

**U.S. COPYRIGHT OFFICE  
Library of Congress  
FY 2016 Appropriations  
Questions for the Record**

**March 10, 2015**

**Committee on Appropriations  
Subcommittee on the Legislative Branch  
United States House of Representatives**

**Questions from Chairman Graves**

*Note: The following answers were provided by Maria A. Pallante, United States Register of Copyrights, at the request of James H. Billington, Librarian of Congress.*

*Dr. Billington, we have some questions about the Copyright Office and the targeted funding provided of 750 thousand dollars to reduce the claims and processing time, and 1.5 million dollars to conduct analysis for the business process engineering of the document recordation function. You are requesting 2 million dollars and 20 FTE's to be funded via increased spending authority of registration receipts. You have stated that since early fiscal 2012 the average processing time for claims has been lengthening. Paper applications have risen from 4.8 months to the current average of 13.5 months today. Further claims filed online have increased from 3.1 months to an average of 4.4 months.*

*With over 5 months of the current fiscal year having passed and having operated under a CR for the first part of the year,*

- *What progress if any have you made with hiring new staff?*

Thank you for the questions, Mr. Chairman. I also want to thank Dr. Billington for asking me to respond to these questions. Together we have worked hard to be transparent about the challenges facing both the Library and the Copyright Office and we both appreciate your interest and your duty to assess funding relating to IT needs.

The Copyright Office is grateful for the Committee's support during the FY15 appropriations process and appreciates, in particular, the \$750,000 intended "to reduce the claims and processing time for copyright registrations."

With these funds, the Copyright Office has commenced the hiring process with the Library's human resources department to bring in approximately a dozen new examining staff to work under the direction of Robert Kasunic, Associate Register of Copyrights and Director of Registration Policy and Practice. We are optimistic that all procedures and interviews can be completed by summer. Those selected will begin an initial training program together as a class and be ready to assist with claims on a graduated schedule throughout the remainder of the year. We are also finalizing the hire of a new Deputy Director of the Registration Program and two staff attorneys to work on registration issues and related rulemakings. Collectively, these 15 new Registration Program hires, coming as they are during the fiscal year, will cost approximately \$450,000. The Copyright Office will use the remaining \$300,000 to fund overtime work in the Registration Program, some of which has already been used this fiscal year. Again, we thank the Committee for its support in working to replace some of the registration vacancies that have occurred in recent years.

- *If you have not been able to hire new staff, how have you utilized the additional 750 thousand dollars?*

Because new registration staff will not be in place before summer, the Copyright Office is using the remaining funding to pay overtime costs for staff willing to work evenings and weekends. The Copyright Office began offering overtime opportunities to qualified registration experts in January. To date, the Copyright Office has committed approximately \$41,000 to overtime work. The remainder, approximately \$258,000, will be committed to overtime by the end of fiscal 2015. We are confident that this dual approach will help keep the backlog from increasing.

*You have stated in your budget justification that "the training program for Registration Specialists is extensive and requires that existing Specialists forego processing claims while they train and mentor new staff".*

- *This being the case at what time would we expect to see a downward trend in claim processing time?*

Because we are offering overtime opportunities to experienced staff at the same time we are seeking and training new staff, we are hopeful that we will see a downward trend by spring 2016. The Copyright Office last hired registration experts in early calendar year 2010. At that time, there was an initial increase in the backlog (for both electronic and paper applications), followed by a gradual but noticeable improvement about nine months after the start of training. It is

important to note that while training was not complete within nine months, by that time the new staff had gained sufficient expertise in examining certain classes of works to enable the staff to positively impact the backlog

Training is essential to providing quality and prompt examination. While analyzing copyrightability questions always has required subject matter expertise, the digital age has impacted copyright applications, which now present even more sophisticated questions. Even since 2010 when the Copyright Office was able to hire the most recent class of registration experts, registrations have grown increasingly complex as digital authorship and distribution continues to grow exponentially. Also, notwithstanding that the registration program is understaffed, accuracy is as important as speed when the Copyright Office registers and documents claims. To hold up as *prima facie* evidence in a court of law, the Copyright Office's registration certificate must be correct. To be useful to copyright commerce, a certificate should also denote all levels of granularity or joint authorship, not merely a top-level claim. In other words, the public record should show all of the creators and copyright owners included in all of the musical works and recordings on an album, not merely who owns the rights in the album.

The Copyright Office's training program is important to both the quality and speed of registration. Training can be more streamlined now that we have released a major revision of the *Compendium of U.S. Copyright Office Practices, Third Edition*, the Copyright Office's official manual of administrative practices. The Copyright Office released the new edition of the *Compendium* in December 2014, and this was the first full revision of the document in more than two decades. The *Compendium* will assist new staff in examining applications and making sound registration decisions for complex works, but it is only the foundation for the work to come. The Copyright Office will need to conduct multiple rulemakings to address practices for works that are evolving. For example, this is likely to include a fresh look at the standards and practices for examining software code, websites, and photographs. Ideally, the Copyright Office will be able to address backlogs and implement new digital practices at the same time.

***You plan to hire 20 additional FTE's with the increase of spending authority (2 million dollars) from receipts.***

- ***If you are hiring personnel with the funding provided this year, is it realistic to think you can fill 20 additional positions next year?***

Yes, it is a realistic goal and since the receipts come primarily from registration fees paid by customers, we believe it makes sense to reinvest them in the registration program. While there are many such needs, including technology improvements, the immediate crisis is in staffing.

The Copyright Office today has 76 professionally trained registration specialists (*i.e.*, examiners)—down from approximately 130 at the beginning of fiscal 2010—to handle approximately half a million copyright claims involving millions of works of authorship. (It has other vacancies in qualified registration assistants and technicians.) Between fiscal 2015 and fiscal 2016 appropriations, the Copyright Office hopes to backfill a total of 32 examiner

vacancies. This would elevate the expert examining staff to 108. While this would be a great relief, it will still be below capacity from the 130 examiners we had in 2010.

Moreover, as mentioned above, the Copyright Office will need to conduct rulemaking proceedings on an ongoing basis to evolve the registration practice to where it needs to be, meaning that even 130 examiners may be insufficient in the future. On the other hand, it is also true that the Copyright Office may come to the decision that it can offer different kinds of registration options to customers—some that are examination intensive and carry the full benefit of legal presumptions and others that are quick and basic and serve a different purpose. Conversations like this are important but will require significant public processes.

*Dr. Billington, the Committee wants a vibrant, efficient, and automated copyright process to be available to the public. So beginning in fiscal year 2000 to date, the Congress has made an investment of over 50 million dollars towards a major Copyright Office Re-engineering Project.*

*In testimony before the House Subcommittee on Courts, Intellectual Property, and the Internet, Ms. Pallante, the Register of Copyrights, testified when asked “what would it cost to give the office separate service from the Library”? Her response was “At a very high level in terms of modernizing the office, I think it’s an investment of somewhere in the neighborhood of 150 million dollars”.*

- *What is the basis upon which you have determined that separate service from that received from the Library is in the 150 million dollar neighborhood?*

On September 18, 2014, during an oversight hearing of the House Judiciary Committee, Register Pallante responded to Ranking Member Nadler’s questions about costs as follows:

**Mr. Nadler:** [W]hat would it cost to give the Office a separate service from the Library?

**Register Pallante:** I don’t know.

**Mr. Nadler:** What magnitude are we talking about? Millions or a billion? Do we have any idea?

**Register Pallante:** At a very high level in terms of modernizing the Office, I think it is an investment somewhere in the neighborhood of \$150 million.

**Mr. Nadler:** Over a time period.

**Ms. Pallante:** Of that, you could say half of that must come from fees, do some public-private partnerships, be creative.

**Mr. Nadler:** And my last question, ... how has the registration program been hurt by budget cuts and early retirement packages?

**Register Pallante:** It has really been cut to the bone. We have huge vacancies, and we have the kind of staff that requires several years of training to get them to the point where they are applying the law and the regulations and the Compendium accurately so that courts and others can rely on it. So they are really exhausted, and then they are dealing with an electronic system that sometimes crashes, doesn't work all the time, and isn't anywhere near the generation of services that copyright owners want.

**Mr. Nadler:** So we are talking about both operating and capital costs there.

**Register Pallante:** Correct.

As indicted by the transcript, the figure was an estimate put forward as a ballpark number in response to a question during the course of hearing. It assumes that a major investment is necessary because both registration and recordation need major improvements and the entire Copyright Office may need its own dedicated infrastructure and enterprise architecture if it is to stay within a realistic pace of its customers and offer technically compatible and interoperable services.

The figure is an approximation of systemic improvements to the process for recording documents, databases and public records, data management, a dedicated enterprise architecture, infrastructure (including capacity and storage), and cloud services. Neither staffing costs nor ongoing maintenance are included, because these were contemplated as annual operating costs, not capital costs.

As indicated in the hearing, some of the investment could come from increasing fees for certain kinds of works or copyright owners to account for certain capital costs, and costs might be reduced further if there are public private partnerships possible, *i.e.*, the Copyright Office might be able to coordinate with a private registry regarding image recognition capabilities for searching photographs or visual works of art. Any such project would require extensive analysis and vetting.

Again, the figure of \$150 million was a quick estimate offered during a hearing at the request of a Member of Congress and requires further scrutiny. What is clear is that from 2000-2009, the Library<sup>1</sup> received funding totaling nearly \$50 million to bring certain functions online (and to renovate work flow and office space and move staff to temporary locations). This was not enough to complete all aspects of the project. Thus, the registration process was automated, but

---

<sup>1</sup> Some of the facilities-related funding was provided to the Architect of the Capitol.

a secure repository was not built (for works submitted to the Copyright Office via registration) and the recordation was never brought online. Given the importance of the Copyright Office to the copyright marketplace, we would not want to underestimate the actual cost of getting to a new generation of services.

- *Under the current IT operations/budget do you believe that the Copyright Office has received an inadequate allocation of IT resources?*

This is a difficult question to answer because IT resources are allocated to the Library to spend on behalf of the entire agency and the Library has never been asked to track the amount of IT resources that it spends on the Copyright Office specifically. This is the case for all IT expenditures at the Library of Congress: resources are not assigned to specific service units or programs. As stated above, the IT needs of the Copyright Office, present and future, are significant enough that it would not be unreasonable to suggest that the Copyright Office should be the focus of a major portion of the Library's IT budget. We know this is not the case as both the IT infrastructure and services from IT staff are insufficient to meet the Copyright Office's current workload. On the other hand, the Library has traditionally followed a centralized IT governance and management approach that is reasonable by many standards, at least where missions can be jointly served. This approach does not require agencies to consider whether some services or component functions might be better served by dedicated investments and resources.

We understand from the Library's Interim CIO that out of more than 200 people who work in ITS, about six are assigned to work specifically on Copyright Office IT, i.e., they assist with planning and development needs, including system analysis. None of these six are senior level employees and, when needed, may be directed to other non-Copyright Office work. The Library uses this management paradigm throughout the agency. Most ITS staff and related resources are jointly used across all Library functions. This means, however, that the Copyright Office must compete with other Library departments to use needed resources, frequently planning months in advance simply to get access to key staff. The Copyright Office's recent backup system test required four months of planning to ensure Library resources would be available.

The Copyright Office itself has a very small IT shop of about two dozen people. With the exception of the recently appointed CIO, this staff acts primarily as a liaison office to the Library, working on day-to-day maintenance or help desk issues. To change this structure would require a close look at resource allocations and management paradigms. The Library has set up multiple investments to serve multiple masters and programs across the agency. The question today is whether this approach can sustain the considerable requirements of the copyright system in the digital age. We also need to consider the proper measure of success. During an oversight hearing of the Copyright Office this past September, Judiciary Committee member Howard Coble, who was chairing the hearing, had this to say: "This discussion needs to be a public one, and it needs to be approached with an open mind, with the clear objective of building a 21<sup>st</sup> century Copyright Office."

As a first step towards taking on more responsibility for IT strategy, and with the approval of the Librarian, I created the position of Copyright Office Chief Information Officer in 2013 and filled it in 2014. The Copyright Office CIO advises the Register on the state of customers' IT needs and general options for moving forward. This kind of focus is important given the shortcomings of the current registration system, and the fact that customers pay for Copyright Office services. Likewise, during the same timeframe, I created a new department focused on public records and a new senior level position to head it, the Director of Public Records and Repositories. (This person has been working on a temporary assignment in the Librarian's office since January, 2015, serving as the interim CIO until the Library can hire a permanent CIO.)

As a basic premise, the Copyright Office is a small government business with significant and growing IT needs. Indeed, it seems unlikely that any other department of the Library has IT needs that are as pronounced. The infrastructure is very strained and services have been very unreliable. The Copyright Office regularly has problems with the quality and timeliness of IT services.

For example, under the Digital Millennium Copyright Act ("DMCA"), the Copyright Office is required to provide a directory of agents acting for online service providers. These are the agents who should be contacted when copyright owners ask websites to remove infringing content. After the DMCA was enacted in 1998, the Copyright Office promulgated interim regulations, which over time proved cumbersome. In 2011, the Copyright Office issued a new notice of proposed rulemaking ("NPR") outlining a new electronic system with more efficiencies, including the ability of service providers to make updates to the directory.

The Copyright Office based the NPR on feedback from its public process. The Copyright Office wanted to contract with an outside software developer to complete the project. The Library's IT department insisted on handling it directly. The project has been frustrated by continuous delays on the part of the Library's IT staff. As of today, more than three years after the Copyright Office issued its notice of proposed rulemaking, and despite many hours of written and in person contact from both the Copyright Office's technology liaisons and the Copyright Office's General Counsel, it seems that not a single line of code has been written. The project has become so urgent that we asked one of our lawyers to develop the wire frames. Even with this assistance, the Library's Information Technology operation cannot identify resources to complete the development, testing and implementation of a simple system.

Experiences like this make it difficult for the Copyright Office to believe that the Library's IT department is devoted or accountable to the copyright system. As a result, we look for ways to handle things more directly. For example, the Copyright Office has created an index of court opinions regarding the fair use doctrine, as a project it is required to undertake in partnership with the Office of the Intellectual Property Enforcement Coordinator (the IPEC). We have resorted to asking one of our two webmasters to build the interface, both because we cannot afford a lengthy delay with the Library's IT staff and because our own webmaster better understands and appreciates the context of the copyright law and our agency responsibilities.

As the Committee knows, and mentioned above, the Copyright Office is one of several departments that compete for IT resources. The Library has other urgent needs that relate to its

singularly impressive collection, including storage, preservation, and educational programs. However, because the Copyright Office administers a federal law, its needs relate to the legal rights and economic interests of its many customers. We believe this distinction is why the Senate Appropriations Committee directed GAO to “identify any deficiencies or obstacles to serving the copyright community in a modernized environment.”

- ***What is your vision of how you would operate with your own IT department?***

This is an interesting and important question. An ideal IT department would be autonomous in assessing the Copyright Office’s needs and implementing solutions. The Copyright Office’s CIO released the Technical Upgrades report just last month, which explored many possible improvements. For instance, the Copyright Office would have its own central investment board, where it is not trading priorities across disparate missions but rather within its own area of expertise and statutory responsibility, *e.g.*, registration and recordation. It would have its own lean but high-end data center, geared only towards copyright services. One key aspect would be an enterprise solution that is dedicated to the Copyright Office and deploys a highly reliable, high performing, redundant, and cost-effective server environment designed to meet the current and future IT needs of the Copyright Office.

The Copyright Office would couple this with cloud services and would work with customers to ensure that all databases and data standards are working for the copyright community. For example, that the Copyright Office’s system would be interoperable with outside databases for information embedded in copyrighted works or in public records. It would be satisfying if customers could hook into APIs and individuals could register or search for licensing information on mobile devices. To have a separate data center, even a small one, the Copyright Office would need its own isolated space (either in a current Library building or a smaller building offsite). The Madison building is a particular challenge, as the capacity, power, cooling and general footprint are insufficient to handle the Library’s current work let alone the kind of additional services many Copyright Office customers want. We believe that experts in the various copyright industries and technology sectors may be helpful in devising a solution to these challenges.

Moreover, the Copyright Office would need the authority to hire its own expert technology and data staff. In general, given that everything the Copyright Office does is IT intensive and data driven, and only like to become more so, about a third of the Copyright Office’s staff should be professionals with expertise in these areas. The Copyright Office has taken a quick look at other organizations in the copyright space that have online businesses and this appears to be the usual ratio. Without this kind of expertise, it is difficult to see how the Copyright Office will be able to improve and adopt data standards for its public records, devise services that are compatible with mobile devices, or otherwise move beyond the current frustrations. The alternative is for the Library to attract this kind of expertise itself, which it can then leverage for multiple purposes. For the reasons expressed above, the Copyright Office, or more directly, its customers, would need assurances as to how exactly this would inure to the benefit of the copyright system.

- ***Has the investment of over 50 million dollars since 2000 been a bad investment?***

We would suggest that the Committee view the current electronic processes as a successful “first generation” system in need of both ongoing upgrades and additional systemic improvements.

As stated last year for the record (*see* Copyright Office Questions for the Record, FY 2015 Budget, House Appropriations Committee), the Committee provided nearly \$50 million to the Library during 2000-2009 for the primary purpose of automating the paper-based registration system. It was not an immediate success, as it required significant troubleshooting after it was implemented in 2007-2008, and caused an initial backlog that was not brought under control until 2011. The system has improved, however. Today more than 80% of applicants submit applications online and about half of these submit digital copies of works.

Having stated this, it is also true that the system remains incomplete. A secure repository was initially envisioned as part of the new system (for the works that copyright owners submit electronically for examination) but was never completed. The Copyright Office’s needs in this regard should not be conflated with the Library’s repository needs or goals as a library. However, even so, the Library’s Interim CIO has stated that the Library has not created any repository that is appropriate for the kind of legal repository required by the Copyright Office and expected by copyright owners.

Although the Committee’s investment was before the tenure of the current Register and her senior staff, we understand the \$50 million that was allocated was used as follows:

- Renovation of Copyright Office workspaces to accommodate new work flows and temporary relocation of staff in Arlington, VA: \$28.4 million
- Development of new technology systems: \$15.6 million
- Planning and program management: \$5.3 million

The amount spent on technology systems appears to have been insufficient. While the Copyright Office has a duty to run a lean and efficient operation, it also needs to properly serve the vibrant and dynamic markets of its customers (both those who produce and those who aggregate and disseminate creative works). This is not a measure we take lightly, as the copyright marketplace is worth a trillion dollars to our economy.

- *What are the major concerns or complaints you receive from your customer base, and what are the short, middle, and long term solution to their concerns?*

These issues have been the focus of two hearings convened by the House Judiciary Committee over the past few months, on September 18, 2014 and February 26, 2015, respectively. Testimony from these hearings may be accessed through the House Judiciary Committee website at <http://judiciary.house.gov/>.

The long term solution may well be to separate all or part of the Copyright Office's IT resources and IT management from the Library's central control. This was the conclusion of the Technical Upgrades Special Project Team, convened by the Copyright Office CIO over the past few years. Part of the Team's process included soliciting written comments from stakeholders across multiple industries in the copyright marketplace. The report can be accessed on the Copyright Office website ([http://copyright.gov/docs/technical\\_upgrades/usco-technicalupgrades.pdf](http://copyright.gov/docs/technical_upgrades/usco-technicalupgrades.pdf)) and a copy is included for your convenience.

Stakeholders believe that the Copyright Office's functions and technologies should be more efficient and interoperable with those of its customers, and that additional precautions should be exercised with respect to the exchange of digital works. In the case of copyright registration, these works are entrusted to the care of the Copyright Office by authors, publishers, and producers seeking the protection of the law. As explained by the Software & Information Industry Association ("SIIA") at the February 26 hearing, some customers have made the dramatic decision to forego registration "because they have found the process to be too expensive and cumbersome and because they are concerned about the security of their deposits."

During the same hearing, the ABA Section on Intellectual Property Law suggested that the online application system's user interface could be improved and that one of the "main obstacles" to registration is that applicants must comply with Library requirements that ask for certain types of a work, which may not be an electronic copy that could be submitted online. For example, SIIA noted that some newspapers do not register their works because the Library requires microfilm deposits, which many newspapers no longer use. Others have testified that the missions of the Library and the Copyright Office are no longer as symbiotic as they once may have been, and that the Copyright Office needs to keep pace with the marketplace of copyrighted works, in which films, music, books, video games, photographs, and other works support a nearly trillion dollar economy.

Specific strategies over varying time frames may require: investing in commercial-grade security measures to ensure the safety of digital works; reducing or otherwise altering the deposit requirements for certain works; improving the interface, functionality, and security of the Copyright Office website ([www.copyright.gov](http://www.copyright.gov)) vis-à-vis the Register's specific duties and authorities articulated in Title 17; offering new ways to register and identify copyright interests, for example, registering photographs through mobile device applications or identifying the individual tracks of a sound recording through new investments in metadata and web interfaces; and implementing platforms and data standards that allow for business-to-business applications with programs and databases in the copyright industries or technology sectors.

The kinds of improvements referenced above will require capital investments, but are necessary to make the Copyright Office a twenty-first century institution. More importantly, they will help create a less burdensome, more efficient, and more useful copyright system for the benefit of global commerce and cultural exchange. The Copyright Office has long been a model for agencies and stakeholders in foreign countries. However, it has a clear obligation to acknowledge and plan for the next generation of services and customers.

- *Is the primary concern of Copyright one of organizational location or the lack of resources?*

The lack of resources impacts the Copyright Office's ability to meet its statutory responsibilities in an acceptable manner. In other words, the steady attrition of staff coupled with the limited means to update IT systems with more intuitive, user-friendly interfaces and robust, secure databases collectively act as significant negative constraints on the Copyright Office's ability to deliver public services that meet the needs and expectations of its customers.

Organizationally, many people, including Members of Congress, are surprised to learn that the Copyright Office is not an agency or even a sub-agency, but rather a department of the Library. As noted by the Register at the oversight hearing last September, this structure has worked fairly well until recently, when both resource challenges and the growing complexity of the Copyright Office's duties have raised concerns. In other words, while there are some synergies, there are also certain natural tensions or conflicts that arise from the competing missions.

Beyond this, there are important legal questions that affect the authority of the Copyright Office and potentially call into question what branch of government the Library, Copyright Office, and Congressional Research Service (CRS) reside in. The work of the Copyright Office, including registration and recordation, are primarily executive branch functions, as are rulemakings. And, the Department of Justice has taken the position that because of copyright functions, the entire Library is executive branch and the Librarian, as the supervisor of those functions, is accountable solely to the President. *See, e.g., Dep't of Justice Br. in Opp'n to Pet. for Cert. (Apr. 2013).* This would make CRS accountable to the executive branch as well, perhaps to the surprise of Congress. Still, the Copyright Office has been the primary policy advisor to Congress on matters of copyright policy since 1897. Most people are of the view that this deep and impartial work has been to the benefit of the Nation and should be preserved in some form if at all possible.

In any event, the Copyright Office's status as a department of the Library of Congress and within the legislative branch of the government is a question that is properly before Congress. We are respectfully participating in the discussion as needed.

- *Are you suggesting that the Copyright Office could more effectively serve its constituents if additional resources were available? If so, then would you also suggest/recommend that the Copyright community bear a significantly greater share of Copyright's operating budget through increased fees?*

The Copyright Office would be pleased to explore this issue further with the Committee. As a general matter, the Office already bears the majority of its operating budget through fees. While the Copyright Office has noted that more could be done to improve fee revenue, it is unlikely that it could or should be funded entirely from fees. This would cause copyright owners to bear the cost of the entire copyright system, even though many others, including companies that

aggregate or disseminate copyright information or copyrighted works, also benefit. Moreover, copyright law is ubiquitous. It affects almost every member of the public.

The Copyright Office released a new fee schedule in May 2014 resulting in an increase in fees for certain public services. The new fee schedule also introduced a tiered fee structure for applications to register copyright claims. For single works of authorship where the author is also the claimant and is filing electronically, the application fee remains \$35. For all other applications filed electronically, including for works made by an employee in the course of his employment, the application fee is \$55. The tiered fee structure is intended to encourage participation in the national registration program by keeping fees reasonable, but also to provide for an appropriate cost sharing structure between individual and corporate filers.

Regarding the Committee's question, it is important to note that the Copyright Office is somewhat constrained in how it can set fees because the current statutory language limits fees to cover "the costs incurred by the Copyright Office for the registration of claims, the recordation of documents, and other services." The Copyright Office's fee authority does not permit it to collect for capital improvements or other forms of investment above the cost it incurs in the ordinary course of business. Moreover, the fees must be "fair and equitable and give due consideration to the objectives of the copyright system," which means that the Copyright Office must consider the public interest in maintaining a registration and recordation system and take care to not unduly discourage registrations and filings through inappropriately high fees.

At the same time, as suggested above, the true cost of the Copyright Office's services is unknown, as the infrastructure for the copyright systems is intertwined with, managed by, and subsidized to some degree by the appropriations and central enterprises of the Library.

***Dr. Billington and Ms. Pallante, understand that this Committee takes very seriously the length of time required for copyright registration and the service you provide to your customers.***

***A vibrant efficient copyright process is essential to serving an industry with billions of dollars at stake.***

***The Committee expects the Librarian of Congress and the Register of Copyrights to work as a team to address the needs of the copyright process and the customers it serves.***

We would simply note here that the copyright system has exploded in recent years with the advent of digital technologies. Today copyrighted works are streamed, accessed, and shared on all kinds of platforms and through all kinds of devices. The Copyright Act is more complicated

than it has ever been, and it affects more people than ever before. In this environment, it is no wonder that Congress is reviewing both the law and the Copyright Office. The Library of Congress takes seriously its role in supporting the Copyright Office, and the Copyright Office has long enjoyed its relationship with the Library. We stand ready to assist the Committee with these complex questions in whatever way is appropriate.