

obtained the copyright from an individual author)?

(iii) Should fees vary depending on whether the claim is being submitted by an individual (e.g., an individual author/claimant submitting the claim on their own behalf) or a corporate entity (e.g., a person submitting a claim on behalf of their corporate employer, a person who works for a law firm, or a person who works for a copyright registration service)?

(c) If the Office were to discount fees for smaller entities, how should entity size be determined—based on annual revenue, employee headcount, non-profit status, and/or another metric?

(d) Under a subscription model, what would be reasonable limits on the number of works that an applicant could register and/or the number of applications they could file within a particular time period? Should there be different limits for different work types and, if so, how should the Office set these limits? How should fees be set given that the Office incurs similar costs when examining each individual work?

(e) What should be the consequence(s) for applicant filing errors (e.g., misclassifying a work, misrepresenting the applicant as an individual or small entity)? In order to help recoup costs and deter this behavior, should the Office refuse registration and require the applicant to refile with a later effective date, charge additional administrative processing fees (in addition to the fee difference), or some other option?

(f) Please identify any current legal or regulatory constraints on adopting alternative fee structures and explain what changes to statutory or regulatory language would remove these impediments.

2. Other than the four alternative fee structures identified in this notice, are there any others that the Office should consider (e.g., tiered fees based on the number of works being registered)? If so, please describe them in detail while considering the above questions.

#### *B. Business and Registration Practices*

3. Please describe your or your organization's current practices with respect to registration, providing information about filing volume and costs incurred (e.g., application fees, personnel costs, third-party service and legal fees) for different types of works where available. In addition, please specify whether you are an individual or organization; and if an organization, please provide the entity's approximate staff headcount and annual revenue.

4. Please describe the extent to which any alternative fee structure, if implemented by the Office, is likely to

affect your practices with respect to registration, including any quantitative projections about the effect on filing volume and registration-related expenses.

5. Are you aware of any potential applicants that are not fully participating in the current registration system and would be incentivized to register works if the Office implemented one or more alternative fee structures? If so, describe the potential applicant(s), identify the fee structure(s), and explain the projected change(s) in registration activity, providing quantitative data where available.

6. Would implementing any of the alternative fee structures deter any potential applicants from seeking registration or otherwise lead them to modify their registration practices? If so, describe the potential applicant(s), identify the fee structure(s), and explain the projected change(s) in registration activity, providing quantitative data and analysis where available.

#### *C. Processing Costs and Feasibility*

7. The Office has traditionally recovered approximately 50 to 60% of our costs through fees; and the remainder is provided through appropriations from Congress. If alternative fee structures were to increase costs for providing registration services—for example, by increasing registration volume and requiring more examiners—how should the Office recover these additional costs? If the Office were to increase fees to make up for any budgetary shortfall, please identify which service fees should be increased and explain why those increases would be “fair and equitable.”

8. The adoption of any alternative fee structure is subject to technical feasibility within ECS Registration, currently in development, and would require developing additional system capabilities. To assess usage and costs before expanding access to more applicants, should the Office adopt any alternative fee structures on a limited or temporary basis? Should these fee structures be limited to certain types of works or applications? Please identify any appropriate limitations and explain why certain applications should be given higher priority.

9. Are there other process changes that could be implemented through development of ECS Registration—i.e., in-process technological upgrades to make application processing easier for internal and external users—that would incentivize registration and improve cost recovery? Would the Office's planned development of API functionality, once implemented,

diminish the need for any of the proposed alternative fee structures?

10. The Office periodically evaluates, including in our fee studies, how often various registration options are used by applicants and the costs associated with providing each of them. If we were to adopt any alternative fee structures, would that obviate the need for any existing application options, such as current group registration applications? Conversely, would more or expanded group registration options obviate the need for any of the alternative fee structures? Should the Office “sunset” or discontinue any group registration options or alternative fee structures if they are infrequently used or duplicative of other options?

Dated: March 24, 2026.

**Emily L. Chapuis,**

*General Counsel and Associate Register of Copyrights.*

[FR Doc. 2026–05886 Filed 3–25–26; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 1410–30–P**

---

## **POSTAL REGULATORY COMMISSION**

**[Docket No. CP2024–545]**

### **New Postal Products**

**AGENCY:** Postal Regulatory Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Commission is noticing a recent Postal Service filing for the Commission's consideration concerning a negotiated service agreement. This notice informs the public of the filing, invites public comment, and takes other administrative steps.

**DATES:** *Comments are due:* March 31, 2026.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit comments electronically via the Commission's Filing Online system at <https://www.prc.gov>. Those who cannot submit comments electronically should contact the person identified in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section by telephone for advice on filing alternatives.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** David A. Trissell, General Counsel, at 202–789–6820.

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

#### **Table of Contents**

- I. Introduction
- II. Public Proceeding(s)
- III. Summary Proceeding(s)

#### **I. Introduction**

Pursuant to 39 CFR 3041.405, the Commission gives notice that the Postal Service filed request(s) for the

Commission to consider matters related to Competitive negotiated service agreement(s). The request(s) may propose the addition of a negotiated service agreement from the Competitive product list or the modification of an existing product currently appearing on the Competitive product list.

The public portions of the Postal Service's request(s) can be accessed via the Commission's website (<http://www.prc.gov>). Non-public portions of the Postal Service's request(s), if any, can be accessed through compliance with the requirements of 39 CFR 3011.301.<sup>1</sup>

Section II identifies the docket number(s) associated with each Postal Service request, if any, that will be reviewed in a public proceeding as defined by 39 CFR 3010.101(p), the title of each such request, the request's acceptance date, and the authority cited by the Postal Service for each request. For each such request, the Commission appoints an officer of the Commission to represent the interests of the general public in the proceeding, pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 505 and 39 CFR 3000.114 (Public Representative). The Public Representative does not represent any individual person, entity or particular point of view, and, when Commission attorneys are appointed, no attorney-client relationship is established. Section II also establishes comment deadline(s) pertaining to each such request.

The Commission invites comments on whether the Postal Service's request(s) identified in Section II, if any, are consistent with the policies of title 39. Applicable statutory and regulatory requirements include 39 U.S.C. 3632, 39 U.S.C. 3633, 39 U.S.C. 3642, 39 CFR part 3035, and 39 CFR part 3041. Comment deadline(s) for each such request, if any, appear in Section II.

Section III identifies the docket number(s) associated with each Postal Service request, if any, to add a standardized distinct product to the Competitive product list or to amend a standardized distinct product, the title of each such request, the request's acceptance date, and the authority cited by the Postal Service for each request. Standardized distinct products are negotiated service agreements that are variations of one or more Competitive products, and for which financial models, minimum rates, and classification criteria have undergone

advance Commission review. *See* 39 CFR 3041.110(n); 39 CFR 3041.205(a). Such requests are reviewed in summary proceedings pursuant to 39 CFR 3041.325(c)(2) and 39 CFR 3041.505(f)(1). Pursuant to 39 CFR 3041.405(c)–(d), the Commission does not appoint a Public Representative or request public comment in proceedings to review such requests.

## II. Public Proceedings(s)

1. *Docket No(s)*: CP2024–545; *Filing Title*: USPS Request Concerning Amendment One to Priority Mail Express, Priority Mail & USPS Ground Advantage Contract 236, with Materials Filed Under Seal; *Filing Acceptance Date*: March 23, 2026; *Filing Authority*: 39 CFR 3035.105 and 39 CFR 3041.505; *Public Representative*: Kenneth Moeller; *Comments Due*: March 31, 2026.

## III. Summary Proceedings(s)

None. *See* Section II for public proceedings.

This Notice will be published in the **Federal Register**.

**Danielle LeFlore**,

*Legal Assistant*.

[FR Doc. 2026–05878 Filed 3–25–26; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7710–FW–P**

## SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34–105063 File No. SR–CBOE–2025–079]

### Self-Regulatory Organizations; Cboe Exchange, Inc.; Notice of Designation of a Longer Period for Commission Action on a Proposed Rule Change To Allow for Extended Trading of Multi-Listed Equity Options

March 23, 2026.

On September 30, 2025, Cboe Exchange, Inc. filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (“Commission”), pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (“Act”) <sup>1</sup> and Rule 19b–4 thereunder,<sup>2</sup> a proposed rule change to amend Cboe Rule 5.1(c) (Global Trading Hours) to allow for extended trading sessions of multi-listed equity options that meet certain eligibility criteria. The proposed rule change was published for comment in the **Federal Register** on October 3, 2025.<sup>3</sup> On November 3, 2025, pursuant to Section 19(b)(2) of the Act,<sup>4</sup>

the Commission designated a longer period within which to approve the proposed rule change, disapprove the proposed rule change, or institute proceedings to determine whether to approve or disapprove the proposed rule change.<sup>5</sup> On December 23, 2025, the Commission instituted proceedings pursuant to Section 19(b)(2)(B) of the Act<sup>6</sup> to determine whether to approve or disapprove the proposed rule change.<sup>7</sup> The Commission received one comment letter regarding the proposed rule change.<sup>8</sup>

Section 19(b)(2) of the Act<sup>9</sup> provides that, after initiating disapproval proceedings, the Commission shall issue an order approving or disapproving the proposed rule change not later than 180 days after the date of publication of notice of filing of the proposed rule change. The Commission may extend the period for issuing an order approving or disapproving the proposed rule change, however, by not more than 60 days if the Commission determines that a longer period is appropriate and publishes the reasons for such determination. The proposed rule change was published for notice and comment in the **Federal Register** on October 3, 2025.<sup>10</sup> April 1, 2026, is 180 days from that date. The Commission is extending the time period for approving or disapproving the proposed rule change for an additional 60 days. The Commission finds it appropriate to designate a longer period within which to issue an order approving or disapproving the proposed rule change so that it has sufficient time to consider the proposed rule change and the issues raised therein. Accordingly, the Commission, pursuant to Section 19(b)(2) of the Act,<sup>11</sup> designates May 31, 2026, as the date by which the Commission shall either approve or disapprove the proposed rule change (File No. SR–CBOE–2025–079).

<sup>5</sup> *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 104173, 90 FR 51424 (Nov. 17, 2025). The Commission designated January 1, 2026, as the date by which the Commission shall approve or disapprove, or institute proceedings to determine whether to approve or disapprove, the proposed rule change.

<sup>6</sup> 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(2)(B).

<sup>7</sup> *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 104509, 90 FR 61454 (Dec. 31, 2025).

<sup>8</sup> Comment letters on the proposed rule change are available at <https://www.sec.gov/rules-regulations/public-comments/sr-cboe-2025-079>.

<sup>9</sup> 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(2).

<sup>10</sup> *See supra* note 3.

<sup>11</sup> 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(2).

<sup>1</sup> *See* Docket No. RM2018–3, Order Adopting Final Rules Relating to Non-Public Information, June 27, 2018, Attachment A at 19–22 (Order No. 4679).

<sup>2</sup> 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

<sup>3</sup> 17 CFR 240.19b–4.

<sup>4</sup> *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 104160 (Sep. 30, 2025), 90 FR 48091.

<sup>5</sup> 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(2).