lesser magnitude. It will provide no information on liquidity provision or market quality in the absence of a bifurcated pricing regime. To test this I would have liked to see a bucket that included pilot securities where pricing was the same whether a trade was adding or removing liquidity.
- The cost will be significant. To implement the pilot exchanges will need to reprogram all their systems as will market participants who connect to them. Market makers, brokers and systems providers will need to update their smart order routers and all back office and admin tools. The amount of work required to implement a pricing change in the pilot buckets will be the same, if not more, than the cost of implementing a market-wide change.
- It is debatable the extent to which all market participants will decide to update their systems, drawing into question the validity of the data collected. Market makers and HFT will certainly re-program their systems, but many smaller brokers may feel the cost of making the change outweighs the benefits.
- The exchanges will fight this hard, as we are already beginning to see. Firstly they were excluded from

the sub-committee that developed the proposed pilot. Secondly there is a proposed bucket with an access fee cap of \$0.0002 which will make it extremely difficult for exchanges to make money in those securities (indeed there was discussion at the meeting yesterday of lowering it to zero). And thirdly, it does not include a trade-at bucket which exchanges have previously indicated they would like to see in return for maker-taker reform.

Now I realize that the proposed pilot was constructed to focus on access fees, because that is the mechanism available under Reg NMS; and I realize that the exchanges were invited to provide feedback to the sub-committee (but not be a member); and I realize that trade-at was left out because there is a trade-at component to the tick size pilot. However, implementing a pilot that will narrowly look at just one part of our controversial market structure will not result in any meaningful improvement.

To me, meaningful market structure reform means we need to look at all the inter-connected issues that are affecting equity market structure and address them together – a holistic approach some might say. We need to recognize that US equity markets contain many diverse participants with different needs and often opposing incentives. Everything needs to be on the table: maker-taker, trade-at, co-location, SIP feeds, market data, etc. To do that will require the SEC to answer some fundamental questions around the value of displayed liquidity and price discovery, how to regulate speed and how to ensure a level playing field with respect to market data. That level of change will take bold, decisive policy unlikely to come out of cross-sectional industry committees.

---

[www.greenwich.com](http://www.greenwich.com) | [ContactUs@greenwich.com](mailto:ContactUs@greenwich.com)

Coalition Greenwich, a division of CRISIL, an S&P Global Company, is a leading global provider of strategic benchmarking, analytics and insights to the financial services industry.

We specialize in providing unique, high-value and actionable information to help our clients improve their business performance.

Our suite of analytics and insights encompass all key performance metrics and drivers: market share, revenue performance, client relationship share and quality, operational excellence, return on equity, behavioral drivers, and industry evolution.

## About CRISIL

CRISIL is a leading, agile and innovative global analytics company driven by its mission of making markets function better. It is majority owned by S&P Global Inc., a leading provider of transparent and independent ratings, benchmarks, analytics, and data to the capital and commodity markets worldwide.

CRISIL is India's foremost provider of ratings, data, research, analytics, and solutions with a strong record of growth, culture of innovation, and global footprint.

It has delivered independent opinions, actionable insights and efficient solutions to over 100,000 customers

through businesses that operate from India, the U.S., the U.K., Argentina, Poland, China, Hong Kong, and Singapore.

For more information, visit [www.crisil.com](http://www.crisil.com)

## Disclaimer and Copyright

This Document is prepared by Crisil Coalition Greenwich, which is a part of Crisil Ltd, a company of S&P Global. All rights reserved. This Document may contain analysis of commercial data relating to revenues, productivity and headcount of financial services organisations (together with any other commercial information set out in the Document). The Document may also include statements, estimates and projections with respect to the anticipated future performance of certain companies and as to the market for those companies' products and services.

The Document does not constitute (or purport to constitute) an accurate or complete representation of past or future activities of the businesses or companies considered in it but rather is designed to only highlight the trends. This Document is not (and does not purport to be) a comprehensive Document on the financial state of any business or company. The Document represents the views of Crisil Coalition Greenwich as on the date of the Document and Crisil Coalition Greenwich has no obligation to update or change it in the light of new or additional information or changed circumstances after submission of the Document.

This Document is not (and does not purport to be) a credit assessment or investment advice and should not form basis of any lending, investment or credit decision. This Document does not constitute nor form part of an offer or invitation to subscribe for, underwrite or purchase securities in any company. Nor should this Document, or any part of it, form the basis to be relied upon in any way in connection with any contract relating to any securities. The Document is not an investment analysis or research and is not subject to regulatory or legal obligations on the production of, or content of, investment analysis or research.

The data contained in the Document is based upon a particular bank's scope, which reflects a bank's data submission, business structure, and sales revenue Reporting methodology. As a result, any data contained in the Document may not be directly comparable to data presented to another bank. For franchise benchmarking, Crisil Coalition Greenwich has implemented equal ranking logic on aggregate results i.e., when sales revenues are within 5% of at least one competitor ahead, a tie is shown and designated by = (where actual ranks are shown). Entity level data has no equal ranking logic implemented and therefore, on occasion, the differences between rank bands can be very close mathematically.

The data in this Document may reflect the views reported to Crisil Coalition Greenwich by the research participants. Interviewees may be asked about their use of and demand for financial products and services and about investment practices in relevant financial markets. Crisil Coalition Greenwich compiles the data received, conducts statistical analysis and reviews for presentation purposes to produce the final results.

THE DOCUMENT IS COMPILED FROM SOURCES CRISIL COALITION GREENWICH BELIEVES TO BE RELIABLE. CRISIL COALITION GREENWICH DISCLAIMS ALL REPRESENTATIONS OR WARRANTIES, EXPRESSED OR IMPLIED, WITH RESPECT TO THIS DOCUMENT, INCLUDING AS TO THE VALIDITY, ACCURACY, REASONABLENESS OR COMPLETENESS OF THE INFORMATION, STATEMENTS, ASSESSMENTS, ESTIMATES AND PROJECTIONS, ANY WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE ARISING OUT OF THE USE OF ALL OR ANY OF THIS DOCUMENT. CRISIL COALITION GREENWICH ACCEPTS NO LIABILITY WHATSOEVER FOR

ANY DIRECT, INDIRECT OR CONSEQUENTIAL LOSS OR DAMAGE OF ANY KIND ARISING OUT OF THE USE OF ALL OR ANY OF THIS DOCUMENT.

Crisil Coalition Greenwich is a part of Crisil Ltd., an S&P Global company. ©2026 Crisil Ltd. All rights reserved.