Below we summarize our analyses based on a number of these statutes and Executive orders.

*A. Impact on Small Entities*

The regulatory flexibility analysis provisions of the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980, 5 U.S.C. 601–612, do not apply to rules that are not subject to notice and comment. Because the Coast Guard has, for good cause, waived the notice and comment requirement that would otherwise apply to this rulemaking, the Regulatory Flexibility Act's flexibility analysis provisions do not apply here.

Under section 213(a) of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 (Pub. L. 104–121), if this rule will affect your small business, organization, or governmental jurisdiction and you have questions, contact the person listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section.

The National Ombudsman resolves concerns of uneven or excessive federal regulatory enforcement. Reviews are confidential and do not waive the right to pursue administrative appeals or any other legal action. Contact 1–888–REG–FAIR (1–888–734–3247) or *Ombudsman@SBA.gov.*

*B. Collection of Information*

This rule will not call for a new collection of information under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501–3520).

*C. Federalism and Indian Tribal Governments*

We have analyzed this rule under Executive Order 13132, Federalism, and have determined that it is consistent with the fundamental federalism principles and preemption requirements described in that Order.

Also, this rule does not have tribal implications under Executive Order 13175, Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments, because it does not have a substantial direct effect on one or more Indian tribes, on the relationship between the Federal Government and Indian tribes, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities between the Federal Government and Indian tribes.

*D. Unfunded Mandates Reform Act*

As required by The Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1531–1538), the Coast Guard certifies that this rule will not result in an annual expenditure of $100,000,000 or more (adjusted for inflation) by a State, local, or tribal government, in the aggregate, or by the private sector.

*E. Environment*

We have analyzed this rule under Department of Homeland Security Directive 023–01, Rev. 1, associated implementing instructions, and Environmental Planning COMDTINST 5090.1 (series), which guide the Coast Guard in complying with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.*), and have determined that this action is one of a category of actions that do not individually or cumulatively have a significant effect on the human environment.

This rule is a safety zone. It is categorically excluded from further review under paragraph L60(c) of Appendix A, Table 1 of DHS Instruction Manual 023–01–001–01, Rev. 1. A Record of Environmental Consideration supporting this determination is available in the docket.

**List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 165**

Harbors, Marine safety, Navigation (water), Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Security measures, Waterways.

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Coast Guard amends 33 CFR part 165 as follows:

## PART 165—REGULATED NAVIGATION AREAS AND LIMITED ACCESS AREAS

■ 1. The authority citation for part 165 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 46 U.S.C. 70034, 70051, 70124; 33 CFR 1.05–1, 6.04–1, 6.04–6, and 160.5; Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 00170.1, Revision No. 01.4.

■ 2. Add § 165.T08–0466 to read as follows:

**§ 165.T08–0466 Safety Zone; Mississippi River, New Orleans, LA.**

(a) *Location.* The following area is a safety zone: all waters of the Lower Mississippi River extending 500 feet from the Left Descending Bank, from Mile Marker 95.5 to 96.5 Above Head of Passes.

(b) *Definitions.* As used in this section, *designated representative* means a Coast Guard Patrol Commander, including a Coast Guard coxswain, petty officer, or other officer operating a Coast Guard vessel and a Federal, State, and local officer designated by or assisting the Captain of the Port Sector New Orleans (COTP) in the enforcement of the safety zone.

(c) *Regulations.* (1) Under the general safety zone regulations in subpart C of this part, you may not enter the safety zone described in paragraph (a) of this section unless authorized by the COTP or the COTP's designated representative.

(2) To seek permission to enter, contact the COTP or the COTP's representative on VHF–FM channel 16 or by telephone at (251) 266–1234. Those in the safety zone must comply with all lawful orders or directions given to them by the COTP or the COTP's designated representative.

(d) *Enforcement period.* This section will be enforced from November 13, 2026 through December 11, 2026, unless cancelled earlier by the COTP.

**Melanie A. Burham,**

*Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port Sector New Orleans.*

[FR Doc. 2026–23452 Filed 11–17–26; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 9110–04–P**

## LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

## U.S. Copyright Office

## 37 CFR Parts 201 and 203

**[Docket No. 2026–2]**

## Copyright Office Fees

**AGENCY:** U.S. Copyright Office, Library of Congress.

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Copyright Office is publishing a final rule establishing adjusted fees for registration, recordation, record retrieval, search and certification, the Licensing Section services, and other services. The Office last adjusted fees in 2020, based on a study of our fiscal 2016 and 2017 costs. Since that time, the costs of providing Office services have risen substantially due to inflation and other increases. The adjusted fees are intended to enable recovery of a percentage of the Office's costs, closer to historical levels, without imposing undue barriers to access its services. This rule will take effect January 5, 2027.

**DATES:** Effective January 5, 2027.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Rhea Efthimiadis, Assistant to the General Counsel, by email at *USCOGeneralCounsel@copyright.gov,* or by telephone at (202) 707–8350.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

### I. Background

This final rule adjusts Copyright Office fees in accordance with section 708 of title 17, United States Code (the ''Copyright Act'' or ''Act''). The Copyright Act requires that the Office charge fees for certain services.[1]

[1] *See* 17 U.S.C. 708. The Office also provides other services free to the public, such as access to the online public record, educational materials, and

Pursuant to the Act, the Register of Copyrights (the ''Register'') may adjust fees based on a study of its costs for administering the registration of claims, the recordation of documents, and the provision of other services.[2] Since 1997, the Office has undertaken a series of studies to determine what fees to charge for specific services.[3] We typically revisit our schedule approximately every three to five years, and adjust fees to take into account changing costs and work processes. During this process, we seek and consider public comment before finalizing a schedule of adjusted fees.[4] The Office last adjusted its fees in 2020.[5]

Section 708(a) of the Act specifies that ''[f]ees shall be paid to the Register'' for the following services:

(1) Filing an application under section 408 for registration of a copyright claim or for a supplementary registration, including the issuance of a certificate of registration if registration is made;

(2) Filing an application for registration of a claim for renewal of a subsisting copyright, including the issuance of a certificate of registration if registration is made;

(3) Issuing a receipt for a deposit under section 407;

(4) Recording a transfer of copyright ownership or other document;

(5) Filing a notice of intention to obtain a compulsory license under section 115(b);

(6) Recording a statement revealing the identity of an author of an anonymous or pseudonymous work, or recording a statement relating to the death of an author;

(7) Issuing an additional certificate of registration;

(8) Issuing any other certification;

(9) Making and reporting on a search, and any related services;

(10) Filing a statement of account based on secondary transmissions of primary transmissions pursuant to sections 119 and 122; and

(11) Filing a statement of account based on secondary transmissions of primary transmissions pursuant to section 111.

Section 708(a) also authorizes the Register to fix fees for other services, such as the cost of preparing copies of Office records.

The statute contemplates two different mechanisms for setting the above fees. Fees for the services described in section 708(a)(1) through (9)—which include the Office's registration and recordation functions—must be outlined in a proposed schedule that is sent to Congress 120 days before the adjusted fees can take effect.[6] Other fees, including those for filing cable and satellite statements of account under sections 708(a)(10) and (11), are not submitted to Congress but instead are established by the Register based on the Office's costs, following a notice-and-comment rulemaking process.[7]

Before proposing adjusted fees for the services enumerated in sections 708(a)(1) through (9), the Register is to conduct a study of the Office's costs for registering claims, recording documents, and providing other services, and to consider the timing of any fee adjustments consistent with the Office's budget.[8] Section 708(b) further provides that the Register may adjust these fees to ''not more than necessary to cover the reasonable costs incurred by the Copyright Office for . . . [such services], plus a reasonable inflation adjustment to account for any estimated increase in costs.'' [9] Finally, this section requires the ''[f]ees established . . . [to] be fair and equitable and give due consideration to the objectives of the copyright system.'' [10]

The Office initiated this fee study in 2023 by contracting with the Library of Congress's (''Library'') Federal Research Division (''FRD'') to analyze our current and expected future costs.[11] The resulting study (the ''FRD Report'') estimated the costs of the Office's fee-based services—incorporating both direct and indirect costs, including IT modernization costs, based on government-identified best practices from the Office of Management and Budget, the U.S. Government Accountability Office, and the Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board.[12] The FRD Report relied on quantitative data gathered from time-use surveys, personnel cost records, non-personnel financial records, licensing fiduciary statements, annual report data, transaction costs for receiving and shipping materials, and Electronic Copyright Office database records from fiscal years 2020 through 2024, as well as qualitative interviews.[13] With this data, FRD created a model calculating the Office's fee-based services to cost an estimated $15.6 million in annual direct costs and $81.8 million in annual indirect costs.[14]

After independently evaluating the FRD Report,[15] the Office published a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (''NPRM'') in the **Federal Register** on March 20, 2026, seeking comments on a proposed schedule of fee adjustments.[16] As we noted in the NPRM, fees have historically comprised a substantial portion of the Office's operating budget.[17] Approximately 60% of our actual expenses were covered by fees from 2009 to 2018, with Congress appropriating the remainder [18]—a balance reflecting the benefits the Office provides to copyright owners and users of copyrighted works as well as the broader public interests we serve. In

authoritative guidance on the Office's practices through the *Compendium of U.S. Copyright Office Practices. See* U.S. Copyright Office, Compendium of Copyright Office Practices (3d. ed. 2021).

[2] *See* 17 U.S.C. 708(b).

[3] In 1997, Congress created a new fee system allowing the Office to set all of its fees by regulation. An Act to make technical amendments to certain provisions of Title 17, Public Law 105–80, 111 Stat. 1529 (1997). Before then, Congress itself set the fees for certain basic copyright services, including registration and recordation (often referred to as ''statutory fees'') and the Register set the fees for other special services by regulation. In enacting statutory copyright fees, Congress considered a number of criteria, including the cost of providing the service, the value of the service to the Library of Congress, and the benefit of the service to the general public.

[4] *See* 17 U.S.C. 708 (establishing Register's authority to set fees, as well as fee setting standards).

[5] *See* 85 FR 9374 (Feb. 19, 2020).

[6] 17 U.S.C. 708(b)(5). The Register submitted the proposed schedule and analysis to Congress on July 14, 2026. U.S. Copyright Office, *Proposed Schedule and Analysis of Copyright Fees to Go into Effect in Fall 2026* (2026) (''Fee Study''), *https://www.copyright.gov/rulemaking/feestudy2026/proposed-fee-schedule.pdf.* If Congress does not enact a law disapproving the proposed schedule, the Register may institute the proposed fees. 17 U.S.C. 708(b)(5).

[7] 17 U.S.C. 708(a).

[8] *Id.* at 708(b)(1).

[9] *Id.* at 708(b)(2).

[10] *Id.* at 708(b)(4).

[11] *Id.* at 708(b)(1)–(2); *see* Federal Research Division, *U.S. Copyright Office FY2024 Fee Study: Cost Assessment Report 3* (2025) (''FRD Report''), *http://copyright.gov/rulemaking/feestudy2026/CostAssessmentReport.pdf.*

[12] *See* FRD Report at 8, 10–11; *id.* at 16–17.

[13] *See id.* at 10; *id.* at 41–42.

[14] *See id.* at 1–2.

[15] The Office focused its evaluation on fairness, equity, the objectives of the Copyright Act, the Office's policy goals, and general guidance from the Government Accountability Office and the Office of Management and Budget's *Circular No. A–25 Revised: User Charges. See* U.S. Gov't Accountability Office, *Federal User Fees: A Design Guide* (May 2008), *https://www.gao.gov/assets/210/203357.pdf; see also* Office of Mgmt. and Budget, *Circular No. A–25 Revised* (2017), *https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/Circular-025.pdf.* Among other things, *Circular No. A–25 Revised* provides that services with a broad-reaching benefit generally need not recover their full costs, whereas special services that provide a particular benefit to a particular customer may recover more than their full cost. The excess revenue collected from special services fees can offset losses from other fees that may not recover their full cost.

[16] 91 FR 13529 (Mar. 20, 2026).

[17] *Id.* at 13532.

[18] *Id.* In the study of the Office's costs for the last fee adjustment, the external consultant also recommended that the Office target a 60% cost recovery from fees. Booz Allen Hamilton, *2017 Fee Study Report* 2 (2017), *https://www.copyright.gov/rulemaking/feestudy2018/fee_study_report.pdf.*

recent years, the percentage of actual costs recovered from fees has decreased sharply, with the Office recovering only 41% of its actual expenses from fees in fiscal year 2024.[19]

The NPRM provided an analysis of the proposed fee changes and explained the Office's conclusion that they were ''fair and equitable and g[a]ve due consideration to the objectives of the copyright system,'' as required by the statute.[20] It also explained that the proposed fee schedule would ''ensure[ ] that the Office continues to be a prudent fiduciary of public funds while supporting the policy goals of promoting creativity and enabling the effective exercise of rights.'' [21]

In the NPRM, the Office proposed an average fee increase of 43% to account for increases in the cost of providing services.[22] This reflects both historic inflation since the last fee study and anticipated inflation over the next three years.[23] We generally apportioned more cost recovery to services primarily used by larger commercial entities and less to services primarily used by individual creators.[24] Where appropriate, we also set identical fees for analogous services, such as certain group registration options.[25] Finally, we assessed each adjustment's impact on projected revenue. For some low-volume services, we proposed only slight increases because more significant ones would not result in much additional revenue.[26] For others, higher costs supported larger increases to bring fees in line with the costs of providing those services.[27]

The NPRM proposed the following fees for basic registration claims: $85 for electronic claims submitted using the Standard Application (up from $65); and $185 for claims submitted using paper applications (up from $125).[28] The proposed fee increase for electronic claims would bring the cost recovery for this service up from 47% to an average 62% in the first year of the new fee term, in line with the historical cost recovery of approximately 60% for most services.[29] The proposed fee increase for paper applications was assessed to approximate the actual cost of the service.[30] In addition, we proposed eliminating the Single Application registration option, which carried a fee of $45, reasoning that eliminating this relatively inefficient option would allow us to process the more widely used options more efficiently.[31]

For most group registration options, the Office proposed a fee of $130 up from approximately $65 to $95 per group in order to account for their often high processing costs and relatively low cost recovery.[32] We proposed more substantial fees for three group options: $700 for group registrations of non-photographic databases (up from $500) and group registrations of updates and revisions to photographic databases (up from $250), and $350 for group registrations of updates to a news website (up from $95).[33] We reasoned that these options primarily serve commercial applicants with relatively inelastic demand, and more substantial increases here could subsidize other group registration options more commonly used by individual applicants.[34] The Office also proposed a fee of $85 for two group options: group registrations of unpublished photographs, and group registrations of published photographs (both up from $55).[35] We reasoned that these modest increases would achieve greater cost recovery while maintaining low per-work registration fees.[36] In recognition of the particular cost barriers faced by photographers, the proposed fees would represent a 35% discount compared to those for other group registration options listed above.[37]

The Office also proposed fee increases for less commonly used registration and related services. These included a proposed fee of $320 for preregistration of certain unpublished works (up from $200), and a fee of $650 for registration of a mask work or vessel design (up from $150 and $500, respectively).[38] Similarly, we proposed a special handling surcharge for expedited application processing of $1,100 (up from $800).[39] Given the high costs of providing these services, we proposed raising these fees to achieve a cost recovery more in line with their full cost.[40] We reasoned that increasing fees for services with relatively inelastic demand would allow for greater overall cost recovery and would offset the cost of other, more commonly used registration services.[41]

Finally, the Office proposed fee increases above the historical and projected rate of inflation for several recordation services. These included a proposed base recordation fee of $215 for electronic submissions (up from $95) and $320 for paper submissions (up from $125), as well as increases for the recordation of additional works and alternate identifiers, correction of online Public Catalog data, designation of an agent to receive notification of claimed infringement, schedule of pre-1972 sound recordings, removal of pre-1972 sound recordings from the Office's database of indexed schedules, and notices of noncommercial uses of pre-1972 sound recordings.[42] We reasoned that larger fee increases for these services, which are most commonly used by commercial entities, would enable greater cost recovery and offset costs of other services.

The Office received 81 comments from a variety of interested parties in response to the NPRM, raising a range of issues that are discussed further below.[43] After carefully considering each comment, on July 14, 2026, we submitted a proposed fee schedule to Congress (''Fee Study''), concerning those fees authorized by section 708(a)(1)–(9), including registration and recordation.[44] The Office adopts the Fee Study's analysis and conclusions as part of the basis for this final rule, as supplemented by the discussion below.

For the reasons explained in the Fee Study, also noted below, the Office made several adjustments to the fees proposed in the NPRM to reasonably take into account the range of public comments received. This final rule also sets forth fees for other Office services that the Register is authorized to establish through her rulemaking

[19] 91 FR 13529, 13532.

[20] *Id.*

[21] *Id.* at 13532–33.

[22] *Id.* at 13533.

[23] *Id.*

[24] *Id.* The Office has long recognized that different services may reasonably recover a different portion of their costs. *See* U.S. Copyright Office, *Proposed Schedule and Analysis of Copyright Fees To Go into Effect In Spring 2020* 13 n.66 (2019) (''2020 Fee Study''), *https://www.copyright.gov/rulemaking/feestudy2018/proposed-fee-schedule.pdf;* U.S. Copyright Office, *Proposed Schedule and Analysis of Fees To Go into Effect On Or About April 1, 2014* 10 n.60, 21 (2013) (''2014 Fee Study''), *https://www.copyright.gov/docs/newfees/USCOFeeStudy-Nov13.pdf;* U.S. Gov't Accountability Office, *Federal User Fees: A Design Guide* (May 2008), *https://www.gao.gov/assets/210/203357.pdf;* Office of Mgmt. and Budget, *Circular No. A–25 Revised* (2017), *https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/Circular-025.pdf.*

[25] 91 FR 13529, 13533.

[26] *Id.*

[27] *Id.*

[28] *Id.*

[29] *Id.*

[30] *Id.*

[31] *Id.* at 13533–13534.

[32] *Id.* at 13534–35.

[33] *Id.*

[34] *Id.* at 13534.

[35] *Id.* at 13534–35.

[36] *Id.* at 13534.

[37] *Id.* This proposed fee is equal to the proposed fee for registering one work with the Standard Application.

[38] *Id.* at 13535–36.

[39] *Id.* at 13535.

[40] *Id.*

[41] *Id.*

[42] *Id.* at 13537–38.

[43] The comments can be viewed through the Copyright Office website at *https://www.copyright.gov/rulemaking/feestudy2026/.*

[44] Fee Study at 19–23.

authority without the need to submit them to Congress.[45]

## II. Adjustments to Proposed Fees

Having carefully considered the public comments in light of our statutory duty to establish fees that are fair, equitable, and serve the objectives of the overall copyright system, the Office has adjusted certain fees to address concerns raised by commenters.

### *A. Consideration of Public Comments*

While a few commenters supported the Office's overall proposal,[46] many expressed concerns that the proposed fee increases would impede access to the copyright system and deter registration.[47] For example, the Songwriters Guild of America (''SGA'') and the Society of Composers & Lyricists (''SCL'') contended that ''registration decisions are often made incrementally and under financial constraint. A fee increase of the magnitude proposed is therefore not merely additive; it is likely to be determinative in whether works are registered at all.'' [48]

Some of these commenters focused on the impacts on individual creators, but others specifically challenged the Office's characterization of organizational registrants as able to bear increased costs compared to individuals.[49] Several also highlighted the relatively substantial fee increases for group registration options.[50] For instance, in objecting to the proposed increase to the group registration option for updates to a news website, the News Media Alliance contended that the increase ''would disproportionately depress registrations for this core copyright sector,'' placing an ''excessive burden . . . on local journalism.'' [51]

Commenters expressed mixed views on the proposed elimination of the Single Application. Many individuals opposed this proposal, stating that the Single Application's relatively low fee has been an important cost-saving measure for independent creators.[52] Organizational views were split, with a few commenters supporting elimination.[53] For instance, the United States Internet Preservation Society agreed that the option ''attracted a disproportionate number of unqualified submissions, wasting both applicant and Office resources.'' [54] Several others, however, described the Single Application as an important option for individual authors and encouraged the Office not to eliminate it altogether.[55] As the National Music Publishers' Association put it, ''eliminating the Single Application, and thereby removing an affordable option which self-published songwriters and their administrators rely on for crucial cost-savings, could price some creators out of registration altogether.'' [56]

The Office also received a few comments expressing concern about the fee increases for other services, focusing on recordation services, requests for reconsideration of denials of registration, and the surcharge for expedited services.[57]

Finally, several commenters challenged the methodology of the FRD Report, particularly in comparison to cost analyses from past fee cycles. As noted in the Fee Study, those objections primarily centered around two themes. First, commenters questioned the scope of the indirect costs incorporated into FRD's cost calculations. Specifically, several commenters contested the inclusion of costs associated with divisions of the Office that serve functions beyond the Office's fee-based services.[58] Others echoed comments from past cycles by questioning the inclusion of modernization costs in these calculations, arguing that such costs should not be passed to registrants until the benefits of modernization have been realized.[59] Second, several

[45] 17 U.S.C. 708(a).

[46] *See, e.g.,* American Intellectual Property Law Association (''AIPLA''), Comments Submitted in Response to U.S. Copyright Office's Mar. 20, 2026, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking at 2 (May 1, 2026) (''AIPLA Comments'') (noting that the proposed fee schedule ''largely advances [section 708's] objectives''); United States internet Preservation Society (''USIPS''), Comments Submitted in Response to U.S. Copyright Office's Mar. 20, 2026, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking at 3 (Mar. 20, 2026) (''USIPS Comments'') (''We urge the Office to finalize these fee adjustments promptly and to consider whether additional upward adjustments are warranted given the accelerating costs of digital infrastructure.'').

[47] *See, e.g.,* Olu AnuKin, Comments Submitted in Response to U.S. Copyright Office's Mar. 20, 2026, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking at 1 (Apr. 15, 2026) (''Do not raise prices for copyright registration nor legalize any factor that will make it more expensive or difficult for us creators and artists to try and protect ourselves.''); Annie Brule, Comments Submitted in Response to U.S. Copyright Office's Mar. 20, 2026, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking at 1 (Apr. 7, 2026) (''If the proposed fee hikes were to take effect, I would likely cease registering my works at all, simply because the process would be too expensive. This would leave me and thousands of other professional creatives without the protections that should be in place.''); Aaron Graves, Comments Submitted in Response to U.S. Copyright Office's Mar. 20, 2026, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking at 1 (Apr. 9, 2026) (''If you raise the price, you raise the barrier to entry that much higher, and you make my own cost for protection that much greater.''); Northwestern University Press, Comments Submitted in Response to U.S. Copyright Office's Mar. 20, 2026, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking at 1 (Mar. 31, 2026) (''Such an increase will only reduce the number of people registering copyright and increase the burden on small publishers.''); National Music Publishers' Association (''NMPA''), Comments Submitted in Response to U.S. Copyright Office's Mar. 20, 2026, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking at 5 (May 4, 2026) (''NMPA Comments'') (''Music publishers have already had to make difficult decisions around when to delay or forego registering works due to prohibitive costs. The current proposal would exacerbate these problems and undermine creators' ability to protect their works.'').

[48] Songwriters Guild of America and the Society of Composers & Lyricists, Comments Submitted in Response to U.S. Copyright Office's Mar. 20, 2026, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking at 1 (May 4, 2026) (''SGA–SCL Joint Comments'').

[49] *See, e.g.,* Copyright Alliance, Comments Submitted in Response to U.S. Copyright Office's Mar. 20, 2026, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking at 19–22 (May 4, 2026) (''Copyright Alliance Comments''); National Association of REALTORS (''NAR''), Comments Submitted in Response to U.S. Copyright Office's Mar. 20, 2026, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking at 2–3 (May 4, 2026); News/Media Alliance, Comments Submitted in Response to U.S. Copyright Office's Mar. 20, 2026, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking at 6–8 (May 4, 2026) (''NMA Comments'').

[50] *See* Copyright Alliance Comments at 19–22; Authors Guild, Comments Submitted in Response to U.S. Copyright Office's Mar. 20, 2026, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking at 5–6 (May 4, 2026) (''Authors Guild Comments''); NMPA Comments at 2–3; National Press Photographers Association, Comments Submitted in Response to U.S. Copyright Office's Mar. 20, 2026, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking at 4–5 (May 4, 2026).

[51] NMA Comments at 2.

[52] *See, e.g.,* Lora Doncea, Comments Submitted in Response to U.S. Copyright Office's Mar. 20, 2026, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking at 1 (Apr. 25, 2026); Jennifer Fischetto, Comments Submitted in Response to U.S. Copyright Office's Mar. 20, 2026, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking at 1 (Apr. 28, 2026) (''Jennifer Fischetto Comments''); Katherine Flanagan, Comments Submitted in Response to U.S. Copyright Office's Mar. 20, 2026, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking at 1 (Apr. 15, 2026).

[53] *See, e.g.,* AIPLA Comments at 3; USIPS Comments at 2.

[54] USIPS Comments at 2.

[55] *See, e.g.,* Copyright Alliance Comments at 22–24; NMPA Comments at 3–4; Authors Guild Comments at 3–4; Association of Medical Illustrators (''AMI''), Comments Submitted in Response to U.S. Copyright Office's Mar. 20, 2026, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking at 3 (May 4, 2026) (''AMI Comments'').

[56] NMPA Comments at 1. In their view, the Office should explore cost-reduction measures rather than eliminate the application option. *Id.* at 4.

[57] *See, e.g.,* Authors Alliance, Comments Submitted in Response to U.S. Copyright Office's Mar. 20, 2026, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking at 3 (May 3, 2026) (''Authors Alliance Comments'') (questioning the increase for filing notices of termination); NMA Comments at 15 (urging the Office to limit increases for requests for reconsideration); AIPLA Comments at 3 (encouraging the Office to reconsider the proposed increases for special handling and expedited services).

[58] *See, e.g.,* Association of American Publishers, Comments Submitted in Response to U.S. Copyright Office's Mar. 20, 2026, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking at 5 (May 4, 2026) (''AAP Comments''); Copyright Alliance Comments at 11–13; NMA Comments at 17–18; Recording Industry Association of America, Inc. (''RIAA''), Comments Submitted in Response to U.S. Copyright Office's Mar. 20, 2026, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking at 5–6 (May 4, 2026) (''RIAA Comments'').

[59] *See, e.g.,* ImageRights International, Inc., Comments Submitted in Response to U.S. Copyright Office's Mar. 20, 2026, Notice of Proposed

Continued

commenters pointed to the FRD Study's lack of elasticity analysis, asserting that the Office failed to adequately analyze the proposed fee schedule's effects on demand.[60]

*B. The Fee Study's Updates to Proposed Fees*

As documented in the Fee Study and in this final rule, the Office carefully reviewed the comments received in response to the NPRM to ensure that adjustments to the fee schedule would be fair, equitable, and duly considerate of the objectives of the copyright system.

In making our adjustments, the Office considered the appropriate balance between recouping a reasonable portion of overall costs, encouraging continued participation in the copyright system, and maintaining a robust and accurate system of copyright records. Specifically, we took note of commenters' views regarding the impact of changes to registration options and of fee increases for certain registration and recordation services and have therefore adjusted those proposals. As explained in the Fee Study, however, we confirm the validity of the methodology used to prepare FRD's cost assessment—including the scope of the indirect costs considered and the use of previous demand elasticity analyses.[61]

With respect to the scope of indirect costs, FRD's incorporation of costs that are related to various Office divisions and that are connected with IT development is consistent with broader federal guidance that advises agencies to incorporate all direct and indirect costs when determining the full cost of a service.[62] FRD's indirect cost allocations likewise align with government approaches and best practices on what indirect costs should be included.[63]

With respect to elasticity of demand, the Office conducted a provisional analysis based on available data for the standard registration application. The results were consistent with the assumptions used by external consultant Booz Allen Hamilton in the prior fee study. However, because this analysis could not disentangle the effects of the prior fee change from the simultaneous effects of the COVID–19 pandemic or estimate elasticity beyond the standard application, the Office considered it provisional and confirmatory rather than evidence that should be relied upon in a substantive way. For that reason, FRD and the Office determined that the most reliable course was to use the elasticity assumptions developed by Booz Allen Hamilton. While the Office did not receive evidence factually supporting alternative elasticity assumptions, some commenters expressed concerns that certain types of claimants may be more sensitive to price changes than others and thus the Office should reconsider its elasticity assumptions. To address this, the Office tested the sensitivity of FRD's model output to alternative elasticity assumptions and found that cost and revenue estimates changed little in response to plausible changes in those assumptions. In some cases, assuming greater elasticity, as advocated for by commenters, implied that a slightly higher fee would be required for cost recovery, and in some cases it implied a slightly lower fee. However, the difference in model outcomes on elasticity was not large enough to materially affect the Office's fee determination.

In sum, we are revising our initial proposal in two areas in response to commenters' concerns. First, with respect to registration services, we are lowering the proposed increase for two fees. The fee for group registration of updates to a news website is increasing to $275 instead of $350, and the fee for group registration of musical works on the same album is increasing to $85 instead of $130. Furthermore, we are maintaining the Single Application and implementing a modest fee increase from $45 to $55, reflecting an inflationary adjustment.

Second, for services other than registration, the Office is lowering the increase to the base fee for filing a notice of termination on paper—increasing the fee to $275 instead of $320. This adjustment responds to commenters' points about the use of this service by individual authors or their heirs. We are instead raising the base fee for all other recordations filed on paper, increasing it to $350 instead of $320. As discussed in the Fee Study and NPRM, this $30 increase above the NPRM proposal will further incentivize online filing where available and serve to accommodate the downward adjustment of the other fees. These complementary adjustments further the overall aims of achieving greater cost recovery from services that are used primarily by larger commercial entities and encouraging users to submit electronically.

Overall, this fee schedule is projected to achieve 53% cost recovery during the first year of implementation. As explained in the Fee Study, this falls short of achieving the Office's historical and recommended cost recovery of approximately 60%, but narrows the substantial gap between that goal and the 41% cost recovery under which we currently operate.[64] We acknowledge that setting fees at the significantly higher levels needed to achieve the recommended (or full) cost recovery could substantially decrease use of the Office's services, to the copyright system's detriment.

## III. Final Regulation

Based on the required cost study, and after careful consideration of public comments, the Office has determined most fees should increase to achieve a more sustainable level of cost recovery. These adjustments will support timely processing and the continued enhancement of Office services. We estimate that revenues generated by these proposed fees and the other fees under the Office's basic budget will be roughly $51 million, bringing cost recovery closer to historic levels.

*A. Registration, Recordation, and Related Services*

1. Basic and Group Registrations

Rulemaking at 4–5 (May 4, 2026) (''ImageRights Comments''); American Association of Independent Music et al., Comments Submitted in Response to U.S. Copyright Office's Mar. 20, 2026, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking at 5 (May 4, 2026); Copyright Alliance Comments at 24–26.

[60] *See, e.g.,* NMA Comments at 12; RIAA Comments at 6–7; Copyright Alliance Comments at 7–9.

[61] Fee Study at 15–16.

[62] *Id.* at 8, 16.

[63] *Id.*

[64] *Id.* at 17–18.

While voluntary, registration offers substantial benefits to the registrant and to the public.[65] As the United States Government has explained to the Supreme Court, ''[r]egistration . . . enables the Copyright Office to compile a public record of copyright claims, and the deposited copies provide definitive evidence of what the work was at the time of registration,'' [66] including key facts relating to the authorship and ownership of a registered work such as title, year of creation, date of publication, and type of authorship. This record ''serves as a valuable resource for those seeking to use copyrighted works lawfully.'' [67] Registration confers valuable enforcement benefits to copyright owners fighting infringement. It also ''gives courts the benefit of the Register's expertise on issues of registrability, and serves judicial economy by narrowing the issues that must be litigated.'' [68] Finally, it ''serves as a major source of the Library's acquisitions,'' since deposit copies can be transferred into the Library's collections.[69] It is therefore important for the Office to maintain efficient and effective service. To support these benefits, fees should provide an appropriate share of the costs associated with administering the registration system.

In reviewing registration fees, the Office carefully considered comments submitted in response to the NPRM and made adjustments to address three principal concerns. First, we sought to address the challenges faced by individual authors who may not produce enough works at one time to benefit from group registration options. Commenters opposing the proposal to eliminate the Single Application underscored those challenges, citing economic hardship and stating that the inability to register would make it more difficult for individual authors to protect and enforce their rights.[70] Second, the Office considered the concerns of songwriters who release musical works independently, without the support of a major label. These commenters stated that the proposed fee increase for the group option to register music on an album would leave more creators unprotected ''not because they don't value their rights, but because the cost of protecting them becomes harder to justify or sustain.'' [71] Third, small news publishers predicted economic challenges from the proposed fee increase for the group option to register updates to news websites.[72]

The Office recognizes the potential effect of the proposed increases on creators with few resources.[73] Accordingly, the final rule retains the Single Application with a modest fee increase to account for inflation and adopts smaller increases than originally proposed for the group options to register musical works and updates to news websites. These adjustments appropriately balance affordable access to registration with our duty to administer the services in a fiscally responsible manner.

i. Basic Registrations

The Office adopts the following registration fees:

| Registration, recordation, and related services | Current fees ($) | New fees ($) |
|---|---|---|
| Registration of a claim in an original work of authorship: | | |
| (i) Electronic filing: | | |
| (A) Single author, same claimant, one work, not for hire | 45 | 55 |
| (B) All other filings | 65 | 85 |
| (ii) Paper Filing (Forms PA, SR, TX, VA, SE) | 125 | 185 |

The most commonly utilized registration options, termed the Standard Application and the Paper Application, may be used to register any work that is eligible for registration under sections 408(a) and 409 of the Copyright Act, including a work by one author, a joint work, a work made for hire, a derivative work, a collective work, or a compilation. The Standard Application is filed electronically through the eCO system. The Paper Application must be mailed to the Office for examination. Currently, the vast majority of applicants, approximately 99%, use the electronic filing option. Electronic filings cost less to process than paper applications, and, on average, require less time to complete.

In reviewing the basic registration fees, the Office closely examined the costs of providing the associated services and the extent to which those costs are recovered under the existing fee schedule. Using a volume-weighted average, we currently recover approximately 50.6% of our costs for claims submitted on the Standard Application and approximately 72% of our costs for processing paper applications. Under fees adopted in this final rule, the Office expects to recover approximately 66% of the costs associated with processing Standard Applications and substantially all costs associated with processing paper applications.[74]

A number of commenters opposed increasing the registration fee for Standard Applications from $65 to $85, asserting that a higher fee could discourage registration.[75] One argued that although ''[t]he costs associated with examination, recordkeeping, and database maintenance largely support institutional objectives and third-party use,'' the proposed fee structure places the ''primary financial burden'' on individual creators.[76] After considering these comments, the Office has determined that the increase is nevertheless warranted. The existing $65 fee was established using cost data

[65] Br. for the United States as Amicus Curiae Supporting Vacatur and Remand at 4, *Reed Elsevier, Inc.* v. *Muchnick,* 559 U.S. 154 (2010) (No. 08–103).

[66] *Id.* at 5.

[67] *Id.* at 22.

[68] *Id.* at 11.

[69] *Id.* at 4.

[70] *See* Authors Guild Comments at 3–4; Copyright Alliance Comments at 22–24; NMPA Comments at 3–4.

[71] Shelby Scott, Comments Submitted in Response to U.S. Copyright Office's March 20, 2026 Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, at 1 (Apr. 14, 2026) (''Shelby Scott Comments'').

[72] NMA Comments app.

[73] *See* Association of American Literary Agents, Comments Submitted in Response to U.S. Copyright Office's March 20, 2026 Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, at 1 (May 1, 2026); AAP Comments at 3; PMP, Comments Submitted in Response to U.S. Copyright Office's March 20, 2026 Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, at 1 (Apr. 23, 2026); Sierra Lewis, Comments Submitted in Response to U.S. Copyright Office's March 20, 2026 Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, at 2 (Mar. 22, 2026).

[74] *See* U.S. Copyright Office, Proposed Schedule and Analysis of Copyright Fees to Go into Effect in Fall 2026 at app. b (2026), *https://www.copyright.gov/rulemaking/feestudy2026/proposed-fee-schedule.pdf.*

[75] *E.g.,* Authors Guild Comments at 3–5; RIAA Comments at 3.

[76] AMI Comments at 3.

that is now a decade old.[77] Since that time, inflation and other cost increases have substantially increased the cost of examining claims and maintaining registration services. Consequently, the current fee recovers only approximately half of the Office's costs to process Standard Applications. Maintaining it would further diminish cost recovery and impair the provision of efficient and timely service. The final rule therefore increases the fee for the Standard Application by $20, still leaving it approximately 34% below the full cost of providing the service.

In adopting this increase, the Office also considered the availability of lower-cost group registration options. Since the existing schedule was adopted in 2020, we have implemented several additional options that permit applicants to register multiple works with one application and filing fee.[78] These options cover a wide variety of works, including short online literary works, musical works and sound recordings (including associated literary, pictorial, and graphic works) contained on an album, frequently updated news websites, and two-dimensional artwork. They supplemented existing group registration options for photographs, unpublished works, serials, newspapers, newsletters, and contributions to periodicals. Under the fee schedule adopted in this final rule, many of these options will continue to provide registration at a fee of only a few dollars per work, in many cases $13 or less. The continued availability of these lower-cost options mitigates the fee increase for the Standard Application and helps preserve access to an efficient registration system.

As noted in the prior fee studies,[79] the substantially higher costs of processing paper applications as compared to the more efficient electronic process justifies a higher fee. Accordingly, the final rule increases the existing $125 fee for paper applications to $185. This fee will recover the entire processing cost and incentivize use of the electronic system.[80]

The Office has reached a different conclusion with respect to the Single Application. The Single Application was established in 2013 as a streamlined registration option for a narrow category of claims involving one work by one author who is also the sole copyright claimant.[81] The lower fee was intended to reflect the relative simplicity of these claims and to ''encourage more individuals creators to register their works.'' [82]

The Office initially proposed eliminating the Single Application due to its administrative complexities and the additional costs imposed on the many applicants who misunderstand its eligibility requirements.[83] While a number of commenters supported the elimination of the Single Application,[84] others opposed it,[85] asserting that doing so would increase registration costs for ''independent authors, who make up a large and growing portion of the publishing landscape.'' [86]

After considering the comments, the Office has decided to retain the Single Application for now. The final rule retains the Single Application and increases its fee by $10 to account for inflation, leaving it 30% lower than the fee for the Standard Application. Given the administrative challenges associated with this option, however, the Office does not expect to incorporate it into the new Enterprise Copyright System (''ECS'') [87] Registration system currently in development. We will instead continue to explore alternative approaches to improve access for individual creators.

The Office also recognizes that some applicants choose to use third-party registration services,[88] which may increase their overall costs to register their works. Applicants are not required to use these services, however, and we provide a variety of educational materials to assist applicants in completing registration applications independently.[89] We also offer assistance via registration ''walk throughs,'' during which a trained Office representative guides an applicant through each screen of the application.[90]

### ii. Group Registration

The Office adopts the following group registration fees:

| Registration, recordation, and related services | Current fees ($) | New fees ($) |
|---|---|---|
| Registration of a claim in a group of contributions to periodicals | 85 | 130 |
| Registration of a claim in a group of updates or revisions to a database that predominantly consists of non-photographic works | 500 | 700 |
| Registration of a claim in a group of published photographs or a claim in a group of unpublished photographs | 55 | 85 |
| Registration of a claim in a group of updates or revisions to a database that predominantly consists of photographs and updates thereto: | | |
| (i) Electronic filing | 250 | 700 |
| (ii) Paper filing | 250 | 700 |

[77] *See* 85 FR 9374, 9374, 9378 (establishing $65 fee based on data from fiscal years 2016 and 2017).

[78] 85 FR 31981, 31982 (May 28, 2020); 85 FR 37341, 37346 (June 22, 2020) (creating the group registration option for short online literary works); 86 FR 10820, 10825 (Feb. 23, 2021) (creating the group registration option for musical works, sound recordings, and certain other works contained on an album); 89 FR 58991, 58999 (July 22, 2024) (creating the group registration option for frequently updated news websites), *revised by* 91 FR 52239, 52241 (Aug. 13, 2026); 90 FR 59383, 59389 (Dec. 19, 2025) (creating the group registration option for two-dimensional artwork).

[79] *See* 2020 Fee Study at 24; 2014 Fee Study at 16.

[80] *See* FRD Study at 19.

[81] 78 FR 38843, 38843–45 (June 28, 2013).

[82] *Id.* at 38844.

[83] 91 FR 13529, 13533–34.

[84] *See* AIPLA Comments at 3 (noting that the Office persuasively demonstrated ''high error rates, increased refusals, and inefficiencies'' of Single Application); USIPS Comments at 2 (''The Office's own data demonstrates that low-cost application options, such as the Single Application, attracted a disproportionate number of unqualified submissions, wasting both applicant and Office resources.'').

[85] *See* Authors Guild Comments at 3–4; Copyright Alliance Comments at 22–24; NMPA Comments at 3–4.

[86] Jennifer Fischetto Comments at 1.

[87] We are building ECS to make all of the Office's services digitized, interconnected, searchable, and easy to navigate. ECS integrates and updates all of the Office's technology-based services, including (1) building a redesigned and easier to use registration system that will replace the current Electronic Copyright Office (eCO) system; (2) developing an online recordation system that is more efficient than the paper-based recordation process; (3) deploying a new Copyright Public Records System with improved functionality over the previous system, which was decommissioned in June 2025; and (4) implementing new tools to streamline our review of licensing statements of account.

[88] When a third-party service files a Single Application on behalf of a claimant, the service must identify itself as a correspondence in the registration application. 37 CFR 202.3(c)(1).

[89] For example, the Office created the Copyright Registration Toolkit to help creators, small business owners, advisors, and others navigate the copyright system. U.S. Copyright Office, *Copyright Registration Toolkit* (2026), *https://copyright.gov/intellectual-property-toolkits/copyright-registration-toolkit.pdf.*

[90] *See Application Assistance: Walk Through Request Form,* U.S. Copyright Office, *https://help.copyright.gov/contact/s/walkthrough-form* (last visited Nov. 6, 2026).

| Registration, recordation, and related services | Current fees ($) | New fees ($) |
|---|---|---|
| Registration of a claim in a group of serials (per issue, minimum two issues) | 35 | 50 |
| Registration of a claim in a group of newspapers or a group of newsletters | 95 | 130 |
| Registration of a claim in a group of works on an album: | | |
| (i) Musical works | 65 | 85 |
| (ii) Sound recordings, photographs, artwork, and liner notes | 65 | 130 |
| Registration of a claim in a group of two-dimensional artwork | 85 | 130 |
| Registration of a claim in a group of unpublished works | 85 | 130 |
| Registration of a claim in a group of short online literary works | 65 | 130 |
| Registration of a claim in a group of updates to a news website | 95 | 275 |

Congress authorized the Register to permit registration of groups of related works with one application and filing fee.[91] Pursuant to that authority, the Register has issued regulations permitting group registration for certain limited categories of works.[92] Although these options facilitate registration, particularly for applicants who create or publish large volumes of works, they generally require more resources to administer than applications covering a single work.[93] It can be more difficult to adequately capture information about each work, particularly within the technological constraints of the current electronic registration system, and examination is more time-consuming, as information relating to each work must be evaluated individually. Additionally, group registration options necessarily have eligibility restrictions that may lead to increased correspondence. Thus, these options cost more to process than claims involving one work.

Numerous commenters opposed the proposed fee increases for group registration options.[94] After careful consideration of those comments, however, the Office has determined that the increases are appropriate, subject to the modifications discussed below. The fees adopted in this final rule reflect the reasonable costs of processing these claims, the benefits conferred to registrants, and the objectives of the copyright system.

For most group registration options, the final rule establishes a common fee of $130. Although these options apply to different categories of works,[95] they provide comparable benefits by allowing applicants to register multiple works with one application and filing fee, thereby reducing the burden of obtaining multiple individual registrations. Establishing a common fee promotes consistency and predictability while modestly improving cost recovery across services. Even with the increases adopted here, the fees remain substantially below the costs of providing these services, with cost recovery rates ranging from 7.1% to 64.4%.

The group options also continue to provide significant value compared to registering works separately. Applicants who submit the maximum number of works permitted under an option subject to the $130 fee will pay no more than $13 per work, and in many cases, substantially less.

The Office has adopted a different fee for the group registration option for musical works published on the same album. During this proceeding, songwriters raised concern that the proposed increase would ''create[ ] a meaningful barrier to access.'' [96] The Songwriters Guild of America (''SGA'') and the Society of Composers & Lyricists (''SCL'') urged the Office to implement ''a framework that distinguishes between individual creators registering their own works and corporate or high-volume registrants.'' [97] In light of these comments, the final rule sets the fee for the group option to register musical works published on the same album at $85 rather than the proposed $130. This adopted fee is the same as the fee for registering one work with the Standard Application ($85) and is intended to preserve an affordable registration option for independent songwriters and other individual creators.

The final rule retains the proposed $130 fee for the group registration option for sound recordings published on the same album because these options provide different benefits and impose different processing requirements. The musical works option is limited to twenty musical works, while the option for registering sound recordings on an album may cover up to twenty sound recordings, together with any associated photographs, artwork, or liner notes that were first published with the same album. Additionally, while electronic deposits are always permitted for the option for musical works, if an album was published in physical or both physical and electronic format, a physical deposit may be required for the option to register sound recordings,[98] which increases processing costs. These differences support the distinct fees adopted here.

The final rule also adopts a more modest increase for the group options to register published and unpublished photographs (''GRPPH'' and ''GRUPH,'' respectively).[99] Photographers frequently produce large numbers of works in a short period of time, and have consistently raised concern about the costs associated with protecting those works. The final fee of $85 takes those concerns into account. Even at this fee, an applicant registering the maximum number of photographs permitted (750) would pay an approximate $0.11 per photograph. The Office has also planned improvements in the new ECS registration system that will allow published and unpublished photographs to be included in the same submission, and permit larger numbers of photographs to be submitted with

[91] *See* 17 U.S.C. 408(c)(1).

[92] *See generally* 37 CFR 202.3(b)(5), 202.4.

[93] *See* 55 FR 50556, 50556 (Dec. 7, 1990) (explaining that the Copyright Office had previously declined to establish a group option ''due to concerns about the administrative burden associated with processing several works on a single application'' and ''[b]ased on the Office's experience with statutory group registration of contributions to periodicals, the Office [found] that, unless appropriate restrictions limit the availability of group registration, the administrative costs and burden on the Office escalate'').

[94] ImageRights Comments at 3–4; Larson Skinner PLLC (''Larson Skinner''), Comments Submitted in Response to U.S. Copyright Office's March 20, 2026 Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, at 1–6 (May 4, 2026); *see also* AMI Comments at 3.

[95] These group options include registration of contributions to periodicals, unpublished works, newspapers, newsletters, short online literary works, sound recordings, and associated literary, pictorial, and graphic works contained on an album, and two-dimensional artwork.

[96] Shelby Scott Comments at 1.

[97] SGA & SCL Joint Comments at 1. The Office appreciates this suggestion and, as indicated above, will consider this type of framework as part of its separate proceeding concerning alternative fee structures for registration. *See* 91 FR 14724, 14725 (Mar. 26, 2026).

[98] 37 CFR 202.4(k)(3) (requiring the applicant to submit ''two complete phonorecords containing the best edition of each recording'').

[99] The current fee for GRPPH and GRUPH is $55, which is less than the fee of registering one work on the Standard Application. This fee has remained unchanged since 2014.

each application, further reducing the effective per-work fee.[100] These fees still remain below the cost of providing the services, achieving a 56% cost recovery rate for GRUPH and an 80% rate for GRPPH.[101]

Several commenters also objected to the proposed increases for group registrations of updates to news websites (''GRNW''). The News/Media Alliance reported that shifts in ''digital advertising markets, inflation, and other economic volatility'' have placed increased financial pressure on many news publishers.[102] They asserted that ''[t]he vast majority of publishers simply are not large corporations that can subsidize other registrants and users of Copyright Office services.'' [103]

The Office appreciates these economic pressures, as well as the critical role news organizations play in disseminating information to the public. Therefore, the final rule sets the fee for GRNW at $275 rather than the proposed $350. GRNW was specifically developed to address the unique vulnerabilities news publishers face and reflects the Office's longstanding effort to provide efficient registration options for high-volume creators. This option provides significant value to publishers by permitting the registration of a month's worth of updates to a news website with one application and filing fee. Registering such volume of updates would be considerably more burdensome and expensive if each website update were submitted individually. The value of this option extends beyond administrative convenience. By permitting registration of a month's worth of updates to news websites, GRNW allows publishers to secure the benefits associated with registration for a large volume of material.

Furthermore, the Office has separately taken steps to make GRNW available to a broader range of news publishers.[104] In a final rule effective August 13, 2026, we adjusted the option's eligibility requirements and expanded the types of news websites that qualify.[105] Together, that expansion and the more modest increase adopted here appropriately balance the benefits of this option with our obligation to administer registration services responsibly, recovering an appropriate portion of the costs associated with providing them.

The estimated cost of processing the GRNW application is $516.94, of which the fee would recover approximately 53% of the cost of providing the service. Section 708 authorizes the Register to ''adjust fees to not more than that necessary to cover the reasonable costs incurred.'' Thus, contrary to one commenter's assertion,[106] proposing a fee that covers just over half of costs does not exceed the Register's authority.

The Office has also considered the National Association of REALTORS' concern that the increase to the fee to register a group of updates to a database from $500 to $700 will disproportionately affect multiple listing services (''MLSs''), driving down this sector's participation in the copyright system.[107] While we understand the increase is unwelcome to the MLSs, the Office does not find this concern to be supported by the available data. The previous increase,[108] although substantial, was not followed by a decline in participation. Registrations per MLS remained essentially unchanged: there were approximately 0.427 registrations per existing MLS in both 2019 (the last full year before the fee increase) and 2022 (the first full year after the industry-disrupting effects of the pandemic had largely subsided).[109]

The Office also considered the scope of this service. Applicants may register all updates and revisions over a three-month period by submitting one application and paying one filing fee, meaning a database provider can register all of its content by filing four applications per year. While this option facilitates registration, especially for large-volume creators, it also imposes higher costs on the Office. Although the fee exceeds the current cost of $506.58 for this service, as noted above, our fee-setting methodology also accounts for inflation and anticipated increases in the costs of providing services. The 40% increase is below the approximately 43% average proposed increase, which is needed to account for historic inflation since our last study and anticipated inflation over the next three years. Because this option primarily serves applicants with relatively inelastic demand, increasing the fees for these services would help the Office maintain lower pricing for other registration options more commonly used by individual authors.[110]

Finally, the Office appreciates commenters' calls to modernize the paper-based database registration process.[111] As part of ECS Registration, we are in the process of gathering requirements and exploring design options for all of our group registration options—including database claims.

2. Other Registration Fees

The Office provides other less commonly used registration services, as authorized by various provisions of the Copyright Act. We adopt the following schedule of fees for such services:

| Registration, recordation, and related services | Current fees ($) | New fees ($) |
|---|---|---|
| Registration of a renewal claim (Form RE): | | |
| (i) Claim without addendum | 125 | 165 |
| (ii) Addendum (in addition to the fee for the claim) | 100 | 135 |

[100] Lib. of Cong., *Copyright Public Modernization Committee Public Meeting February 25, 2026* (2026), *https://www.loc.gov/item/video-11705/*.

[101] The Copyright Alliance observed that the estimated costs for these services differ despite their similar structures and requirements. Copyright Alliance Comments at 9. The Office acknowledges that observation, but notes that claims for unpublished photographs are typically submitted by applicants who have limited familiarity with the Office's registration requirements. As a result, these applications can require additional correspondence to address errors, which may contribute to the difference in the estimated costs.

[102] NMA Comments at 7.

[103] *Id.* at 6.

[104] 91 FR 52239.

[105] *Id.*

[106] *See* NMA Comments at 8–9.

[107] NAR Comments at 3; *see* NAR *Ex Parte* Letter (Aug. 10, 2026), *https://www.copyright.gov/rulemaking/feestudy2026/nars-1-aug-10-2026.pdf*.

[108] Six years ago when the Office implemented its last fee updates, the group registration fee for databases increased from $85 to $500. 85 FR 9374, 9379.

[109] Copyright Office registration records show 241 MLS registrations in 2019 and 223 in 2022. T3 Sixty data indicate that there were 565 MLS organizations at the end of 2019 and 522 at the end of 2022. *See* T3 Sixty, *Extreme Contrast Revealed in Real Estate MLS Study Released Today,* PRWEB (Feb. 20, 2020), *https://www.prweb.com/releases/extreme-contrast-revealed-in-real-estate-mls-study-released-today-854754740.html* (reporting 565 MLS organizations and subscriber counts as of December 31, 2019); *Pennsylvania Broker-Owner: Small MLS ''Fiefdoms'' Hurt Agents and Clients,* REAL ESTATE NEWS (July 15, 2023), *https://www.realestatenews.com/2023/07/15/pennsylvania-broker-owner-small-mls-fiefdoms-hurt-agents-and-clients* (reporting, based on T3 Sixty data, 522 MLS organizations at the end of 2022). Registrations per MLS are therefore 241 ÷ 565 = 0.4265 in 2019 and 223 ÷ 522 = 0.4272 in 2022.

[110] *See* Fee Study at 11.

[111] Larson Skinner Comments at 2–5; NAR *Ex Parte Letter* at 2.

| Registration, recordation, and related services | Current fees ($) | New fees ($) |
|---|---|---|
| Registration of a claim in a restored copyright (Form GATT) | 100 | 165 |
| Preregistration of certain unpublished works | 200 | 320 |
| Registration of a correction or amplification to a claim: | | |
| (i) Supplementary registration: | | |
| (A) Electronic filing | 100 | 85 |
| (B) Paper Filing for correction or amplification of renewal registrations, GATT registrations, and group registrations for non-photographic databases (Form CA) | 150 | 185 |
| (ii) Correction of a design registration (Form DC) | 100 | 185 |
| Registration of a claim in a mask work (Form MW) | 150 | 650 |
| Registration of a claim in a vessel design (Form D/VH) | 500 | 650 |

| Special services: other registration services | Current fees ($) | New fees ($) |
|---|---|---|
| Appeals: | | |
| (i) First appeal (per claim) | 350 | 535 |
| (ii) Second appeal (per claim) | 700 | 1,200 |
| Secure test examining fee (per staff member per hour) | 250 | 375 |
| Special handling fee for a claim | 800 | 1,100 |
| Handling fee for each non-special handling claim using the same deposit | 50 | 60 |
| Full-term retention of a published deposit: | | |
| (i) Physical deposit | 540 | 640 |
| (ii) Electronic deposit | 220 | 320 |
| Voluntary cancellation of registration | 150 | 320 |
| Matching unidentified deposit to deposit ticket claim (per hour, one hour minimum) | 40 | 50 |

After considering our costs and the comments submitted in response to the NPRM, the Office concludes that the current fees do not offset a sufficient percentage of the costs of processing paper-based applications, which include registration applications for restored copyrights (Form GATT) and renewal claims (Forms RE and RE/Addendum).[112] Paper-based processes are considerably less efficient than electronic registration. The issues involved with restored copyrights and renewal claims can be difficult and complex, requiring the work of higher-paid senior staff as well as multiple rounds of correspondence. While these services are low volume, they carry a high cost per transaction. For example, the renewal application and the renewal addendum carry total costs per transaction of $1,537.49 and $1,163.24, respectively. Accordingly, having received no comments in opposition, the final rule adopts increases to recover a greater portion of the costs of providing the services.

The Office is also implementing increases above historical and projected inflation rates to several low-volume services with high costs per transaction. For example, the cost per transaction for preregistration of certain unpublished works is about $794, and thus, the final rule increases the fee from $200 to $320.

The final rule also adopts increases to recover more than the estimated cost per transaction for certain services for which demand is relatively inelastic because they are either compulsory or in strong demand among certain customer segments and typically serve commercial organizations. Unlike copyright registration, which is voluntary, registration is a mandatory condition for securing legal protection in a vessel design or a mask work.[113] As discussed in the NPRM, the costs per transaction for vessel design and mask work registrations are about $261 and $217 respectively, and the final rule increases each fee to $650. Similarly, the cost per transaction for the special handling surcharge,[114] which expedites the examination of claims in circumstances such as pending litigation, is about $659. The final rule increases this fee from $800 to $1,100 to help offset the cost of other registration services used by individual creators for which full cost recovery is impracticable.

The final rule aligns the fee for supplementary applications with those for basic registration applications. Specifically, it decreases the fee for supplementary registration applications submitted online from $100 to $85 to match the fee for the Standard Application, and increases the fee for the paper supplementary registration form to $185 to match the fee for the paper registration applications. Aligning these fees encourages applicants seeking to correct or amplify information in an existing registration to use the supplementary registration application rather than submit a duplicate registration application. Submitting a supplementary registration is preferable because it will be cross-referenced in the basic registration and vice versa.

The Office also increases the fees for registration appeals. As explained in the NPRM, applicants have two opportunities to appeal the denial of a registration claim within the Office, both of which require intensive legal analysis at costs that considerably exceed the existing fees. Review of a first appeal by the attorneys in the Office of Registration Policy and Practice costs the Office approximately $3,244. Thus, the final rule increases the fee for this service from $350 to $535 per claim. A second request involves substantial work by senior attorneys, including the Register of Copyrights, the General Counsel and Associate Register of Copyrights, or their respective designees,[115] resulting in a cost to the Office of approximately $9,471 per appeal. The final rule increases the fee for this service from $700 to $1,200 per claim, still a small percentage of the actual cost.

Finally, the final rule adopts inflation-based increases to several other services, including the full-term retention of

[112] The current cost per transaction is $520.14 for the paper Form GATT, $1,537.49 for the paper Form RE, and $1,163.24 for the paper Addendum to Form RE.

[113] 17 U.S.C. 1310(a).

[114] Special handling fees are charged in addition to the otherwise applicable processing fees.

[115] *See* 37 CFR 202.5(f).

published copyright deposits. To account for projected storage costs for the entire retention period, the Office is increasing the fee from $540 to $640 for physical deposits, and from $220 to $320 for electronic deposits.

While commenters generally did not oppose the proposed fee adjustments for these miscellaneous registration services, three urged the Office to reconsider proposed increases to the fees for special handling and the full-term retention of published electronic deposits. Specifically, acknowledging the value of expedited examination, AIPLA, AMI, and News/Media Alliance expressed concern that the increased surcharge would make the service inaccessible to rightsholders seeking to ''preserve enforcement rights or comply with statutory deadlines.'' [116] AMI proposed a reduced special handling fee for claims submitted by ''single author[s].'' [117] Separately, AMI also encouraged the Office to eliminate the fee for full-term retention of published electronic deposits, arguing that the fee to retain the file should be included in the initial registration fee.[118]

The Office appreciates these concerns and suggestions, but has determined that the fees are nonetheless reasonable in light of the nature of the services provided. Special handling prompts the Office to give an application priority over earlier-submitted claims in the examination queue and devote resources to completing the review on an expedited basis (in five days or less). Full-term retention involves costs to preserve an electronic deposit copy for an extended period, which are not de minimis. Additionally, we do not find it appropriate to pass these costs on to all registration applicants, as many may not intend to seek full-term retention. Therefore, the final rule adopts these fees without further adjustment.

3. Recordation Fees

The Office is adopting the following fees for recordation services:

| Registration, recordation, and related services: recordation services | Current fees ($) | New fees ($) |
|---|---|---|
| Recordation of a document, including a notice of termination and a notice of intention to enforce a restored copyright: | | |
| Base fee (includes 1 work identified by 1 title and/or registration number): | | |
| Paper filing for notices of termination (Form TCS) | 125 | 275 |
| Paper filing for all other recordations | 125 | 350 |
| Electronic | 95 | 215 |
| Additional transfer (per transfer) (for documents recorded under 17 U.S.C. 205) | 95 | 215 |
| Additional works and alternate identifiers: | | |
| Paper (per group of 10 or fewer additional works and alternate identifiers) | 60 | 215 |
| Electronic: | | |
| 1 to 50 additional works and alternate identifiers | 60 | 215 |
| 51 to 500 additional works and alternate identifiers | 225 | 300 |
| 501 to 1,000 additional works and alternate identifiers | 390 | 520 |
| 1,001 to 10,000 additional works and alternate identifiers | 555 | 745 |
| Per group of 10,000 above 10,000 additional works and alternate identifiers | [119] +5,500 | 745 |
| Correction of online Public Catalog data due to erroneous electronic title submission (per title) | 7 | 10 |
| Schedule of pre-1972 sound recordings, or supplemental schedule of pre-1972 sound recordings (single sound recording) | 75 | 160 |
| Additional sound recordings (per group of 1 to 100 sound recordings) | 10 | 80 |
| Removal of pre-1972 sound recording from Office's database of indexed schedules (single sound recording) | 75 | 160 |
| Notice of noncommercial use of pre-1972 sound recording | 50 | 160 |
| Opt-out notice of noncommercial use of pre-1972 sound recording | 50 | 160 |

| Special services: recordation services | Current fees ($) | New fees ($) |
|---|---|---|
| Special handling fee for recordation of a document | 550 | 1,100 |

As discussed in the Fee Study and NPRM, the Office is increasing recordation fees to better recover costs for these services, which are largely used by commercial entities.[120]

The Office records three primary types of documents: transfers of copyright ownership, notices of termination, and other documents pertaining to a copyright. Recordation submissions include the document subject to recordation and a title list identifying the relevant works, which can number in the hundreds or thousands. The Office examines documents for completeness and accuracy, indexes documents into public records, and may also correspond with a remitter to clarify any inconsistencies. Approximately 90% of all recordations are submitted through the Office's online recordation system.

[116] AIPLA Comments at 3; *see* AMI Comments at 4; NMA Comments at 15–16.

[117] AMI Comments at 4.

[118] *Id.*

[119] Under the current fee schedule, this tier covers 10,001 or more additional works and alternate identifiers.

[120] Fee Study at 36; 91 FR 13529, 13537.

A few commenters expressed concerns with the proposed increases to the primary recordation fees, calling the size of some increases ''staggering'' [121] and noting their potential to ''undermin[e] the public notice function that recordation is intended to serve.'' [122] With respect to notices of termination specifically, some commenters likewise expressed concerns about the impact higher fees could have on the exercise of the right.[123] As explained in the Fee Study, while the online system has reduced processing times, the current base recordation fee for electronic filing recovers less than half of the costs of providing the service.[124] Thus, the base fee for recording a document with an electronic filing is increasing from $95 to $215 to better recover costs.[125] Similarly, the Office is increasing the per-transfer fee for additional transfers—which applies when a single document involves multiple transfers or other transactions—from $95 to $215, resulting in a cost recovery of 51%.

Some recordation types cannot yet be handled electronically. For instance, remitters must use the Office's mail-based paper submission process for notices of termination and for documents relating to more than 10,000 works and alternate identifiers. Paper submissions can be significantly more resource-intensive to process. For paper submissions with paper title lists, staff must manually transcribe information to index into the public record. Costs also include the processing of incoming submissions and sending recordation certificates to remitters.

The Office is raising the base fee for recording notices of termination with a paper filing from $125 to $275, which would recover 24% of costs. This is lower than the $320 fee that we proposed in the NPRM. As we explained in the Fee Study, although notices of termination are costly to provide (approximately $1,131.50 in total costs), this adjustment takes into account that the service is primarily used by individual authors and their heirs.[126]

To accommodate the downward adjustment for notices of termination, the Office is increasing the base fee for recording a transfer of ownership or other document pertaining to a copyright with a paper filing from $125 to $350—slightly higher than the $320 fee we proposed in the NPRM. We are also increasing the fee for each ten additional works submitted with a paper title list from $60 to $215, allowing for 88% cost recovery for these more resource-intensive filings.

The Office is also adjusting the fees for submitting additional works and alternate identifiers on electronic title lists. This applies to title lists submitted through the online recordation system and to electronic title lists submitted on portable storage media with a paper submission. The Office will continue to offer a five-tiered reduced fee system for identifying additional works with an electronic title list, which is unchanged from the NPRM: (1) the fee for 1 to 50 additional works and alternate identifiers is increasing from $60 to $215; (2) the fee for 51 to 500 additional works and alternate identifiers is increasing from $225 to $300; (3) the fee for 501 to 1,000 additional works and alternate identifiers is increasing from $390 to $520; (4) the fee for 1,001 to 10,000 additional works and alternate identifiers is increasing from $555 to $745; and (5) the fee for more than 10,000 additional works and alternate identifiers is switching from a flat fee of $5,500 to $745 per group of 10,000 additional works and alternate identifiers.[127]

As described in the NPRM, the increased fee for up to 50 additional works under the first tier mirrors the fee for up to 10 additional works submitted on a paper title list.[128] The incremental fee increases provide reduced fees when using an electronic format for documents relating to more than 11 works. This incentivizes the use of an electronic title list and the online recordation system, while also achieving greater cost recovery. Under the fifth tier for more than 10,000 additional works, the shift from a $5,500 flat fee to $745 per group of 10,000 additional works reduces costs for remitters on the lower end of that scale. For substantially larger numbers of works, the fee increases will better offset the additional costs.[129]

The Office believes that these increases are necessary to avoid exacerbating the cost-recovery shortfall for these services. While these increases may appear large in relative terms, the new fees would not recover the full cost of even the simplest recordation and remain modest when considered on a per-work basis. And although remitters vary in size, the Office's current system cannot draw these distinctions, and we therefore consider the predominant type of remitter. Further, the comparison with the USPTO is not apt, given that they are entirely fee-funded and operate under a different fee structure.[130]

The Office is also increasing the fees for recordation services related to title II of the Music Modernization Act for sound recordings fixed before February 15, 1972 (''pre-1972 sound recordings'').[131] The fee for the filing and removal of schedules of pre-1972 sound recordings (''pre-1972 schedules'') is increasing from $75 to $160 for a single sound recording, while the fee for additional pre-1972 sound recordings (per group of 1 to 100) is increasing from $10 to $80. These new fees are far below the costs for providing these services, which are $1,027.22 for the filing of pre-1972 schedules and $454.23 for a group of additional sound recordings. The Office is also raising fees related to the noncommercial use exception to unauthorized uses of pre-1972 sound recordings.[132] The fees for submitting a notice of noncommercial use and for submitting a notice opting out of a proposed noncommercial use are increasing from $50 to $160, likewise remaining far below estimated costs ($741.02).

The Recording Industry Association of America (''RIAA'') opposed the increases for pre-1972 schedules. They noted that the higher fees ''would be absorbed in its entirety by owners of

[120] Fee Study at 36; 91 FR 13529, 13537.

[121] NMPA Comments at 5.

[122] AIPLA Comments at 2; *see also id.* (''AIPLA would therefore encourage the Office to assess whether these increases may disproportionately affect compliance-oriented filers, rather than strategic or high-volume users, in a manner inconsistent with the statutory objective of maintaining an accurate and accessible public record.''); Anonymous 12, Comments Submitted in Response to U.S. Copyright Office's Mar. 20, 2026, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (May 4, 2026) (noting that ''[a]n inexpensive recordation system reduces barriers to recordation'').

[123] *See* Authors Alliance Comments at 2 (noting that the increase could ''diminish an author's willingness to exercise this right''); Rights Recapture LLC, Comments Submitted in Response to U.S. Copyright Office's Mar. 20, 2026, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, at 2 (Apr. 28, 2026) (stating that ''[a]uthors or statutory heirs should not bear outsized expense as an entry fee to exercise their rights'').

[124] Fee Study at 37.

[125] Cost recovery will range between 53–87%, depending on the type of document.

[126] Fee Study at 38.

[127] If after the new schedule has gone into effect, a filing under examination requires corrections that result in a change to the number of transfers or the fee tier for additional works and alternate identifiers, the Office will refund that portion of the fee and charge a fee based upon the new schedule. The new fee schedule will also apply to corrections made after a document is recorded that result in a change to the number of transfers or fee tier.

[129] To allow simple comparison between titles provided on electronic or paper title lists, FRD calculated the cost of processing groups of ten additional titles. The total cost per group of ten titles provided electronically is $88.31. FRD Report at 28.

[130] *See* U.S. Pat. & Trademark Off., *FY 2025 Agency Financial Report* 121 (2025), *https://www.uspto.gov/sites/default/files/documents/USPTOFY2025AFR.pdf.*

[131] *See* 17 U.S.C. 1401.

[132] *See id.* at 1401(c).

pre-72 sound recordings, many of whom are record companies but some of whom are presumably pre-72 artists themselves.'' [133] RIAA also highlighted the increase for a group of additional sound recordings, noting that ''a 700% increase . . . is simply too large to be absorbed as a one-time increase, especially when considering the large number of pre-72 recordings that need to be included on schedules filed with the Office.'' [134] The Office believes that these increases reflect an appropriate balance that modestly narrows what is a substantial gap between the services' costs and fees. Under the new fees, the cost recovery for filing pre-1972 schedules increases from 7.3% to 15.6%, with cost recovery increasing from 2.2% to 17.6% for groups of additional sound recordings.

The special handling surcharge for the expedited recordation of documents is increasing from $550 to $1,100, consistent with the special handling fees the Office is charging for other expedited services. As we explained in the NPRM, given the strikingly decreased processing times through the online recordation system, we also expect a decrease in demand for expedited recordation.[135]

Finally, the fee for correcting online public catalog data due to erroneous electronic title submission is increasing from $7 to $10 per title, which reflects an inflationary increase.

*B. Record Retrieval, Search, and Certification Services*

The Office's Records Research and Certification Section (RRC) provides copies of completed and in-process registration and recordation records, search reports, and registration deposit materials. The Office is adopting the following fee schedule for records retrieval, search, and certification services:

| Registration, recordation, and related services: record retrieval, search, and certification services | Current fees ($) | New fees ($) |
|---|---|---|
| Provision of an additional certificate of registration | 55 | 80 |
| Certification of other Copyright Office records, including search reports (per certification) | 200 | 300 |
| Search report prepared from official records other than Licensing Division records (per hour, 2 hour minimum) | 200 | 300 |
| Estimate of retrieval or search fee (credited to retrieval or search fee) | 200 | 300 |
| Retrieval of in-process or completed Copyright Office records or other Copyright Office materials: | | |
| Retrieval of paper records (per hour, 1 hour minimum) | 200 | 300 |
| Retrieval of digital records (per hour, half hour minimum, quarter hour increments) | 200 | 300 |

| Special services: record retrieval, search, and certification services | Current fees ($) | New fees ($) |
|---|---|---|
| Copying of Copyright Office records by staff | 12 (all formats) | |
| Photocopy | | 20 |
| Audiocassette | | 105 |
| Videocassette | | 105 |
| CD or DVD | | 55 |
| Flash drive | | 55 |
| Unsupported formats and other copying of materials by outside providers | | Varied |
| Special handling fee for records retrieval, search, and certification services (per hour, 1 hour minimum) | 500 | 1,100 |
| Litigation statement (Form LS) | 100 | 320 |

The new fees for search and retrieval services reflect an increase slightly above historical and projected inflation. These services can be time consuming and often require specialized knowledge, and the increases modestly address the associated cost recovery shortfall. For copying records, the Office is reverting to its past practice by changing the fee of $12 per copy regardless of format to a variable fee based on the type of media being copied. This change will better account for the varying complexity of copying different media types and enable greater cost recovery. The Office is also increasing the fee for litigation statements from $100 to $320. Demand for this service is relatively inelastic, and this increase will help offset the cost of services for which greater cost recovery is unattainable. Finally, the increase from $500 to $1,100 for the special handling fee for records retrieval, search, and certification services is consistent with the special handling fees proposed for other expedited services.

The Office did not receive any comments on its proposed adjusted fees for record retrieval, search, and certification services.

*C. Miscellaneous Fees*

The Office is adopting the following miscellaneous fees, as authorized by 17 U.S.C. 708 and other provisions of the Copyright Act:

| Registration, recordation, and related services: miscellaneous services | Current fees ($) | New fees ($) |
|---|---|---|
| Designation of agent under 17 U.S.C. 512(c)(2) to receive notification of claimed infringement, or amendment or resubmission of designation | 6 | 25 |
| Issuance of a receipt for a section 407 deposit | 30 | 30 |
| Removal of PII from registration records: | | |
| Initial request, per registration record | 100 | 100 |
| Reconsideration of denied requests, flat fee | 60 | 135 |

[133] RIAA Comments at 3–4.

[134] RIAA Comments at 4.

[135] 91 FR 13529, 13537.

| Special services: miscellaneous services | Current fees ($) | New fees ($) |
|---|---|---|
| Service charge for deposit account overdraft | 285 | 305 |
| Service charge for dishonored deposit account replenishment check | 500 | 535 |
| Service charge for an uncollectible or non-negotiable payment | 115 | 125 |
| Notice to libraries and archives | 50 | 55 |
| Each additional title | 20 | 20 |
| Service charge for express mailing | 45 | 105 |
| Service charge for delivery of documents via facsimile (per page, 7 page maximum) | 1 | 10 |

The Office is raising the fee for online service providers to designate an agent to receive notices of claimed copyright infringement under 17 U.S.C. 512(c)(2) from $6 to $25. As detailed in the NPRM, the cost of providing this service ($741.02) is largely attributable to the amount of time needed to review service providers' requests to use a post office box address in lieu of a street address. Although the new fee recovers only 3% of the cost of providing the service, maintaining a modest fee increase preserves accessibility for service providers of all sizes.

As detailed in the NPRM, the Office had insufficient volume to calculate the costs for providing the following services, and therefore is implementing only a modest fee increase to account for inflation or no increase: the fee for overdraft of a deposit account is increasing from $285 to $305; the fee for dishonored replenishment checks for deposit accounts is increasing from $500 to $535; the fee for uncollectible or non-negotiable payment is increasing from $115 to $125; and the fee for recording a notice to libraries and archives under 17 U.S.C. 108(h) is increasing from $50 to $55. The fee for recording each additional title under 17 U.S.C. 108(h) will remain unchanged.

Two additional miscellaneous fees are unchanged: the fee for obtaining a receipt for depositing copies of works with the Office under 17 U.S.C. 407 will remain at $30, and the fee for an initial request to remove personally identifiable information (''PII'') from our public catalog will remain at $100. The fee for reconsideration of a denial of the request to remove PII is increasing from $60 to $135 to better reflect, but remain below, the cost of providing that service ($2,696.67).

Finally, as proposed in the NPRM, the fee to deliver documents by Federal Express mailing is increasing from $45 to $105, and the fee to deliver documents by fax is increasing from $1 to $10, requiring payment in advance. These increases are in line with the Office's estimate of the costs for providing those services. Advance payments that are greater than the service provider's costs will be reimbursed to the customer.

*D. Licensing Section and Related Fees*

The Office is adopting the following Licensing Section fees:

| Licensing Section services | Current fees ($) | New fees ($) |
|---|---|---|
| (1)(i) Recordation of a notice of intention to make and distribute phonorecords (17 U.S.C. 115) | 75 | 100 |
| (ii) Additional titles (per group of 1 to 10 titles) (paper filing) | 20 | 25 |
| (iii) Additional titles (per group of 1 to 100 titles) (online filing) | 10 | 15 |
| (2) Statement of account amendment (cable television systems and satellite carriers, 17 U.S.C. 111 and 119; digital audio recording devices or media, 17 U.S.C. 1003) | 50 | 70 |
| (3) Recordation of certain contracts by cable TV systems located outside the 48 contiguous states | 50 | 70 |
| (4) Initial or amended notice of digital transmission of sound recording (17 U.S.C. 112, 114) | 50 | 70 |
| (5) Processing of a statement of account based on secondary transmissions of primary transmissions pursuant to 17 U.S.C. 111: | ..... | ..... |
| (i) Form SA1 | 15 | 20 |
| (ii) Form SA2 | 20 | 25 |
| (iii) Form SA3 | 725 | 960 |
| (6) Processing of a statement of account based on secondary transmissions of primary transmissions pursuant to 17 U.S.C. 119 or 122 | 725 | 960 |
| (7) Search report prepared from Licensing Section records (per hour, 2 hour minimum) | 200 | 300 |

As proposed in the NPRM, the final rule adopts small increases to all Licensing Section fees to account for inflation.[136] Fees associated with section 111, 119, and 122 licenses will remain, in the aggregate over the next five year period, below 50% of the Office's reasonable expenses to administer the cable and satellite licensing programs, as is required by statute.[137] We will continue to monitor costs and filing volume to ensure compliance with the statutory limit.

*E. Freedom of Information Act Requests*

The Freedom of Information Act (''FOIA'') permits the Office to charge an hourly rate for the search and review of requested records by administrative or professional staff, unless a fee waiver or reduction applies.[138] Under the current regulations, requesters must pay fees by check or money order. As part of broader efforts to make our services digitized, interconnected, and easier to navigate, the final rule allows requesters to make their payments via any of the methods prescribed in 37 CFR 201.6(a), including through *pay.gov*. This amendment ensures consistency in payment methods across the Office's services.

*F. Technical Amendments*

The final rule adopts technical amendments to correct typographical errors and to conform existing regulations to changes to the fee schedule.

[136] The Office has taken into account that the volume of cable statements of account is projected to continue to decrease, as it has done for a number of years.

[137] 17 U.S.C. 708(a)(11).

[138] 37 CFR 203.11(a)(1), (2).

*G. Effective Date*

As noted above, on July 14, 2026, the Register submitted the Fee Study to Congress pursuant to 17 U.S.C. 708(b)(5). The statutory 120-day review period ended November 11, 2026. The adjusted fees described herein will take effect on January 5, 2027.

**List of Subjects in 37 CFR Parts 201 and 203**

Copyright, General provisions.

**Final Regulations**

For the reasons set forth in the preamble, the Copyright Office amends 37 CFR parts 201 and 202 as follows:

## PART 201—GENERAL PROVISIONS

■ 1. The authority citation for part 201 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 17 U.S.C. 702.

■ 2. In § 201.3, revise paragraphs (c), (d), and (e) to read as follows:

**§ 201.3 Fees for registration, recordation, and related services, special services, and services performed by the Licensing Division.**

* * * * *

(c) *Registration, recordation, and related service fees.* The Copyright Office has established fees for these services. To calculate the fee specified by paragraph (c)(23) of this section, for each work identified in a document: The first title and/or first registration number provided for that particular work constitutes a work; and each additional title and registration number provided for that particular work beyond the first constitutes an alternate identifier. The fees are as follows:

TABLE 1 TO PARAGRAPH (c)

| Registration, recordation, and related services | Fees ($) |
|---|---|
| (1) Registration of a claim in an original work of authorship: | ..... |
| (i) Electronic filing: | ..... |
| (A) Single author, same claimant, one work, not for hire | 55 |
| (B) All other filings | 85 |
| (ii) Paper Filing (Forms PA, SR, TX, VA, SE) | 185 |
| (2) Registration of a claim in a group of contributions to periodicals | 130 |
| (3) Registration of a claim in a group of updates or revisions to a database that predominantly consists of non-photographic works | 700 |
| (4) Registration of a claim in a group of published photographs or a claim in a group of unpublished photographs | 85 |
| (5) Registration of a claim in a group of updates or revisions to a database that predominantly consists of photographs and updates thereto: | ..... |
| (i) Electronic filing | 700 |
| (ii) Paper filing | 700 |
| (6) Registration of a renewal claim (Form RE): | ..... |
| (i) Claim without addendum | 165 |
| (ii) Addendum (in addition to the fee for the claim) | 135 |
| (7) Registration of a claim in a group of serials (per issue, minimum two issues) | 50 |
| (8) Registration of a claim in a group of newspapers or a group of newsletters | 130 |
| (9) Registration of a claim in a group of works on an album: | ..... |
| (i) Musical works | 85 |
| (ii) Sound recordings, photographs, artwork, and liner notes | 130 |
| (10) Registration of a claim in a group of two-dimensional artwork | 130 |
| (11) Registration of a claim in a group of unpublished works | 130 |
| (12) Registration of a claim in a group of short online literary works | 130 |
| (13) Registration of a claim in a group of updates to a news website | 275 |
| (14) Registration of a claim in a restored copyright (Form GATT) | 165 |
| (15) Preregistration of certain unpublished works | 320 |
| (16) Registration of a correction or amplification to a claim: | ..... |
| (i) Supplementary registration: | ..... |
| (A) Electronic filing | 85 |
| (B) Paper filing for correction or amplification of renewal registrations, GATT registrations, and group registrations for non-photographic databases (Form CA) | 185 |
| (ii) Correction of a design registration: Form DC | 185 |
| (17) Registration of a claim in a mask work (Form MW) | 650 |
| (18) Registration of a claim in a vessel design (Form D/VH) | 650 |
| (19) Provision of an additional certificate of registration | 80 |
| (20) Certification of other Copyright Office records, including search reports (per certification) | 300 |
| (21) Search report prepared from official records other than Licensing Section records (per hour, 2 hour minimum) | 300 |
| (22) Estimate of retrieval or search fee (credited to retrieval or search fee) | 300 |
| (23) Retrieval of in-process or completed Copyright Office records or other Copyright Office materials: | ..... |
| (i) Retrieval of paper records (per hour, 1 hour minimum) | 300 |
| (ii) Retrieval of digital records (per hour, half hour minimum, quarter hour increments) | 300 |
| (24) Recordation of a document, including a notice of termination and a notice of intention to enforce a restored copyright: | ..... |
| (i) Base fee (includes 1 work identified by 1 title and/or registration number): | ..... |
| (A) Paper filing for notices of termination (Form TCS) | 275 |
| (B) Paper filing for all other recordations | 350 |
| (C) Electronic | 215 |
| (ii) Additional transfer (per transfer) (for documents recorded under 17 U.S.C. 205) | 215 |
| (iii) Additional works and alternate identifiers: | ..... |
| (A) Paper (per group of 10 or fewer additional works and alternate identifiers) | 215 |
| (B) Electronic: | ..... |
| *(1)* 1 to 50 additional works and alternate identifiers | 215 |
| *(2)* 51 to 500 additional works and alternate identifiers | 300 |

TABLE 1 TO PARAGRAPH (c)—Continued

| Registration, recordation, and related services | Fees ($) |
|---|---|
| *(3)* 501 to 1,000 additional works and alternate identifiers | 520 |
| *(4)* 1,001 to 10,000 additional works and alternate identifiers | 745 |
| *(5)* Per group of 10,000 above 10,000 additional works and alternate identifiers | 745 |
| (iv) Correction of online Public Catalog data due to erroneous electronic title submission (per title) | 10 |
| (25) Designation of agent under 17 U.S.C. 512(c)(2) to receive notification of claimed infringement, or amendment or resubmission of designation | 25 |
| (26)(i) Schedule of pre-1972 sound recordings, or supplemental schedule of pre-1972 sound recordings (single sound recording) | 160 |
| (ii) Additional sound recordings (per group of 1 to 100 sound recordings) | 80 |
| (27) Removal of pre-1972 sound recording from Office's database of indexed schedules (single sound recording) | 160 |
| (28) Notice of noncommercial use of pre-1972 sound recording | 160 |
| (29) Opt-out notice of noncommercial use of pre-1972 sound recording | 160 |
| (30) Issuance of a receipt for a section 407 deposit | 30 |
| (31) Removal of PII from Registration Records: | ..... |
| (i) Initial request, per registration record | 100 |
| (ii) Reconsideration of denied requests, flat fee | 135 |

(d) *Special service fees.* The Copyright Office has established the following fees for special services of the Office:

TABLE 1 TO PARAGRAPH (d)

| Special services | Fees ($) |
|---|---|
| (1) Service charge for deposit account overdraft | 305 |
| (2) Service charge for dishonored deposit account replenishment check | 535 |
| (3) Service charge for an uncollectible or non-negotiable payment | 125 |
| (4) Appeals: | ..... |
| (i) First appeal (per claim) | 535 |
| (ii) Second appeal (per claim) | 1,200 |
| (5) Secure test examining fee (per staff member per hour) | 375 |
| (6) Copying of Copyright Office records by staff: | ..... |
| (i) Photocopy | 20 |
| (ii) Audiocassette | 105 |
| (iii) Videocassette | 105 |
| (iv) CD or DVD | 55 |
| (v) Flash drive | 55 |
| (vi) Unsupported formats and other copying of materials by outside providers, at cost of provider | Varied |
| (7)(i) Special handling fee for a claim | 1,100 |
| (ii) Handling fee for each non-special handling claim using the same deposit | 60 |
| (8) Small claims expedited registration fee per registration application request | 55 |
| (9) Special handling fee for recordation of a document | 1,100 |
| (10) Handling fee for extra deposit copy for certification | 55 |
| (11) Full-term retention of a published deposit: | ..... |
| (i) Physical deposit | 640 |
| (ii) Electronic deposit | 320 |
| (12) Voluntary cancellation of registration | 320 |
| (13) Matching unidentified deposit to deposit ticket claim (per hour, one hour minimum) | 50 |
| (14) Special handling fee for records retrieval, search, and certification services (per hour, 1 hour minimum) | 1,100 |
| (15) Litigation statement (Form LS) | 320 |
| (16)(i) Notice to libraries and archives | 55 |
| (ii) Each additional title | 20 |
| (17) Service charge for Federal Express mailing | 105 |
| (18) Service charge for delivery of documents via facsimile (per page, 7 page maximum) | 10 |

(e) *Licensing Division service fees.* The Copyright Office has established the following fees for specific services of the Licensing Division:

TABLE 1 TO PARAGRAPH (e)

| Licensing Section services | Fees ($) |
|---|---|
| (1)(i) Recordation of a notice of intention to make and distribute phonorecords (17 U.S.C. 115) | 100 |
| (ii) Additional titles (per group of 1 to 10 titles) (paper filing) | 25 |
| (iii) Additional titles (per group of 1 to 100 titles) (online filing) | 15 |

TABLE 1 TO PARAGRAPH (e)—Continued

| Licensing Section services | Fees ($) |
|---|---|
| (2) Statement of account amendment (cable television systems and satellite carriers, 17 U.S.C. 111 and 119; digital audio recording devices or media, 17 U.S.C. 1003) | 70 |
| (3) Recordation of certain contracts by cable TV systems located outside the 48 contiguous states | 70 |
| (4) Initial or amended notice of digital transmission of sound recording (17 U.S.C. 112, 114) | 70 |
| (5) Processing of a statement of account based on secondary transmissions of primary transmissions pursuant to 17 U.S.C. 111: | |
| (i) Form SA1 | 20 |
| (ii) Form SA2 | 25 |
| (iii) Form SA3 | 960 |
| (6) Processing of a statement of account based on secondary transmissions of primary transmissions pursuant to 17 U.S.C. 119 or 122 | 960 |
| (7) Search report prepared from Licensing Section records (per hour, 2 hour minimum) | 300 |

* * * * *

## PART 203—FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT: POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

■ 5. The authority citation for part 203 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 5 U.S.C. 552.

■ 6. In § 203.11, amend paragraph (a)(2) by revising the last sentence to read as follows:

**§ 203.11 Fees.**

(a) * * *

(2) Payment of the applicable fees under this paragraph shall be made by the methods established under § 201.6(a) of this chapter.

* * * * *

Dated: November 13, 2026.

**Shira Perlmutter,**

*Register of Copyrights and Director of the U.S. Copyright Office.*

Approved by:

**Robert R. Newlen,**

*Acting Librarian of Congress.*

[FR Doc. 2026–23415 Filed 11–17–26; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 1410–30–P**

## FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

### 47 CFR Part 52

**[WC Docket No. 21–341; FCC 23–95; FR ID 378222]**

### Protecting Consumers From SIM-Swap and Port-Out Fraud

**AGENCY:** Federal Communications Commission

**ACTION:** Final rule; announcement of compliance date.

**SUMMARY:** In this document, the Wireline Competition Bureau (Bureau) announces that the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has approved, for a period of three years, the information collection associated with Telephone Number Portability. This document is consistent with the *SIM Swap and Port-Out Fraud Order,* which directed the Wireline Competition Bureau to publish a document in the **Federal Register** announcing a compliance date of the rules.

**DATES:**

*Effective date:* Amendatory instruction 2 (47 CFR 52.37), published at 88 FR 85794, December 8, 2023, is effective on November 18, 2026. The amendments in this final rule are effective November 18, 2026.

*Compliance date:* Compliance with the amendments to 47 CFR 52.37, published at 88 FR 85794, December 8, 2023, for commercial mobile radio service providers is required as of December 18, 2026.

**ADDRESSES:** Federal Communications Commission, 45 L Street SW, Washington, DC 20554.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** For further information, contact Melissa Kirkel, Competition Policy Division, Wireline Competition Bureau, at (202) 418–7958 or *Melissa.Kirkel@fcc.gov.*

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** On November 16, 2023, the FCC released a *Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking* (88 FR 85794 (Dec. 8, 2023)) (*SIM Swap and Port-Out Fraud Order*), which adds new information collection requirements. The *SIM Swap and Port-Out Fraud Order* adopted baseline measures to increase protections for customers against fraudulent port-outs by adding new § 52.37 in Part 52, and adds new information collection requirements in paragraphs (c), (d), (e), and (g) of that rule. Port-out fraud occurs where a bad actor impersonates a customers of a wireless provider and convinces the provider to port the real customer's telephone number to a new wireless provider and a device that the bad actor controls, allowing a bad actor to control the victim's mobile account and receive text messages and phone calls intended for the victim. The new rules establish a uniform framework that gives wireless providers flexibility to implement customer authentication and security methods to address port-out fraud. The *SIM Swap and Port-Out Fraud Order* modifies the existing Local Number Portability collection requirements to require wireless providers to: (1) immediately notify customers of any requests for a port-out request associated with the customer's account before effectuating the request; (2) provide customers with advance notice of any account protection measures offered; (3) offer all customers, at no cost, the option to lock or freeze their account to stop SIM change requests; and (4) maintain a clear process for customers to report fraudulent number ports, and promptly provide customers with documentation of fraudulent ports involving their accounts. Wireless providers are required to comply with the new or modified rules except where the Safe Connections Act requires alternate procedures to be used. The Commission required covered providers to comply with the rules adopted therein within six months after the effective date of the *Order,* or after review of the rules by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) is completed, whichever is later.

On January 15, 2025, OMB completed its review of the Commission's rules implementing the *SIM Swap and Port-Out Fraud Order.* Accordingly, compliance with the rules adopted by the Commission in that *Order,* 47 CFR 52.37, is required by December 18, 2026.

The Commission publishes this document as an announcement of the compliance date of 47 CFR 52.37 and to modify the text of this rule previously published at 88 FR 85794 (December 8, 2023), to incorporate this date and eliminate text referring to pending