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III. Current Actions

Type of Review: Extension without changes.

Title: Worker Profiling and Reemployment Services Activity and Outcomes.

OMB Number: 1205–0353.

AFFECTED PUBLIC: State Workforce Agencies.

Form(s): ETA 9048, ETA 9049.

Estimated Total Annual Respondents: 53.

Annual Frequency: Quarterly.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Copyright Office

SCOPE OF THE COPYRIGHT ROYALTY JUDGES’ CONTINUING JURISDICTION

AGENCY: Copyright Office, Library of Congress.

ACTION: Final order.

SUMMARY: The Copyright Royalty Judges (“CRJs”), acting pursuant to statute, referred novel material questions of substantive law to the Register of Copyrights for resolution. Those questions concerned the manner and extent to which section 114(f)(5)(C) of the Copyright Act bars the CRJs from admitting into evidence or otherwise considering the provisions contained in settlement agreements reached pursuant to the Webcaster Settlement Act of 2009. The Register resolved those questions in a written decision that was transmitted to the CRJs. That decision is reproduced below.

DATES: Effective Date: September 22, 2015.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Stephen Ruwe, Assistant General Counsel, U.S. Copyright Office, P.O. Box 70400, Washington, DC 20024. Telephone: (202) 707–8350.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Copyright Royalty Judges are tasked with determining and adjusting rates and terms of royalty payments for statutory licenses under the Copyright Act. See 17 U.S.C. 801. If, in the course of proceedings before the CRJs, novel material questions of substantive law concern the interpretation of provisions of title 17 arise, the CRJs are required by statute to refer those