

The requirements requested below were documented during the 6/3/2011 copyright owner's and remitter's workshops that are under consideration by the Copyright Office. The notes provided here are tentative at this stage of the re-engineering project and are subject to change at any time as circumstances may warrant.

| ID | Date Identified | Title | Requirements Requested Description | Rationale and Notes | Status |
|----|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--|-----------|
| 48 | 6/3/2011 | SOA Preparation | A procedures manual to understand the LD expectations with regard to a SOA completion. | The LD is planning on creating procedures manuals for the online system. | In Review |
| 49 | 6/3/2011 | SOA Preparation | The remitters would like the size of an organization to help determine the amount of people that have ownership of the SOA process. | The size of the organization should determine the amount of people who have ownership of the SOA process within organizations, with smaller organizations having fewer people involved in the process. Larger organizations may have at least two people working to prepare the SOA while small organizations may have one. Middle sized organizations may go either way. | In Review |
| 50 | 6/3/2011 | SOA Submission | External service providers should have their own internal and formal policies for protecting client information. | The external service providers usually have expertise in the area due to having multiple clients with similar needs. | In Review |
| 51 | 6/3/2011 | Role Access | A 'super-user' role and an 'approver' role for validation and submission of filings should be created. | There is a concern that the LD's role in oversight may be too large, especially if these roles are implemented. There may be situations where either the parent or the subsidiary signs the forms (e.g., decentralized cable systems) which may affect the number of super-users and signatories. | In Review |
| 52 | 6/3/2011 | Communication | Remitters asked: Will the LD convert and replace the microfiche archiving system by digitizing all cable microfilm records since 1978? | This request is being reviewed. | In Review |
| 53 | 6/3/2011 | Privacy | A cable company's information should not be made available to the public or the Library of Congress prior to final submission. Information about public online searches (i.e., who searched what data or reports) should not be made available to the public or the Library of Congress. | The remitters want to ensure confidentiality and integrity of filings, mergers and acquisitions (e.g., a buyer should not have access to the seller's pre-merger information), and owners want their searches to be confidential. Owners asked if their online searches (either at the data field level or report level) would be subject to a Freedom of Information Act request. Tentatively, the Library's IT group indicated that the public nor the Library would know the particulars of the search. However, the Library would need to know who accessed the public database pursuant to IT security directives without knowing the data gleaned. A formal IT security review will need to be performed for the new system. | In Review |
| 54 | 6/3/2011 | Fail Safe Plan | A fail-safe plan be implemented in the case of employee turnover/unavailability. | The fail safe plan pertains to remitter staff turnover/unavailability during the SOA preparation. | In Review |
| 55 | 6/3/2011 | Need for Interim Solution | An interim solution has been suggested in lieu of the Gralin form. | The Office is reviewing the proposal for an interim solution. | In Review |
| 56 | 6/3/2011 | Education | Online long form tutorial to address common mistakes. | There is currently a short form tutorial online to specifically address common mistakes by filers. These mistakes were identified by the examiners. There is currently a team in place to create a similar online tutorial for the long form. | In Review |
| 57 | 6/3/2011 | Report | New Grandfather Report | A historical report on grandfathered stations/call signs. | In Review |
| 58 | 6/3/2011 | Extended Filing Period | Extended filing period for the first submission. | Due to the possibility of confusion during the first submission, an extended filing period was requested to help with the transition to the To-Be system. The ease of use for smaller companies is also a concern. If the system does not work properly the first time there may be resistance in using it in the future. Filers want a very flexible version of the forms, as well as the flexibility for the To-Be system to not restrict SOA submissions by authenticating a desktop or laptop. | In Review |
| 59 | 6/3/2011 | E-signature Usage | E-signatures may be used to validate who is submitting the final form. | The Copyright Office anticipates publishing a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in the Federal Register regarding electronic signatures. | In Review |
| 60 | 6/3/2011 | Survey Cable Companies | A survey of the cable companies was requested to be conducted. | The results of the survey may be used to better understand their needs and draw requirements. | In Review |
| 61 | 6/3/2011 | FCC e-Filing System | The FCC e-filing system may provide insight and guidance to aid in implementing this new system. | The LD may consider the FCC e-filing system as a benchmarking partner. | In Review |

The requirements requested below were documented during the 6/3/2011 copyright owner's and remitter's workshops that are under consideration by the Copyright Office. The notes provided here are tentative at this stage of the re-engineering project and are subject to change at any time as circumstances may warrant.

| ID | Date Identified | Title | Requirements Requested Description | Rationale and Notes | Status |
|-----|-----------------|----------------------------------|---|--|-----------|
| 62 | 6/3/2011 | Simplified Flow Chart Analysis | A simplified flow chart analysis will make requirements gathering a bit easier. | This is being planned for presentation to the cable companies when the requirements are approved. | In Review |
| 63a | 6/3/2011 | Red Flag System | It is recommended by the owners the system have red flags which indicate field information validity and help provide for meaningful certification. | A flag, as discussed during the workshop may be an alert, triggered before or after a SOA is submitted that occurs when a cable operator, for example, makes a designation of a station as 'local' or 'distant' and that designation disagrees with the designation on a recent filing (e.g., local in 2013/1 filing and on the 2013/2 designates the station as distant). Specific requests included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The red flag log should be accessible and clearly displayed to the Approver and the Certifier before the actual electronic signature occurs. • Creation of an Errata report for LD to notify of red flags is recommended to assist the examining section with their evaluations. • A summary report to list all certified SOAs submitted with red flags. • Summary of alerts/flags upon e-signing/certification (e.g., signer acknowledges digitally signing the document knowing that flags existed). CONTINUED BELOW | In Review |
| 63b | 6/3/2011 | Red Flag System | Will there be Red Flags implemented for the above stated reasons? | Some flag types may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Filer level pre-submission. • Owner report level pre- and post-submission. • Licensing examiner report level during internal review. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 50% change (or another percentage threshold % change) for a gross receipts change in Space K across accounting periods. o Station types in Space G (e.g., network vs. independent). o Space K gross receipts aggregate amount versus the total of all individual amounts from subscriber groups' gross receipts. o When multiple previous SOA filings are combined into one filing in a subsequent accounting period, and vice-versa. o Disagreements between the examiner and the operator post-examination. o No reply correspondence. o Summary change report when operators over-ride the system in particular data fields. | In Review |
| 64 | 6/3/2011 | Document Review | Verification that the signer of the document has actually read the document. | Owners mentioned a concern that the person digitally signing the document many times currently may not read and verify the e-SOA data entered by others in their cable company. | In Review |
| 65 | 6/3/2011 | Report | Summary change report is requested to provide a means to review input changes between filing periods. | For example, if the gross receipts figure changes by 50% (decrease or increase), or if a television signal reported for years as distant becomes local, a system alert and report should ensue. | In Review |
| 66 | 6/3/2011 | Mock Up Area | A request by the owners to create a "Mock Up" area not tied to a Case ID to assist the filers, owners, and data-gathering firms with the calculations and assist with some of their own SOA what-if analysis. | Dependent on the features and functionality available on the COTS solution selected the requested mock up forms may be saved to their local machines but not stored on LD environment with access restricted to the logged in user. In addition to use by owners, the mock up area may be used as a precursor to the actual execution of the e-SOA by remitters and electronically signed and submitted. | In Review |
| 67 | 6/3/2011 | Global Cross Check Functionality | Ability to see which filers regard a signal as independently owned and to check this against those who claim otherwise on their forms. | A discrepancy should trigger a red flag if all but one filer reports a station as Independently owned versus Network. | In Review |
| 68 | 6/3/2011 | Data Element Availability | The owners prefer that all data elements be available to the public. | Currently only some web-based SOA data elements in the current LD system are available to the public. | In Review |

The requirements requested below were documented during the 6/3/2011 copyright owner's and remitter's workshops that are under consideration by the Copyright Office. The notes provided here are tentative at this stage of the re-engineering project and are subject to change at any time as circumstances may warrant.

| ID | Date Identified | Title | Requirements Requested Description | Rationale and Notes | Status |
|----|-----------------|---|--|---|-----------|
| 69 | 6/3/2011 | Time Stamping Correspondence | Time stamping LD correspondence will aid in measuring quantifiable goals with regard to the Customer Service function. | Owners request to receive a report which time stamps correspondence within the LD. And 'No Replies' should be captured within a certain time frame. | In Review |
| 70 | 6/3/2011 | Report Formats | Multiple data formats can increase accessibility for users. | Reports and data should be available in csv, txt or pdf formats and importable to Excel. | In Review |
| 71 | 6/3/2011 | DAO Balance, Account Activity, and ECO Access | Ease of access for pertinent information can decrease work for reporting. | Links or a window on the new site providing access to the Deposit Account (DAO) balances and account activity is suggested by owners. Link to ECO (Electronic Copyright Office - online system for completing the electronic copyright registration of your work). | In Review |
| 72 | 6/3/2011 | System Owner Fields | Fields should be mandatory and enforced, for example the System Owner field. | The System Owner fields should be mandatory. | In Review |
| 73 | 6/3/2011 | Report I-1 - List of Call signs | Requested Changes to Current Reports | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need Column Headings • Need state Input parameter • Need local/distant/all input parameter (this will eliminate the need to have a separate report for distant call signs) • Need a drill through report on the 4 call signs indicated. <p>On the sample report for list of call signs, there is a column for call signs without a heading. This was assumed to be the number of stations. A drill down report has been suggested for this number to display the details of the station. Note: the "List of Distant Call Signs" the column is identified and is actually the Channel number, so a drill down report would not be applicable.</p> | In Review |
| 74 | 6/3/2011 | Report I-2 – Cable Systems marked for Deletion | Requested Changes to Current Reports | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change report title to "Cable Systems marked for Deactivation" • Add Report column for Form Number (SA 1,2,3) • Add an input parameter for form type (SA 1,2,3) • Create separate fields for First Community and State. (parse all fields into their own column) | In Review |
| 75 | 6/3/2011 | Report I-3 – Cable Systems without Allocations or Transfers | Requested Changes to Current Reports | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parse all fields into their own column. • Add Report column for Form Number (SA 1,2,3) | In Review |
| 76 | 6/3/2011 | Report I-5 – Correspondence Flag | Requested Changes to Current Reports | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add Report column for initial date of correspondence • Add Report column with Y/N value for "responded" • Phase 2 - Add Correspondence categories • Add Report column for Form Number (SA 1,2,3) | In Review |
| 77 | 6/3/2011 | Report I-9b – Report of System name changes | Requested Changes to Current Reports | Need the following fields: MSO, Old Name, New Name, Number of Communities, System Owner Y/N | In Review |
| 78 | 6/3/2011 | Report I-10A – Cable Systems By Legal Name | Requested Changes to Current Reports | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parse all fields into their own column • Add Report column for Form Number (SA 1,2,3) • Input parameter for State • Add an input parameter for form type (SA 1,2,3) • Column Headings needs to be displayed properly | In Review |

The requirements requested below were documented during the 6/3/2011 copyright owner's and remitter's workshops that are under consideration by the Copyright Office. The notes provided here are tentative at this stage of the re-engineering project and are subject to change at any time as circumstances may warrant.

| ID | Date Identified | Title | Requirements Requested Description | Rationale and Notes | Status |
|----|-----------------|---|--------------------------------------|---|-----------|
| 79 | 6/3/2011 | Report I-10B/ I15 – All/First community cross reference | Requested Changes to Current Reports | - Parse all fields into their own column - Fix page number count at top of report | In Review |
| 80 | 6/3/2011 | Report I-17 – Cable Remittance | Requested Changes to Current Reports | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parse all fields into their own column Add Report column for Form Number (SA 1,2,3) Add input parameter for Acct YR/Period Add input parameter for Date | In Review |
| 81 | 6/3/2011 | Report I-18 – Authorized Refunds | Requested Changes to Current Reports | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove last 4 report columns for internal reference: Examining Authorized Examining Approved By Examining approved By Fiscal Approved By Add Report Column for Date Requested (Amendment Date) Add Report column for Form Number (SA 1,2,3) New Report – Amendment Report (All) Refund (Y/N) OR Additional Payment Add a Date at top of report Add Report column for Form Number (SA 1,2,3) Add all fields that are in the Authorized Refunds report above | In Review |
| 82 | 6/3/2011 | Report E-10 – Closed Statements of Accounts | Requested Changes on Current Reports | Parse all fields into their own column. | In Review |
| 83 | 6/3/2011 | Report E-11 – Cable Systems carrying specified signal | Requested Changes to Current Reports | - Parse all fields into their own column. - Remove Column “type” | In Review |
| 84 | 6/3/2011 | Report F-99 – Gross Receipts by account year and Period (no Changes) | Requested Changes to Current Reports | Gross Receipts by account year and Period (no Changes) | In Review |
| 85 | 6/3/2011 | Report F-38 – Stakeholder Operating Costs (PDF report) | Requested Changes to Current Reports | Need to have the data in csv format | In Review |
| 86 | 6/3/2011 | Report F-2 – CRT (CRB) Report – Cable Royalties by fund/status of Cable Royalty Receipts (no Changes) | Requested Changes to Current Reports | CRT (CRB) Report – Cable Royalties by fund/status of Cable Royalty Receipts (no Changes) | In Review |