



Neal L. Wolkoff
Chief Executive Officer
ELX Futures L.P.
www.elxfutures.com

T. 212 294 8056
F. 212 294 8058

110 East 59th Street
New York, NY 10022
nwolkoff@elxfutures.com

By Electronic Filing

November 4, 2009

Mr. David A. Stawick
Secretary to the Commission
Commodity Futures Trading Commission
Three Lafayette Center
1155 21st Street, NW
Washington, DC 20581

2009 NOV 5 AM 8 56
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARIAT
C.F.T.C.

Re: Supplement to Letter to the Commission Dated October 20, 2009 to stay the effectiveness of CME Group's self-certified Rule Interpretation concerning EFF Transactions

Dear Mr. Stawick:

ELX Futures, L.P. ("ELX") respectfully submits this supplemental material in connection with ELX's letter dated October 20, 2009 to the Secretary of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission (the "Commission") to stay the self-certified Advisory Notice filed by the CME Group ("CME") and dated October 19, 2009 (CBOT RA0907-1) (the "Rule Interpretation"). The request for the stay is predicated on the certification accompanying the Rule Interpretation being a "false certification," which is a basis for the Commission to stay, or reject, the CME's Rule Interpretation, and reassert the primacy of the Commission's rule approval process.

Among other claims, the Rule Interpretation states:

Additionally, a prearranged, matched pair of ... trades that are executed for the purpose of moving a futures position from one clearing house to another are both contingent and transitory trades and, under CBOT rules, may not be employed to create or liquidate a futures position.

As previously pointed out, by calling the EFF a "prearranged trade," the Rule Interpretation is giving supremacy to the CME's view of what constitutes a violation of

commodity law above the Commission's determination in the rule approval process.¹ The Commission's rule approval after due consideration determined that the EFF transaction did not violate the Act and, as a result, ELX and its users were entitled to the legal certainty of the rule having been approved with finality. CME's usurpation of regulatory authority from the Commission must be resolved in favor of the Commission to preserve the legal certainty of Commission actions, including rule approvals, from subsequent attacks by regulated entities.

Further, in ELX's letter of October 20, ELX points out that the CME routinely accepts what it refers to as "transitory" trades, i.e. trades that the CME claims are in violation of various rules and regulations, including as we noted in its CBOT division.

Accompanying this letter we provide the Commission with additional information that ELX was not aware of on October 20. This concerns the existence of an electronic marketplace on a major electronic platform that offers trades termed "EFS" between NYMEX and ICE crude oil futures contracts. These futures against futures transactions involve "matched pair[s] of... trades that are executed for the purpose of moving a futures position from one clearing house to another [and] are both contingent and transitory trades..."(see the Rule Interpretation).

Copies of screen shots are attached as evidence. The futures against futures trades between exchanges are offered as part of a menu of Clearport services, which is a major offering of CME. CME, of course, clears these trades, and its marketing department heavily markets the Clearport services. In addition, its compliance department conducts audits to determine the bona fides of EFRP trades. We are not seeking to undo, or sanction the electronic service, but merely point out the hypocrisy and lack of regulatory purpose in allowing transitory trades in all of CME's markets, and allowing the equivalent of EFF trades both inter-market (NYMEX-ICE) and intra-market (NYMEX e-minis vs. NYMEX standard sized physically settled contracts), while concurrently espousing regulatory concerns, and threatening regulatory sanctions against firms, from the same trades when they pose a possible source of competition to CME.

It is clear that as long as the beneficiary of the rules is CME and not ELX, CME views the practices of transitory trades and EFFs as permissible, but if the beneficiary is a competitor, like ELX, the practices are said to be abhorrent. The Act's Core Principle 18 (Anti-Trust Considerations) should not permit a Self-Regulatory Organization ("SRO") to exercise rule enforcement powers for any reason other than protection of investors and the public at large.²

¹ The terms "transitory" and "prearranged" trades are not specifically mentioned in the Act, but the terms "wash trade," fictitious trade," §4c(a), 7 USC §6c(a) and the Act requires a "competitive, open and efficient market," §5d(9), 7 USC §7(d)(9). Prearranged and transitory trades derive their illegitimacy through non-compliance with the foregoing sections of the Commodity Exchange Act, the "Act." The Commission's rule approval after due consideration determined that the EFF transaction did not violate the Act.

² Section 3(b) of the Act, 7USC § 5(b) – PROTECTION OF THE PUBLIC INTEREST, states: It is the purpose of this Act to serve the public interests...through a series a system of effective self-regulation of trading facilities...under the oversight of the Commission.

Thank you for your consideration. Please don't hesitate to call me with any questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Neal Wolkoff". The signature is written in a cursive, slightly slanted style.

Neal L. Wolkoff

cc: Chairman Gary Gensler
Commissioners Dunn, Sommers, Chilton and O'Malia
Dan Berkovitz
Steven Schoenfeld
Eric Juvenas
Tim Karpoff
Richard Shilts
Riva Adriance

Attachments: Prior Filing of October 20, 2009; screen shots; CBOT RA0907-1

ENERGY - WTI Nymex vs Ice



09:22:42

Basis Swap ME EFS Comp NBP - Ht - NS Nmx vs Ice NI Sweeps PenLD Comp Prompt NG WTI Nymex vs Ice

Plan	Description	BidAmt	Bid	Offer	OfrAmt	LTP	Flag	Description	BidAmt	Bid	Offer	OfrAmt	LTP
✓	---NMX WTI TAS Blocks---						✓	CLH2 vs ENH2 Mar12					
✓	NMX WTI TAS Dec09						✓	CLJ2 vs ENJ2 Apr12					
✓	---WTI NMX vs ICE---						✓	CLK2 vs ENK2 May12					
✓	CLZ9 vs ENZ9 Dec09						✓	CLM2 vs ENM2 Jun12					
✓	CLF0 vs ENF0 Jan10						✓	CLN2 vs ENN2 Jul12					
✓	CLG0 vs ENG0 Feb10						✓	CLO1 vs ENO1 Aug12					
✓	CLH0 vs ENH0 Mar10						✓	CLJ2 vs ENJ2 Sep12					
✓	CLJ0 vs ENJ0 Apr10						✓	CLV2 vs ENV2 Oct12					
✓	CLK0 vs ENK0 May10						✓	CLX2 vs ENX2 Nov12					
✓	CLM0 vs ENM0 Jun10						✓	CLZ2 vs ENZ2 Dec12					
✓	CLN0 vs ENN0 Jul10						✓	CLE3 vs ENF3 Jan13					
✓	CLQ0 vs ENQ0 Aug10						✓	CLG3 vs ENG3 Feb13					
✓	CLU0 vs ENU0 Sep10						✓	CLJ3 vs ENJ3 Apr13					
✓	CLV0 vs ENV0 Oct10						✓	CLK3 vs ENK3 May13					
✓	CLX0 vs ENX0 Nov10						✓	CLZ3 vs ENZ3 Dec13					
✓	CLZ0 vs ENZ0 Dec10						✓	CLZ4 vs ENZ4 Dec14					
✓	CLF1 vs ENF1 Jan11						✓	CLZ5 vs ENZ5 Dec15					
✓	CLG1 vs ENG1 Feb11						✓	CLZ6 vs ENZ6 Dec16					
✓	CLH1 vs ENH1 Mar11						✓	WTI Nmx vs Ice Dec09 vs					
✓	CLJ1 vs ENJ1 Apr11						✓	WTI Nmx vs Ice Dec09 vs					
✓	CLK1 vs ENK1 May11						✓	WTI Nmx vs Ice Dec09 vs					
✓	CLM1 vs ENM1 Jun11						✓	WTI Nmx vs Ice Dec09 vs					
✓	CLN1 vs ENN1 Jul11						✓	WTI Nmx vs Ice Dec09 vs					
✓	CLQ1 vs ENQ1 Aug11						✓	WTI Nmx vs Ice Dec09 vs					
✓	CLU1 vs ENU1 Sep11						✓	WTI Nmx vs Ice Jan10 vs					
✓	CLV1 vs ENV1 Oct11						✓	WTI Nmx vs Ice Jan10 vs					
✓	CLX1 vs ENX1 Nov11						✓	WTI Nmx vs Ice Feb10 vs					
✓	CLZ1 vs ENZ1 Dec11						✓	WTI Nmx vs Ice Dec10 vs					
✓	CLF2 vs ENF2 Jan12						✓	WTI Nmx vs Ice Dec10 vs					
✓	CLG2 vs ENG2 Feb12						✓	WTI Nmx vs Ice Dec11 vs					

Futures Contract Description

Notes

The ICE Futures West Texas Intermediate (WTI) Light Sweet Crude Oil futures contract, launched on February 3 2006. This contract is cash settled against the prevailing market price for US light sweet crude. Price is equal to the penultimate settlement price of WTI crude

25) View All Notes

Contract Specifications

Name WTI CRUDE FUTURE Dec09
 26) Ticker ENZ9 Comdty
 27) Exchange ICE-Intercontinental Exchange
 Underlying

Trading Hours

Exchange Local
 01:00-23:00 21:00-19:00

Contract Size 1,000 barrels

Value of 1.0 pt \$ 1,000

Tick Size 0.01

Tick Value \$ 10

28) Price **78.91** USD/bbl

Contract Value \$ 78,910 @ 10:37:13

Margin Limits

Speculator Hedger

Initial 4,140

Secondary

Cycle	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Up Limit										250.00		146.77
Down Limit										5.00		46.15

Related Dates

Cash Settled

First Trade Tue Feb 21, 2006
 Last Trade Thu Nov 19, 2009
 Valuation Date Thu Nov 19, 2009

Price Range

Up Limit 250.00 Life High 146.77
 Down Limit 5.00 Life Low 46.15

Future

Australia 61 2 9777 8600 Brazil 5511 3048 4500 Europe 44 20 7330 7500 Germany 49 69 9204 1210 Hong Kong 852 2977 6000
 Japan 81 3 3201 8900 Singapore 65 6212 1000
 Copyright 2009 Bloomberg Finance L.P.
 SH 898172 29-Oct-2009 10:47:36

