



Timothy Elliott
Managing Director and Chief Regulatory Counsel
Legal Department

November 8, 2024

VIA ELECTRONIC PORTAL

Mr. Christopher J. Kirkpatrick
Office of the Secretariat
Commodity Futures Trading Commission
Three Lafayette Centre
1155 21st Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20581

Re: FOIA Confidential Treatment Request

Dear Mr. Kirkpatrick:

By electronic portal dated today, November 8, 2024, The Board of Trade of the City of Chicago, Inc. ("CBOT") submitted a supplemental organization rule certification filing (Submission No. 24-124S) to the Commodity Futures Trading Commission ("CFTC" or "Commission"). The supplemental filing includes an Appendix A and Appendix B for which the Exchange is submitting a detailed written justification setting forth grounds for this request for confidential treatment.

Pursuant to Sections 8 and 8(a) of the Commodity Exchange Act ("CEA"), as amended, and Commission Regulation 145.9(d), the Exchange requests confidential treatment of Appendix A and Appendix B on the grounds that disclosure of Appendix A and Appendix B would reveal confidential commercial information of the Exchange. Pursuant to Commission Regulation 145.9(d)(5), the Exchange requests that confidential treatment be maintained for Appendix A and Appendix B until further notice from the Exchange. The Exchange also requests that the Commission notify the undersigned immediately after receiving any FOIA request for said Appendix A and Appendix B or any other court order, subpoena or summons for same. Finally, the Exchange requests notification in the event the Commission intends to disclose such Appendix A and Appendix B to Congress or to any other governmental agency or unit pursuant to Section 8 of the CEA. The Exchange does not waive its notification rights under Section 8(f) of the CEA with respect to any subpoena or summons for such Appendix A and Appendix B.

Should you have any questions concerning the above, please contact the undersigned at (312) 466-7478 or via e-mail at CMEGSubmissionInquiry@cmegroup.com.

Sincerely,

/s/ Timothy Elliott
Managing Director and Chief Regulatory Counsel

Attachment: Exhibit 1

Exhibit 1

DETAILED WRITTEN JUSTIFICATION



Timothy Elliott
Managing Director and Chief Regulatory Counsel
Legal Department

November 8, 2024

VIA ELECTRONIC PORTAL

Assistant Secretary of the Commission for FOIA,
Privacy and Sunshine Acts Compliance
Commodity Futures Trading Commission
Three Lafayette Centre, 8th Floor
1155 21st Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20581

**Re: FOIA Confidential Treatment Request: Appendix A and Appendix B to CBOT
Submission No. 24-124S**

Dear FOIA Compliance Staff:

I am writing on behalf of The Board of Trade of the City of Chicago, Inc. ("CBOT" or "Exchange"), a subsidiary of CME Group Inc. In accordance with the requirements set forth in Commodity Futures Trading Commission ("CFTC" or "Commission") Regulation 40.8, the Exchange hereby submits its detailed written justification in support of continued confidentiality of the information set out in Appendix A and Appendix B to Submission No. 24-124S ("Appendix A and Appendix B") and respectfully requests that the Commission not release the information contained therein.

As discussed more fully below, Submission No. 24-124S contains confidential and proprietary commercial information of the Exchange and is thus exempt from disclosure pursuant to Section 8 of the Commodity Exchange Act ("CEA"), Commission Regulation 145.9(d) and Exemption 4 (the "Exemption") to the Freedom of Information Act ("FOIA").

Presumption of Confidentiality

There is a presumption of confidentiality for commercial information that is (1) provided voluntarily and (2) is of a kind the provider would not customarily make available to the public. See Critical Mass Energy Project v. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, 975 F.2d 871, 878 (D.C. Cir. 1992) (en banc); see also Center for Auto Safety v. National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 244 F.3d 144, 147 (D.C. Cir. 2001) (affirming continuing validity of Critical Mass and applying tests detailed in that case). The Exchange provided the confidential information in Appendix A and Appendix B to the Commission voluntarily in connection with the above referenced submission in order to demonstrate to the Commission the compliance with the CEA and relevant Commission Regulations. The information set out in Appendix A and Appendix B were developed by the Exchange at significant cost and over a substantial period of time. The Exchange would not customarily make such information available to the public.

Disclosure Would Likely Cause Competitive Harm to the Exchange

Notwithstanding this presumption of confidentiality, the confidential information in Appendix A and Appendix B still would be considered "confidential" because it is information that the Exchange would not have disclosed to the public and its disclosure would cause substantial harm to the competitive position of

the Exchange. FOIA was enacted to facilitate the disclosure of information to the public, but was clearly not intended to allow business competitors “cheap” access to valuable confidential information, especially when “competition in business turns on the relative costs and opportunities faced by members of the same industry.” Worthington Compressors v. Costle, 662 F.2d 45, 51 (D.C. Cir. 1981).

When a submitter of confidential information has a “commercial interest in the requested information the [E]xemption is properly invoked.” ISG Group, Inc. v. Dept. of Defense, 1989 WL 168858 (D.D.C. 1989). The test for determining confidentiality under Exemption 4 is set forth in National Parks & Conservation Association v. Morton, where the court held that information is confidential if its disclosure would “cause substantial harm to the competitive position of the person from whom the information was obtained.” In applying the “competitive harm” test for confidentiality, there is no requirement to demonstrate actual competitive harm. Gulf & Western Indus., Inc. v. United States, 615 F.2d 527, 530 (D.C. Cir. 1979). “Actual competition and the likelihood of substantial competitive injury is all that need to be shown.” Gulf & Western Indus., Inc. v. United States, 615 F.2d at 530. Information is confidential if: 1) there is actual competition in the relevant market; and 2) disclosure is likely to cause substantial competitive injury. Id. Neither the Commission nor the courts must conduct a sophisticated economic analysis to determine the likely effects of disclosure; evidence demonstrating the *potential* for economic harm is sufficient. Utah v. Bahe et al., No. 00-4018, 2001 WL 777034, at 2 (10th Cir. July 10, 2001); Public Citizen Health Research Group v. Food & Drug Admin., 704 F.2d 1280, 1291 (D.C. Cir. 1983).

Disclosure Would Likely Harm the Exchange

The Exchange also satisfies the second requirement for the “competitive harm” test for confidentiality because the release of the information would likely cause substantial competitive injury to the Exchange. See Gulf & Western Indus. Inc. v. United States 615 F.2d 527,530 (D.C. Cir. 1979). As noted above, a sophisticated economic analysis is unnecessary; the potential for economic harm is sufficient. Utah v. Bahe et al., No. 00-4018, 2001 WL 777034, at 2 (Cir. July 10, 2001); Public Citizen Health Research Group v. Food & Drug Admin., 704 F.2d 1280, 1291 (D.C. Cir. 1983).

Under circumstances similar to those involved here, courts have recognized that disclosure of commercial information holds the potential for significant competitive harm. Bahe No. 00-4018, 2001 WL 777034, at 2-3 (terms and structure of contract for storage of nuclear fuel confidential); Heeney v. Food & Drug Admin., 2001 U.S. App. Lexis 7732, at 3-4 (9th Cir. April 12, 2001) (manufacturing agreement and other information confidential); Professional Review Org. v. U.S. Department of Health and Human Servs., 607 F. Supp. 423, 425-26 (D.D.C. 1985) (business plans confidential). When applying the “substantial competitive harm test,” courts “[c]onsider how valuable the information will be to the requesting competitors and how much this gain will damage the submitter.” Worthington Compressors, 662 F.2d at 51.

Appendix A and Appendix B contain valuable commercial information. This information was developed at significant cost and over a substantial period of time. It would destroy the value of that work if the Exchange was required to make that information available to competitors, who could free ride our efforts with no cost. Additionally, there is no regulatory imperative to disclose such information.

For the foregoing reasons, the Exchange respectfully requests that the Commission maintain the confidential privilege afforded to this type of information and refrain from releasing Appendix A and Appendix B as such action could prove harmful to the Exchange.

Should you have any questions concerning the above, please contact the undersigned at (312) 466-7478 or via e-mail at CMEGSubmissionInquiry@cmegroup.com.

Sincerely,

/s/ Timothy Elliott
Managing Director and Chief Regulatory Counsel