

## **Quoting Behavior and Information Leakage Project**

Beniamin Connault <br/>
<br/>
beniamin.connault@iextrading.com>

To: Thomas Moore <thomas\_moore@mfe.berkeley.edu>

Tue, Jun 11, 2019 at 12:38 PM

Cc: Kevin Ramlal <kevinramlal@berkeley.edu>, Weipeng Shao <weipeng\_shao@berkeley.edu>, Junjie Rao <raojunjie2014@berkeley.edu>

Hi all.

Thank you for this detailed update. Great to hear you've already made good progress. If you'd like, I am happy to jump on a call and chat a bit about the project, maybe answer potential questions you may have. No pressure though, up to you.

TAQ is definitely the right data for this project. I know the data is not easy to work with and I read through your jupyter notebook – great job unpacking the data already. Here are a couple of additional pointers

- The SIP distributes (and TAQ redistributes) 3 tables: "trades", "quotes", "nbbo".
- The "nbbo" table name is misleading. It cannot be used by itself and it's really a complement of the "quotes" table for the purpose of building the nbbo.
- There are two roads to building the nbbo:
  - Use "quotes" + "nnbo" and the NATBBO\_IND column.

  - Just using "quotes" and the quote condition logic (QU\_COND).

     This is the road that we take at IEX internally (we don't look at the SIP/TAQ "nnbo" table at all).
    - It allows you to create a richer version of a custom nbbo table, including for example the set of exchanges on the nbb / nbo (probably useful for this project). See below for a screenshot of our internal nbbo table.

| data       |      | åi.e               | - Banca    | b alas a   | h a la a | 614     |         |       |            |            |
|------------|------|--------------------|------------|------------|----------|---------|---------|-------|------------|------------|
| date       | sym  | time               | bexs       | bsizes     | bsize    | bid     | ask     | asize | asizes     | aexs       |
| 2018.01.04 | AAPL | 09:30:00.114854924 | enlist "T" | enlist 51i | 51       | 1726000 | 1727100 | 1     | enlist li  | enlist "T" |
| 2018.01.04 | AAPL | 09:30:00.179964944 | enlist "P" | enlist li  | 1        | 1726300 | 1727100 | 1     | enlist li  | enlist "T" |
| 2018.01.04 | AAPL | 09:30:00.192815687 | enlist "P" | enlist li  | 1        | 1726300 | 1727100 | 2     | enlist 2i  | enlist "T" |
| 2018.01.04 | AAPL | 09:30:00.216050853 | enlist "X" | enlist li  | 1        | 1726400 | 1727100 | 2     | enlist 2i  | enlist "T" |
| 2018.01.04 | AAPL | 09:30:00.242303475 | enlist "P" | enlist li  | 1        | 1726300 | 1727100 | 2     | enlist 2i  | enlist "T" |
| 2018.01.04 | AAPL | 09:30:00.258104228 | enlist "P" | enlist li  | 1        | 1726300 | 1727000 | 1     | enlist li  | enlist "Z" |
| 2018.01.04 | AAPL | 09:30:00.265703274 | enlist "P" | enlist li  | 1        | 1726300 | 1727100 | 2     | enlist 2i  | enlist "T" |
| 2018.01.04 | AAPL | 09:30:00.419196064 | enlist "P" | enlist li  | 1        | 1726300 | 1726700 | 1     | enlist li  | enlist "X" |
| 2018.01.04 | AAPL | 09:30:00.419537911 | enlist "P" | enlist li  | 1        | 1726300 | 1727100 | 2     | enlist 2i  | enlist "T" |
| 2018.01.04 | AAPL | 09:30:00.426891904 | "TP"       | 5 li       | 6        | 1726300 | 1727100 | 2     | enlist 2i  | enlist "T" |
| 2018.01.04 | AAPL | 09:30:00.428479371 | "TP"       | 6 li       | 7        | 1726300 | 1727100 | 2     | enlist 2i  | enlist "T" |
| 2018.01.04 | AAPL | 09:30:00.430316889 | "TP"       | 7 li       | 8        | 1726300 | 1727100 | 2     | enlist 2i  | enlist "T" |
| 2018.01.04 | AAPL | 09:30:00.492765733 | "TP"       | 7 li       | 8        | 1726300 | 1727100 | 3     | enlist 3i  | enlist "T" |
| 2018.01.04 | AAPL | 09:30:00.505282524 | enlist "P" | enlist li  | 1        | 1727100 | 1727100 | 3     | enlist 3i  | enlist "T" |
| 2018.01.04 | AAPL | 09:30:00.505380370 | "TP"       | 7 li       | 8        | 1726300 | 1727100 | 3     | enlist 3i  | enlist "T" |
| 2018.01.04 | AAPL | 09:30:00.522023025 | "TP"       | 7 li       | 8        | 1726300 | 1727100 | 2     | enlist 2i  | enlist "T" |
| 2018.01.04 | AAPL | 09:30:00.522087340 | "TP"       | 7 li       | 8        | 1726300 | 1727100 | 1     | enlist li  | enlist "T" |
| 2018.01.04 | AAPL | 09:30:00.522090449 | "TP"       | 7 li       | 8        | 1726300 | 1728000 | 17    | enlist 17i | enlist "T" |
| 2018.01.04 | AAPL | 09:30:00.524159767 | "TP"       | 7 li       | 8        | 1726300 | 1727100 | 1     | enlist li  | enlist "T" |
| 2018.01.04 | AAPL | 09:30:00.544454718 | "TP"       | 7 li       | 8        | 1726300 | 1728000 | 17    | enlist 17i | enlist "T" |
| 2018.01.04 | AAPL | 09:30:00.545599610 | "TP"       | 7 li       | 8        | 1726300 | 1728000 | 18    | 17 11      | "TZ"       |
| 2018.01.04 | AAPL | 09:30:00.545671400 | "TPZ"      | 7 l li     | 9        | 1726300 | 1728000 | 18    | 17 li      | "TZ"       |
| 2018.01.04 | AAPL | 09:30:00.545720327 | "TPKZ"     | 7 1 1 1i   | 10       | 1726300 | 1728000 | 18    | 17 11      | "TZ"       |
| 2018.01.04 | AAPL | 09:30:00.546314235 | "TPKZ"     | 7 2 1 li   | 11       | 1726300 | 1728000 | 18    | 17 li      | "TZ"       |
| 2018.01.04 | AAPL | 09:30:00.551261172 | enlist "T" | enlist 12i | 12       | 1727500 | 1728000 | 18    | 17 li      | "TZ"       |
| 2018.01.04 | AAPL | 09:30:00.571368371 | enlist "T" | enlist lli | 11       | 1727500 | 1728000 | 18    | 17 li      | "TZ"       |
| 2018.01.04 | AAPL | 09:30:00.571402510 | enlist "T" | enlist 10i | 10       | 1727500 | 1728000 | 18    | 17 li      | "TZ"       |
| 2018.01.04 | AAPL | 09:30:00.571465939 | enlist "T" | enlist 5i  | 5        | 1727500 | 1728000 | 18    | 17 li      | "TZ"       |
| 2018.01.04 | AAPL | 09:30:00.571466174 | enlist "T" | enlist 4i  | 4        | 1727500 | 1728000 | 18    | 17 li      | "TZ"       |

In terms of quote conditions, the quote that can contribute to the NBBO are the following: O, R for all symbols + Y for tape C symbols.

Once you have nbbo-building logic, you can send me an example and I can validate it against our internal version.

About time aggregation:

- You have access to (non-rounded) nanosecond timestamp so there is 1 approach to the project where you don't do any aggregation.
   This may allow you down-the-line to distinguish and compare two cases such as:

  - Nasdaq creates a bid and is "quickly" followed by BATS.
  - BATS creates a bid and is "quickly" followed by Nasdaq.
     If you aggregate you will see that BATS and NASDAQ created bids.
- Aggregation is still a reasonable way to approach the project. I just wanted to point out the above for you to consider please proceed as you prefer.
- If you do aggregate, I would suggest:
  - Write code so that you easily play with the aggregation window (1 sec, 100 ms, etc.) for potential robustness checks
     Take some time to look at the distribution of # of quote creations by time window.

## Ben

[Quoted text hidden]

This email is subject to important notices and disclaimers regarding legal privilege, confidentiality, viruses and monitoring, available at www.iextrading.com/electroniccommunications