United States Copyright Office

Proposed Schedule and Analysis of Copyright Fees to Go into Effect in Fall 2026

Submitted to Congress July 14, 2026

UNITED STATES COPYRIGHT OFFICE

Proposed Schedule and Analysis of Copyright Fees to Go into Effect in Fall 2026

SUBMITTED TO CONGRESS JULY 14, 2026

The Register of Copyrights of the United States of America
United States Copyright Office · 101 Independence Avenue SE · Washington, DC 20559-6000

The Honorable J.D. Vance
Vice President of the United States
President of the Senate
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

July 14, 2026

Dear Mr. Vice President:

On behalf of the United States Copyright Office and in accordance with section 708(b) of Title 17 of the United States Code, I am pleased to present to Congress a proposed new fee schedule for Copyright Office services, along with a supporting analysis.

As required by the statute, the proposed schedule takes into account both the costs to the Office in administering services and the overall objectives of the copyright system. In developing the schedule, the Office conducted a cost study, engaged in a notice and comment process, and responded to public feedback.

This is the first change to the Office's fees since 2020. It would permit us to achieve fee recovery of an amount closer to the historical percentage of our operational budget, incorporating a reasonable inflation adjustment. To maintain fiscally responsible operations at a level commensurate with stakeholder demand, and because copyright registration and recordation are voluntary under U.S. law, the Office sought to set fees that allow us to maintain quality services while continuing to encourage active participation in the copyright system.

By law, the Register of Copyrights may institute the new fees 120 days after the proposed schedule is submitted to Congress unless Congress enacts a law within that time period stating that it does not approve the schedule. The Office seeks to implement these new fees in the fall of 2026.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,

Shira Perlmutter

Shira Perlmutter
Register of Copyrights and Director
U.S. Copyright Office

Enclosure

The Register of Copyrights of the United States of America
United States Copyright Office · 101 Independence Avenue SE · Washington, DC 20559-6000

The Honorable Mike Johnson
Speaker of the House of Representatives
United States House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

July 14, 2026

Dear Speaker Johnson:

On behalf of the United States Copyright Office and in accordance with section 708(b) of Title 17 of the United States Code, I am pleased to present to Congress a proposed new fee schedule for Copyright Office services, along with a supporting analysis.

As required by the statute, the proposed schedule takes into account both the costs to the Office in administering services and the overall objectives of the copyright system. In developing the schedule, the Office conducted a cost study, engaged in a notice and comment process, and responded to public feedback.

This is the first change to the Office's fees since 2020. It would permit us to achieve fee recovery of an amount closer to the historical percentage of our operational budget, incorporating a reasonable inflation adjustment. To maintain fiscally responsible operations at a level commensurate with stakeholder demand, and because copyright registration and recordation are voluntary under U.S. law, the Office sought to set fees that allow us to maintain quality services while continuing to encourage active participation in the copyright system.

By law, the Register of Copyrights may institute the new fees 120 days after the proposed schedule is submitted to Congress unless Congress enacts a law within that time period stating that it does not approve the schedule. The Office seeks to implement these new fees in the fall of 2026.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,

Shira Perlmutter

Shira Perlmutter
Register of Copyrights and Director
U.S. Copyright Office

Enclosure

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPENDICES

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Every few years, the U.S. Copyright Office ("Office") conducts an analysis of the fees we charge for our services and adjusts them to account for changing costs.[1] Under Title 17, registration, recordation, and other Office fees must be "fair and equitable and give due consideration to the objectives of the copyright system."[2] To adjust fees, the Register must conduct a study of the costs of providing the services.[3] Fees may be adjusted "to not more than that necessary to cover the reasonable costs . . . plus a reasonable inflation adjustment."[4]

Nearly a decade has passed since the cost data underlying the current fee schedule was collected, and the Office's fees have remained unchanged for the past six years despite rising costs.[5] As a result, fee collections now recover a substantially smaller share of the Office's operating costs than they have historically. Because the Office is not fully funded through appropriations, fee collections are necessary to support our administration of the registration, recordation, and public records systems that benefit copyright owners, users, and the public at large.

To maintain fiscally responsible operations at a level commensurate with stakeholder demand for services, the Office commenced this fee study in August 2023. As part of our review, we contracted with the Library of Congress's ("Library") Federal Research Division ("FRD") for the statutorily required cost study. FRD analyzed the Office's fee structure as well as the operation of specific services, following recognized federal agency guidance for user charges. Using FRD's analysis, the Office considered fee changes that would balance fiscal responsibility with the copyright system's objective of "encourag[ing] the production of original literary, artistic, and musical expression for the good of the public."[6] Because copyright registration and recordation are voluntary under U.S. law, we sought to set fees at levels that allow adequate

[1] *See* 17 U.S.C. § 708 (establishing Register of Copyrights' authority to set fees, as well as fee-setting standards). The Office last adjusted our fees in 2020. *See* Copyright Office Fees, 85 Fed. Reg. 9374 (Feb. 19, 2020).
[2] 17 U.S.C. § 708(b)(4). This language does not apply to certain statement of account fees, which are not addressed in this Report. *See id.* § 708(b) (excluding statements of account from categories of fees that may be adjusted by the Register by regulation).
[3] *Id.* § 708(b)(1).
[4] *Id.* § 708(b)(2).
[5] The Office last adjusted our fee schedule in March 2020 based on a multi-year study of the Office's fiscal 2016 and 2017 costs. *See* 85 Fed. Reg. at 9374.
[6] *Fogerty v. Fantasy, Inc.*, 510 U.S. 517, 524 (1994).

recovery of reasonable costs while encouraging active participation in the copyright system.

In March 2026, the Office published a *Federal Register* notice seeking public comments on a proposed fee schedule that would raise fees an average of 43%, to reflect our increased costs and restore the historic proportion of our funding through fees.[7] In response, we received 81 comments, many expressing concern about the effect of inflation and other rising costs on individual creators and small businesses.

The Office recognizes that copyright owners are facing increased costs, and takes seriously the concerns expressed. As a result, we have modified several elements of the proposed schedule. First, due to administrative complexities, the Office initially proposed to eliminate the Single Application, a less expensive streamlined option for registering simpler claims. After reviewing the public comments, we are proposing to retain the Single Application, with a small fee increase to account for inflation. We have also lowered our proposed fees for certain group registration options, as well as the base fee for filing a notice of termination on paper. These adjustments will further mitigate the impact of the increased fees.

Without periodic fee adjustments, a declining share of our operating costs will be recovered through fees. The Office must then either rely on increased appropriations or reduce the level of services we provide. The proposed schedule seeks to avoid those outcomes by restoring a more sustainable balance between appropriated funding and fee collections while minimizing burdens on users.

To that end, the Office also recommends targeted amendments to section 708 to improve the fee-setting process and provide greater flexibility in administering Office services. Specifically, we recommend authorizing the Register to make annual inflation-based adjustments to fees while preserving the existing cost study structure for broader changes. We further recommend expanding the Register's authority to waive fees to promote access to Office services in exceptional circumstances.

Together, the proposed fee schedule and legislative recommendations reflect the Office's obligations to set fees in a fiscally responsible manner and to provide timely, reliable, and effective services. Adequate funding is essential to maintain the quality of the registration, recordation, and public records systems, and to prevent the degradation of services relied on by copyright owners, users, and the public. We

[7] Copyright Office Fees, 91 Fed. Reg. 13529, 13533 (Mar. 20, 2026) ("NPRM").

believe that the proposed schedule appropriately balances these obligations with the goal of maintaining broad access to the copyright system.

I. BUDGETARY AND LEGAL FRAMEWORK

A. Funding Sources

The Office has two main funding sources for most of our core operations:[8] (1) fees for services; and (2) appropriations.[9] Historically, fees have comprised a substantial portion of the Office's operating budget, with approximately 60% of our actual expenses covered by fees from 2009 to 2018.[10] This balance reflects the benefits the Office provides to copyright owners and users of copyrighted works as well as the broader public interests we serve by supporting the national copyright system, providing unbiased expert advice to Congress and the public on copyright law and policy, and maintaining a searchable public record of copyright registration and ownership information.

Congress determines, through the annual appropriations process, the amount the Office may expend to support these services. Although the Office collects user fees throughout the fiscal year, those funds may be obligated and spent only to the extent authorized by Congress. If annual fee collections exceed the annual spending limit, those fees are retained and may be made available to the Office as part of a future appropriation.[11] We organize our operations with the expectation that any retained prior-year fees may be used in the future to cover short-term deficits caused by

---

[8] This includes the majority of payroll-related expenses.

[9] This budget is referred to as the "Basic Budget" within the Office. In this Proposed Fee Analysis and Schedule, any references to the budget relate to the Basic Budget. The Office has two additional budgets that are *not* the subject of this Proposed Fee Schedule and Analysis: (1) the Licensing Budget, which is derived entirely from licensing royalty collections otherwise payable to copyright owners and filing fees paid by cable and satellite licenses pursuant to statutory licenses administered by the Office; and (2) the Copyright Royalty Judges Budget, which funds the Copyright Royalty Board ("CRB"). Although the CRB is not a part of the Office, the Office administers the CRB's budget on behalf of the Library. In addition to the Basic Budget, the Copyright Office Salaries and Expenses Appropriation includes a budget for the Copyright Royalty Judges and for the Office's Licensing Division. *See* S. REP. NO. 119-38, at 42–46 (2025); H.R. REP. NO. 119-178, at 22–24 (2025); *Budget Hearing—Architect of the Capitol, Library of Congress: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Legis. Branch of the H. Comm. on Appropriations*, 119th Cong. (2025), https://www.copyright.gov/laws/hearings/US-Copyright-Office-Statement-for-FY26-House-Legislative-Branch-hearing-April-8-2025-FINAL.pdf (statement of Shira Perlmutter, Register of Copyrights and Dir., U.S. Copyright Office).

[10] In recent years, the percentage of actual costs recovered from fees has decreased sharply; in fiscal year 2024, the Office recovered only 41% of our actual expenses from fees. NPRM at 13532.

[11] The Copyright Act states that "fees that are collected shall remain available until expended." 17 U.S.C. § 708(d)(1).

fluctuations in annual fee collections. Retained fee balances therefore support continuity of operations.[12]

B. Budgets for Fiscal Years 2023–2026

For the current fee schedule, the Office reviewed budgetary data, expenditures, and operational costs associated with fee-based services for fiscal years 2023 through 2025. We also considered projected future costs, particularly inflationary increases and ongoing information technology ("IT") development expenses.

For fiscal year 2023, the Office had an overall annual operating budget of $100,674,000, which came from appropriations of $53.7 million and authority to offset $46.9 million with fees collected in both fiscal year 2023 and prior years.[13] For fiscal year 2024, we had an overall annual operating budget of $103,128,000, which came from appropriations of $57.5 million and authority to offset $45.6 million with fees collected in both 2024 and prior years.[14] For fiscal year 2025, fiscal year 2024 funding levels continued under the same authorities and conditions.[15] Finally, for fiscal year 2026, Congress provided a $102,386,000 budget, with authority to offset $44.8 million with fees collected in both 2026 and prior years.[16]

C. Fee Types and Adjustments

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

---

[12] *See* H.R. REP. NO. 115-199, at 19 (2017) (recommending "$28,446,000 plus authority to spend $41,305,000 in receipts, and $2,260,000 in prior year unobligated balances for salaries and expenses of the Copyright Office" and including funding for "[c]opyright modernization"); H.R. REP. NO. 114-594, at 18 (2016) ("The authority to spend prior year unobligated balances of $4,531,000 will fund the contract portion of the Data Management Initiative ($1,091,000) and the Searchable Historic Copyright Records Project ($3,440,000).").

[13] Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2023, Pub. L. No. 117-328, div. I, tit. I, 136 Stat. 4459, 4930 (2022). The Licensing Division is fully funded from user fees and withdrawals of administrative costs from royalty pools. In fiscal 2023, it had an annual budget of $6.636 million. LIBR. OF CONG., FISCAL 2024 BUDGET JUSTIFICATION 121 (2023).

[14] Further Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2024, Pub. L. No. 118-47, div. E, tit. I, 138 Stat. 460, 722–23 (2024). In fiscal 2024, the Licensing Division had an annual budget of $6.963 million. LIBR. OF CONG., FISCAL 2025 BUDGET JUSTIFICATION 119 (2024).

[15] Full-Year Continuing Appropriations and Extensions Act, 2025, Pub. L. No. 119-4, § 1101(a)(9), 139 Stat. 9, 12 (2025).

[16] Continuing Appropriations, Agriculture, Legislative Branch, Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Extensions Act, 2026, Pub. L. No. 119-37, div. C, tit. I, 139 Stat. 495, 578 (2025).

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;[17]

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);[18]

6) Recording a statement revealing the identity of an author of an anonymous or pseudonymous work, or for 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 of a search of Copyright Office records, and for any related services;

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

11) Filing a statement of account based on secondary transmissions of primary transmissions pursuant to section 111.[19]

---

[17] Section 407 requires copyright owners and publishers to deposit copies of works published in the United States in the Copyright Office within three months of publication for the use or disposition of the Library. 17 U.S.C. § 407.

[18] Section 115 permits a licensee to make and distribute phonorecords of musical works, including in digital formats, provided certain statutory requirements are met. *See id.* § 115. The Orrin G. Hatch-Bob Goodlatte Music Modernization Act eliminated the need for certain notices of intention for certain mechanical licenses under 17 U.S.C. § 115. *See* Pub. L. No. 115-264, 132 Stat. 3676 (2018).

[19] 17 U.S.C. § 708(a).

In addition, section 708(a) authorizes the Register to fix fees for other services, such as preparing copies of Copyright Office records, based on the cost of providing the service.[20]

Before proposing new fees for the services enumerated in (1) through (9), the Register must conduct a study of the Office's costs for registering claims, recording documents, and providing other services, and must consider the timing of any fee adjustments and the Office's authority to use the fees consistent with the Office's budget.[21] As noted, the Register may adjust these fees to "not more than that necessary to cover the reasonable costs incurred by the Copyright Office for [such] services . . . plus a reasonable inflation adjustment."[22] Fee adjustments "shall be fair and equitable and give due consideration to the objectives of the copyright system."[23]

Since 1997, the Office has undertaken a series of studies to determine what fees to charge for specific services.[24] We generally revisit this fee schedule approximately every three to five years, a process during which we seek and consider public comment before submitting a proposed fee schedule to Congress.

II. FEE-SETTING OBJECTIVES

When adjusting our fee structure, in addition to fiscal considerations, the Office must give due consideration to the objective of "encourag[ing] the production of original literary, artistic, and musical expression for the good of the public."[25] Additionally, the adjusted fees must not diminish the vitality of the U.S. copyright

---

[20] *Id.*

[21] *Id.* § 708(b)(1). The Office does not submit other fees to Congress (including those for the filing of cable and satellite statements of account under section 708(a)(10) and (11) and additional Office services); instead, a separate statutory provision authorizes the Office to adjust those fees pursuant to our rulemaking authority. The Office published our proposed adjustments to these fees in our 2026 Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, and will finalize those fees at the same time as the section 708(a)(1)–(9) fees addressed in this Proposed Fee Schedule and Analysis. *See* NPRM at 13541–43. See Appendix C to view our full schedule of proposed fees.

[22] 17 U.S.C. § 708(b)(2).

[23] *Id.* § 708(b)(4).

[24] In 1997, Congress created a new fee system allowing the Office to set all of our fees by regulation rather than in the statute. An Act to make technical amendments to certain provisions of Title 17, United States Code, Pub. L. No. 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, and the benefit of the service to the general public.

[25] *Fogerty*, 510 U.S. at 524.

system.[26] The Office therefore seeks to set fees at a level that will allow us to recoup a reasonable portion of costs while encouraging participation in the copyright system and maintaining a robust and accurate system of copyright records.

A. Value of Copyright Registration and Recordation

Participation in the voluntary copyright registration and recordation systems is an important national objective.[27] The public database of copyright ownership serves users of copyrighted materials as well as copyright owners. A robust public record of copyright ownership and status facilitates marketplace transactions (and the resulting dissemination of copyrighted works) and encourages development of innovative business models that rely on copyrighted works.

In addition, the copyright system provides significant benefits to the Library, which maintains an unparalleled collection of materials for the use of Congress and the American public. The Library receives books, motion pictures, sound recordings, and other items that it would otherwise have to purchase.[28] The value of the materials that the Office provides to the Library was estimated at approximately $57.8 million in fiscal 2025.[29] The registration system thus plays a pivotal role in fostering the preservation and dissemination of the country's cultural identity.

Moreover, while registration is voluntary, it provides meaningful benefits to copyright owners in protecting their rights. A registration certificate made before or

---

[26] *See generally U.S. Copyright Office: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Cts., Intell. Prop., & the Internet of the H. Comm. on the Judiciary*, 113th Cong. 25 (2014) (statement of Rep. John Conyers, Jr., Ranking Member, H. Comm. on the Judiciary) ("[The Copyright] Office plays a critical role in promoting and protecting the integrity and vitality of our Nation's copyright system.").

[27] *See generally* Letter from Karyn A. Temple, Register of Copyrights & Dir., U.S. Copyright Office, to Hon. Thom Tillis, Chairman, Subcomm. on Intell. Prop., S. Comm. on the Judiciary, and Hon. Christopher A. Coons, Ranking Member, Subcomm. on Intellectual Prop., S. Comm. on the Judiciary, Explanation of U.S. Copyright Office Registration Processes and Challenges, at 3–6 (May 31, 2019) (noting that registration, augmented by recordation, provides the public with authoritative information about millions of vetted copyright claims, promotes judicial efficiency in infringement actions, and assists the Library in growing its collections); *U.S. Copyright Office: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Cts., Intell. Prop., & the Internet of the H. Comm. on the Judiciary*, 113th Cong. 27 (2014) (statement of Rep. Jerrold Nadler, Ranking Member, Subcomm. on Cts., Intell. Prop., & the Internet, H. Comm. on the Judiciary) (noting what the Copyright Office must do "so that users can continue to have confidence in participation in the copyright system").

[28] Through copyright registration and the mandatory deposit provision of the copyright law, the Office acquires published copyrighted works that the Library can select for its collections. *See* 17 U.S.C. §§ 407– 408.

[29] U.S. COPYRIGHT OFFICE, ANNUAL REPORT FY 2025 19 (2026), https://www.copyright.gov/reports/annual/2025/ar2025.pdf.

within five years of publication constitutes "prima facie evidence of the validity of the copyright and of the facts stated in the certificate."[30] A registration certificate or refusal is required for a copyright owner of a U.S. work to bring an infringement lawsuit in federal court.[31] Registration must be made in a timely manner to enable a copyright owner to seek statutory damages and/or attorneys' fees,[32] which are valuable remedies in lawsuits. Enabling authors and their designees to efficiently register their works is thus important for judicial enforcement and the value of copyright.[33]

B. Cost Efficiencies and Recovery

The Office operates within a larger copyright ecosystem that contributes significantly to the national economy. In 2023, core copyright industries added more than $2.09 trillion to the U.S. gross domestic product, representing 7.66% of the U.S. economy.[34] These industries employed almost 11.6 million workers, accounting for 5.43% of the entire U.S. workforce and 6.10% of total private employment in the U.S.[35] The scale and economic significance of these industries underscores the importance of a well-functioning copyright system and the continued public investment necessary to support its administration.

Although fee receipts comprise a large share of our budget, the Office has never been funded entirely by fees. Because the copyright system provides broad economic and public benefits extending beyond individual rightsholders, Congress has historically supported the Office's administration of the system through a combination

[30] 17 U.S.C. § 410(c).

[31] *Id.* § 411(a). In 2019, the Supreme Court confirmed that Copyright Office action on an application for registration must be complete before the owner of a U.S. work can seek redress for infringement of their rights in court. *Fourth Est. Pub. Benefit Corp. v. Wall-Street.com, LLC*, 586 U.S. 296, 309 (2019). This registration (or refused application) requirement for bringing a lawsuit in federal court only applies to "United States works," as defined in section 101 of the Copyright Act. A purported copyright owner can still bring suit if the Copyright Office refuses registration, but the refusal must be issued before the claim is filed.

[32] 17 U.S.C. § 412.

[33] This registration (or refused application) requirement for bringing a lawsuit only applies to "United States works," as defined in section 101 of the Copyright Act. Although they are not required to register their works to file a lawsuit, foreign authors and copyright owners routinely register their works with the Office to avail themselves of the important benefits that a registration provides, including the legal presumptions and eligibility for enhanced legal remedies discussed above, as well as the benefit of creating a public record of authorship and ownership.

[34] INT'L INTELL. PROP. ALL., COPYRIGHT INDUSTRIES IN THE U.S. ECONOMY: THE 2024 REPORT 1 (2025), https://www.iipa.org/files/uploads/2025/02/IIPA-Copyright-Industries-in-the-U.S.-Economy-Report-2024_ONLINE_FINAL.pdf.

[35] *Id.*

of appropriated funds and user fees. While appropriations play an important role in supporting our operations, the Office must recover a substantial portion of our expenses through fees. Maintaining an appropriate balance of cost recovery between fees and appropriations ensures that the Office can continue to administer services effectively and sustainably.

The Office has historically recovered approximately 60% of our actual expenses from fees,[36] with Congress appropriating the remainder. In recent years, however, that percentage has declined substantially. In fiscal year 2024, the Office recovered only 41% of our actual expenses through fee collections. Inflation has contributed significantly to this decline, impacting costs associated with personnel, technology, and other operations-related expenses. For example, although Congress has continued to provide support for labor and modernization activities through appropriations, the Office has experienced significant gaps between the funding provided for salaries via continuing resolution and the amounts needed to implement mandatory federal pay raises, as well as increasing IT costs that exceed earlier budget requests and appropriated levels. As a result, the Office has absorbed a growing share of these expenses within our existing budget.

In addition to overseeing the national copyright registration and recordation systems, the Office continues to perform our broader statutory responsibilities, including advising Congress on copyright policy and legislation; supporting the work of the courts, the Department of Justice, and other federal agencies on copyright litigation and international matters; conducting administrative and regulatory activities under the Copyright Act; educating the public about copyright; and improving public-facing systems and services. Maintaining an appropriate level of cost recovery is necessary to sustain these responsibilities without requiring substantially increased appropriations.

C. Federal Guidance Regarding Fees Assessed for Government Services

In conducting the present fee study, the Office followed the requirements set forth in section 708, directing the Register to conduct a study of the Office's costs and authorizing the adjustment of fees to recover the reasonable costs incurred by the Office, together with a reasonable inflation adjustment. In addition, we applied federal guidance concerning user charges.

[36] In the study of the Office's costs for the last fee adjustment, the external consultant likewise 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.

The Office of Management and Budget's ("OMB") Circular No. A-25 establishes general federal policy regarding fees assessed for government services. In particular, the Office found two policy objectives instructive. First, Circular No. A-25 provides that services with a broad-reaching benefit generally need not recover their full costs, whereas special services, that is, those that provide a particular benefit to a particular customer, may recover more than their full cost in certain circumstances.[37] The excess revenue collected from special services fees can offset losses accruing from other fees that may not recover their full cost.

Second, Circular No. A-25 instructs agencies to include all direct and indirect costs when determining the full cost for a service. OMB defines "full costs" broadly to include "all direct and indirect costs to any part of the Federal Government of providing a good, resource, or service."[38] It explains that such costs include, among other things, direct and indirect personnel costs; "[p]hysical overhead, consulting, and other indirect costs including material and supply costs, utilities, insurance, travel, and rents or imputed rents on land, buildings, and equipment"; "[t]he costs of . . . research, establishment of standards, and regulation"; and "management and supervisory costs."[39]

The Office also considered guidance issued by the Government Accountability Office ("GAO") concerning federal user fees. It states that, "[u]nless the authorizing legislation specifies costs that should be included or excluded, agencies should follow OMB guidance," which instructs agencies "to include all direct and indirect costs when determining full cost, including but not limited to personnel costs, . . . physical overhead; consulting; material and supply costs; . . . management and supervisory costs; . . . research; establishment of standards and regulation; and imputed costs."[40]

Although the Office is not subject to Circular A-25,[41] the guidance is consistent with Congress's direction for the Register to evaluate the reasonable costs incurred in administering Office services. Accordingly, in assessing the costs associated with registration, recordation, and related services, the Office considered both direct and indirect operational costs associated with administering and supporting those activities,

---

[37] OFF. OF MGMT. & BUDGET, CIRCULAR NO. A-25 REVISED, USER CHARGES at 3–4 (2017) ("CIRCULAR NO. A-25"), https://whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/Circular-025.pdf.
[38] *Id*. at 5.
[39] *Id*. at 5–6.
[40] U.S. GOV'T ACCOUNTABILITY OFF. ("GAO"), FEDERAL USER FEES: A DESIGN GUIDE 15 (May 2008), http://www.gao.gov/assets/210/203357.pdf.
[41] CIRCULAR NO. A-25 at 1 ("The Circular does not apply to the activities of the legislative and judicial branches of Government").

while also recognizing that certain services providing particularized benefits may appropriately recover more than their full costs to offset losses accruing from other services.

III. Procedural History and Methodology

A. Federal Research Division Report

The Office initiated this fee study in August 2023 by contracting with FRD to conduct a review of the Office's current and expected future costs.[42] This review was conducted with the oversight of the Office's Assistant Register and Director of Operations and our Chief Economist.[43] The resulting study (the "FRD Report") was finalized in June 2025.

The FRD Report employed a mixed quantitative and qualitative methodology to assess the Office's costs.[44] To collect quantitative data, FRD distributed a data collection instrument to Office employees which measured the time employees spent processing fee-based services ("time-use data") over a four-week period.[45] To collect time-use data related to second appeals of registration decisions, it distributed a time-use survey to employees in the Office of the General Counsel and the Office of Policy and International Affairs.[46] It also reviewed personnel cost records, non-personnel financial records, licensing fiduciary statements, annual report data, transaction costs for receiving and shipping materials, and Electronic Copyright Office ("eCO") database records from fiscal years 2020 through 2024.[47] Finally, it conducted qualitative interviews to gather additional context and data.[48]

FRD used this data to develop a model which incorporated both direct and indirect costs according to government-identified best practices to estimate the costs of the Office's fee-based services.[49] In FRD's cost model, unit costs of each fee-based service incorporated four broad categories: (1) direct time costs; (2) direct in-processing and out-processing costs; (3) indirect personnel costs; and (4) indirect non-personnel

---

[42] *See* 17 U.S.C. § 708(b)(2) (permitting fees to "account for any estimated increase in costs"); FED. RSCH. DIV., U.S. COPYRIGHT OFFICE FY2024 FEE STUDY: COST ASSESSMENT REPORT 3 (2025) ("FRD REPORT"), http://copyright.gov/rulemaking/feestudy2026/Cost Assessment Report.pdf.
[43] *See* NPRM at 13531.
[44] *See* FRD REPORT at 10.
[45] *See id*.
[46] *See id*.
[47] *See id*.
[48] *See id*. at 41.
[49] *See id*. at 8.

costs.[50] Direct costs reflected the average cost of employee time across all units for each service recorded over the four-week data collection period.[51] The cost of employee time was calculated using each employee's 2025 General Schedule salary rates, including locality pay, as well as an estimate of the costs of employee benefits.[52]

Direct in-processing and out-processing costs reflected the time and material costs required for receiving and sending physical shipments related to registration and recordation services.[53] Direct in-processing costs reflected the time costs of unpacking, sorting, and recording incoming physical materials, including paper-based application materials and physical deposits.[54]

Indirect personnel costs reflected the total personnel costs of personnel not directly engaged in fee-based services but whose work supports the provision of those services.[55] These costs included pay and benefits for supervisory and administrative employees, as well as personnel time not directly dedicated to fee-based services by employees who otherwise directly engaged in fee-based services, such as time spent in training, in meetings, or on leave.[56]

Finally, indirect non-personnel costs reflected the total costs across all directorates of the Office of non-personnel items such as information technology, equipment, travel, and contract services.[57] Indirect non-personnel costs also included IT modernization costs, for which the Office had received $10 million in appropriations each year for the past five years.[58]

Using this methodology, FRD calculated 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.[59] These totals comprise an estimated $14,052,125 in direct costs and $16,565,171 in indirect costs for registration services; an estimated $1,316,863 in direct costs and $6,242,077 in indirect costs for copyright records services; an estimated $201,078 in direct costs and $943,583 in indirect costs for the Licensing Section's record request and

---

[50] *See id*. at 12.
[51] *See id*. at 10.
[52] *See id*. at 12.
[53] *See id*. at 13.
[54] *See id*.
[55] *See id*. at 14.
[56] *See id*.
[57] *See id*. at 16.
[58] *Id*.
[59] *See id*. at 1.

filing services; and an estimated $48,097,279 in overhead operating expenses.[60] Before estimating future expected costs, FRD made adjustments for inflation using historical increases in the federal General Schedule pay scale and Washington-Baltimore-Arlington locality payments for indirect personnel costs, and historical increases in the Consumer Price Index for non-personnel costs.[61]

B. Notice of Proposed Rulemaking

After independently evaluating the FRD Report, the Office issued a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking ("NPRM") in the *Federal Register* on May 20, 2026, seeking comments on a proposed schedule of fee adjustments.[62] The NPRM provided an analysis of the proposed fee changes and concluded that they were "fair and equitable and g[a]ve due consideration to the objectives of the copyright system," as required by the statute.[63] The Office further concluded 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."[64]

Overall, the Office proposed an average fee increase of 43% to account for increases in the cost of providing services.[65] This figure accounted for historic inflation of 33% since the last fee study—which was based on fiscal years 2016 and 2017 costs—as well as anticipated inflation over the next three years at a projected rate of 3% annually.[66] After accounting for inflation, the Office assessed the appropriate portion of rising costs to recover through each fee, based on its expected impact to the copyright system.[67] We generally apportioned more cost recovery to services primarily used by larger commercial entities and less to services primarily used by individual creators.[68] Where appropriate, we also set identical fees for analogous services, such as group registration options.[69] Finally, we assessed each adjustment's impact on projected

---

[60] *See id*. at 32; NPRM at 13531.
[61] *See* FRD REPORT app. II at 39.
[62] *See* NPRM at 13529.
[63] 17 U.S.C. § 708(b)(4).
[64] NPRM at 13532–33.
[65] *Id.* at 13533.
[66] *See id.*
[67] *Id.*
[68] *Id.*
[69] *Id.*

revenue, proposing only slight increases where more significant increases would not result in significantly increased revenue due to low service volume.[70]

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 those submitted using paper applications (up from $125).[71] 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, more in line with the Office's historical cost recovery of 60% for most services.[72] The proposed fee increase for paper applications, while slightly above the historical and projected inflation rate, was assessed by the Office to approximate the actual cost of the service.[73] In addition, we proposed eliminating the Single Application registration option, which currently carries a fee of $45. Intended to be a streamlined option, the Single Application has proven to be inefficient for both applicants and the Office, and its use has decreased consistently over time.[74] We reasoned that eliminating this relatively inefficient option would allow us to process the more widely used options more efficiently.[75]

For most group registration options, the Office proposed a fee of $130 (up from $65 for group registrations of works on an album and group registrations of short online literary works; up from $85 for group registrations of contributions to periodicals, group registrations of two-dimensional artworks, and group registrations of unpublished works; and up from $95 for group registrations of newspapers or newsletters published within the same calendar month).[76] We intended this proposed increase to account for the often high processing costs and relatively low cost recovery of group options.[77] Additionally, 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).[78] These options primarily serve corporate applicants with relatively inelastic demand, and more substantial increases could subsidize other group registration options more commonly

---

[70] *Id.*
[71] *Id.*
[72] *Id.*
[73] *Id.*
[74] *Id.* at 13533–34.
[75] *Id.* at 13534.
[76] *Id.* at 13534–35.
[77] *Id.* at 13534.
[78] *Id.* at 13534–35.

used by individual applicants.[79] 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).[80] We reasoned that these modest increases would achieve greater cost recovery while maintaining low per-work registration fees.[81] 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, such as the group registration of short online literary works.[82]

The Office also proposed fee increases for less commonly used registration and related services. Because these are low-volume services with high provision costs, we proposed raising these fees above the historical and projected inflation rates to achieve a cost recovery more in line with their full cost.[83] 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).[84] Similarly, we proposed a special handling surcharge for expedited application processing of $1,100 (up from $800).[85] Increasing fees for these low-volume services with relatively inelastic demand would allow for greater overall cost recovery and would offset the cost of other, more commonly used registration services.[86]

Finally, the Office proposed fee increases above the historical and projected rate of inflation for several recordation services. For example, we proposed a base recordation fee of $215 for electronic submissions (up from $95) and $320 for paper submissions (up from $125).[87] We reasoned these increases would achieve greater cost recovery and were reasonable given their typical use by commercial entities.[88]

The Office received a variety of comments from a wide range of interested parties in response to the NPRM.[89] Overall, we received 81 comments, roughly three quarters from individual commenters and roughly one quarter from organizational commenters.

---

[79] *Id.* at 13534.
[80] *Id.* at 13534–35.
[81] *Id.* at 13534.
[82] *Id.* This proposed fee is equal to the proposed fee for registering one work with the Standard Application.
[83] *Id.* at 13535.
[84] *Id.* at 13535–36.
[85] *Id.* at 13535.
[86] *Id.*
[87] *Id.* at 13537.
[88] *Id.*
[89] The comments can be viewed through the Copyright Office website at https://www.copyright.gov/rulemaking/feestudy2026/.

Many commenters expressed concern that the proposed fee increases would deter registration given rising costs for consumers and businesses as well as other economic trends, including the rise of generative AI and its impact on creative industries.[90] While some focused on the impacts on independent artists and creators, others challenged the assumption that corporate registrants will be more able to bear increased costs than individual registrants.[91] Comments from the Copyright Alliance, Authors Guild, National Music Publishers' Association ("NMPA"), National Press Photographers Association, and other individual and organizational commenters argued that the relatively substantial fee increases for group registration options would impose an excessive burden on their members and reduce registration demand.[92]

A number of organizational commenters pointed to changes in the methodology of the FRD Report compared to cost analyses from past fee cycles. Several questioned the inclusion of certain indirect costs in the FRD Report's cost calculations, such as those associated with the Office of Policy and International Affairs and the Copyright Royalty Board.[93] Others echoed comments from past cycles by questioning the inclusion of modernization costs in these calculations, arguing such costs should not be passed to registrants until the benefits of modernization have been realized.[94] Several others

[90] *See, e.g.*, Olu AnuKin, Comments Submitted in Response to U.S. Copyright Office's March 20, 2026 Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, at 1 (Apr. 15, 2026); Annie Brule, Comments Submitted in Response to U.S. Copyright Office's March 20, 2026 Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, at 1 (Apr. 7, 2026); Uma Krishnaswami, Comments Submitted in Response to U.S. Copyright Office's March 20, 2026 Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, at 1 (Apr. 23, 2026).

[91] *See, e.g.*, Copyright Alliance, Comments Submitted in Response to U.S. Copyright Office's March 20, 2026 Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, at 19–22 (May 4, 2026) ("Copyright Alliance Comments"); National Association of REALTORS, Comments Submitted in Response to U.S. Copyright Office's March 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 March 20, 2026 Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, at 6–8 (May 4, 2026) ("NMA Comments").

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

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

[94] *See, e.g.*, ImageRights International, Inc., Comments Submitted in Response to U.S. Copyright Office's March 20, 2026 Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, at 4–5 (May 4, 2026) ("ImageRights Comments");

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 registration demand.[95]

Finally, 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.[96] Organizational commenters, on the other hand, were split in their response. The American Intellectual Property Law Association and United States Internet Preservation Society argued the Office had persuasively demonstrated the Single Application's inefficiency.[97] In contrast, the Copyright Alliance, NMPA, Authors Guild, and others argued that the Single Application is an important option for creatives and the Office should explore strategies for improving its efficiency rather than eliminate it altogether.[98]

IV. FURTHER METHODOLOGY AND ADJUSTMENTS

The Office has carefully reviewed the comments received in response to the NPRM. After analyzing the comments in light of the statutory directive that fees be fair, equitable, and duly consider the objectives of the copyright system, we have amended the proposed fee schedule.

As an initial matter, the Office confirms the validity of the underlying methodology used to prepare our cost assessment. Under section 708, such an assessment is foundational for formulating proposed fee adjustments.[99] As discussed

---

American Association of Independent Music, Comments Submitted in Response to U.S. Copyright Office's March 20, 2026 Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, at 5 (May 4, 2026); Copyright Alliance Comments at 24–25.

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

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

[97] *See* American Intellectual Property Law Association, Comments Submitted in Response to U.S. Copyright Office's March 20, 2026 Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, at 3 (May 1, 2026) ("AIPLA Comments"); United States Internet Preservation Society, Comments Submitted in Response to U.S. Copyright Office's March 20, 2026 Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, at 2–3 (Mar. 20, 2026) ("USIPS Comments").

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

[99] *See* 17 U.S.C. § 708(b)(1)–(2).

above, several commenters questioned FRD's decision to include certain indirect costs in its assessment, including costs related to other divisions within the Office and in connection with IT development costs. FRD's allocation of these indirect costs is consistent with the broader federal guidance for analyzing costs for fee-based services described above.[100] This guidance advises agencies to incorporate "*all* direct and indirect costs" when determining the full cost of a service[101]—not a selectively narrowed subset. FRD's assessment likewise aligns with government approaches and best practices on what indirect costs should be included.[102] Under this broader allowance, the Office need not restrict consideration of certain overhead or defer consideration of costs associated with IT development.

Some commenters also questioned the absence of an elasticity analysis—that is, the relationship between an increased fee and the demand for that service. The Office is mindful that registration and recordation are voluntary. If we increase fees too much, participation in the system could decrease. Although the FRD Report does not devote a separate section to elasticity, its cost and revenue forecasting model relies on previous demand analyses to project the impact of increased fees on the volume of a service's use. The Office considered this in our calculus, alongside the factors described above.

Turning to the fees for specific services, the Office intends to adjust some of the fees we proposed in the NPRM. Among registration services, we propose lowering the proposed increase for two fees. The fee for group registration of updates to a news website would increase to $275 instead of $350, and the fee for group registration of musical works on the same album would increase to $85 instead of $130. We also reconsidered our proposal to eliminate the Single Application. We will instead maintain this application for the time being and implement a modest fee increase from $45 to $55, reflecting an inflationary adjustment. As discussed below, these adjustments

---

[100] *See supra* Section II.C.

[101] CIRCULAR NO. A-25 at 5 (emphasis added); *see also* GAO, FEDERAL USER FEES: A DESIGN GUIDE 15 (May 2008), http://www.gao.gov/assets/210/203357.pdf (noting that the Office of Management and Budget's guidance directs "agencies to include all direct and indirect costs when determining full cost, including but not limited to personnel costs, including salaries and benefits such as medical insurance and retirement; physical overhead; consulting; material and supply costs; utilities; insurance; travel; rents or imputed rents on land, buildings, and equipment; management and supervisory costs; costs of collecting and enforcing fees; research; establishment of standards and regulation; and imputed costs").

[102] *See* FRD REPORT at 7 (asterisked notation) (noting alignment with the Library's definition, which defines an indirect cost as "any cost not directly identified with a single product or service but identified with two or more products or services, and therefore must be allocated on some cause and effect basis (overhead)"); *id.* at 8 (noting that the cause-and-effect basis is among the Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board's cost assignment methods).

address commenters' concerns about the level of the increases to those fees, and the elimination of a lower-cost registration option for a single work.

Outside of registration, the Office is proposing to lower the increase to the base fee for filing a notice of termination on paper—increasing the fee to $275 instead of $320.[103] This adjustment acknowledges commenters' concerns about the level of the initial increase on a service used by individual authors or their heirs. We are proposing a higher increase to the base fee for all other recordations filed on paper, increasing the fee to $350 instead of $320. The $30 increase above the NPRM proposal will further incentivize online filing where available and serve to accommodate the downward adjustment of the other fees.

The resulting updated fee proposal provides an appropriate balance between providing recoupment of a reasonable portion of the Office's overall costs, while also encouraging continued participation in the copyright system and maintaining a robust and accurate system of copyright records. The fee schedule is projected to achieve 53% cost recovery during the first year of implementation. This falls short of achieving the Office's historical and recommended cost recovery of approximately 60%,[104] but narrows the substantial gap between that goal and the 41% cost recovery under which we currently operate.

One commenter encouraged the Office not to "settl[e]" for 53%.[105] Indeed, when Congress established the Register's current fee-adjustment authority, it envisioned that the ability to increase fees "would eliminate the need for appropriations to fund the Copyright Office."[106] However, setting fees at the significantly higher levels needed to match past (or full) cost recovery could substantially decrease use of the Office's

---

[103] We note that notices of termination are not among the services captured under section 708(a)(1)–(9). The adjustment to this fee is included in this proposal to provide a complete picture of our further adjustments to the proposed recordation fees.

[104] NPRM at 13532 & n.44. Two commenters questioned the Office's focus on the historical 60% cost-recovery rate. *See* Copyright Alliance Comments at 14; Anonymous 8, Comments Submitted in Response to U.S. Copyright Office's March 20, 2026 Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, at 1 (Apr. 14, 2026). Congress has long aimed for the Office to recover the majority of our expenses from fees. Prior to the enactment of the Register's current fee-adjustment authority, Congress noted that "[h]istorically, the Copyright Office recoups the greater portion of its expenses from earned fees," but that inflation over the last decade had "reduced the fee share of the Copyright Office budget to about 35 percent." H.R. REP. NO. 101-279, at 2 (1989). Congress doubled the then-statutory fee schedule to account for inflation and gave the Register the authority to make inflation-based adjustments at five-year intervals to maintain the "balance between user fees and costs to taxpayers." *Id*. at 3.

[105] USIPS Comments at 1.

[106] H.R. REP. NO. 105-25, at 8 (1997).

services, to the copyright system's detriment. Congress expressly noted that fees should be fair and equitable and give due consideration to the objectives of the copyright system and that the Register may "decide that fees may be less than the costs of the services provided."[107]

Alternatively, if the cost-recovery shortfall were left unmitigated, the Office would need to request increased appropriations or substantially reduce the scope and quality of the services that the public has come to expect. An underfunded copyright system that can no longer timely register works, efficiently maintain a robust record, or otherwise keep up with creators' needs and expectations would present its own impediment to fulfilling the objectives of the copyright system.

[107] *Id*. at 16.

V. Proposed Fees

A. Schedule of Proposed Adjustments

Below is a chart of the proposed adjusted fees showing the approximate cost recovery for each service.[108]

	Registration, Recordation, and Related Services Referenced in 708(a)(1)–(9)	Current Fee	Proposed New Fee	Cost Recovery[109]
(1)	Registration of a claim in an original work of authorship:			
	Electronic Filing:			
	(i) Single author, same claimant, one work, not for hire	$45	**$55[110]**	44%[111]
	(ii) All other filings	$65	$85	62%[112]
	Paper Filing (Forms PA, SR, TX, VA, SE)	$125	$185	101%
	Registration of a claim in a group of contributions to periodicals (electronic filing only)	$85	$130	7%
	Registration of a claim in a group of published photographs or a claim in a group of unpublished photographs (electronic filing only)	$55	$85	Varied[113]

[108] Fee adjustments that differ from those proposed in the NPRM are indicated in bold type. See Appendix B: Summary of Costs and Fees for additional data concerning the Office's costs in connection with these services.

[109] To calculate estimated cost recovery, the Office used the service's proposed fee against its per-unit total costs. For cost recovery entries marked "N/A," FRD did not provide cost data.

[110] This proposed new fee differs from the NPRM's proposal to eliminate the Single Application. *See infra* Section V(B)(1)(b).

[111] Based on the simple average of costs across all types of works and deposit types.

[112] Based on the simple average of costs across all types of works and deposit types.

[113] Cost recovery is 72% for registering groups of published photographs and 52% for registering groups of unpublished photographs (averaged across deposit type).

	Registration, Recordation, and Related Services Referenced in 708(a)(1)–(9)	**Current Fee**	**Proposed New Fee**	**Cost Recovery[109]**
	Registration of updates and revisions to a database that predominantly consists of photographs:			
	Electronic filing	$250	$700	121%
	Paper filing	$250	$700	
	Registration of updates and revisions to a database that predominantly consists of non-photographic works (paper filing only)	$500	$700	138%
	Registration of a claim in a group of serials (per issue, minimum 2 issues) (electronic filing only)	$35	$50	76%
	Registration of a claim in a group of newspapers or a group of newsletters (electronic filing only)	$95	$130	Varied[114]
	Registration of a claim in a group of unpublished works (electronic filing only)	$85	$130	64%
	Registration of a group of works on an album (electronic filing only)			
	Musical works	$65	**$85[115]**	46%[116]
	Sound recordings, photographs, artwork, and liner notes	$65	$130	
	Registration of a group of short online literary works (electronic filing only)	$65	$130	20%

[114] Cost recovery is approximately 19% for newspapers and 20% for newsletters.
[115] This proposed new fee is lower than the NPRM's proposal of $130. *See infra* Section V(B)(1)(c).
[116] Based on the average of the proposed fees for registering a group of musical works on an album (GRAM/PA) and registering a group of sound recordings on an album (GRAM/SR), and the average of costs across both application and deposit types.

	Registration, Recordation, and Related Services Referenced in 708(a)(1)–(9)	**Current Fee**	**Proposed New Fee**	**Cost Recovery[109]**
	Registration of a group of two-dimensional artwork (electronic filing only)	$85	$130	N/A
	Registration of a group of updates to news websites (electronic filing only)	$95	**$275**[117]	53%
	Registration of a claim in a restored copyright (Form GATT) (paper filing only)	$100	$165	32%
	Registration of a correction or amplification to a claim:			
	Electronic Filing	$100	$85	21%
	Paper Filing for correction or amplification of renewal registrations, GATT registrations, and group registrations for non-photographic databases (Form CA)	$150	$185	48%
(2)	Registration of a renewal claim (Form RE):			
	(i) Claim without addendum	$125	$165	11%
	(ii) Addendum (in addition to the fee for the claim)	$100	$135	12%
(3)	Issuance of receipt for § 407 deposit	$30	$30	N/A

[117] This proposed new fee is lower than the NPRM's proposal of $350. *See infra* Section V(B)(1)(c).

	Registration, Recordation, and Related Services Referenced in 708(a)(1)–(9)	Current Fee	Proposed New Fee	Cost Recovery[109]
(4), (6)	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):			
	Paper filing for notices of termination (Form TCS)	$125	**$275**[118]	24%
	Paper filing for all other recordations	$125	**$350**[119]	78–81%
	Electronic	$95	$215	53–87%
	(ii) Additional transfer (per transfer) (for documents recorded under 17 U.S.C. 205)	$95	$215	51%[120]
	(iii) Additional works and alternate identifiers:			
	Paper (per group of 10 or fewer additional works and alternate identifiers)	$60	$215	88%
	Electronic:			Varied[121]
	1 to 50 additional works and alternate identifiers	$60	$215	
	51 to 500 additional works and alternate identifiers	$225	$300	

[118] This proposed new fee is lower than the NPRM's proposal of $320. *See infra* Section V(B)(3).
[119] This proposed new fee differs from the NPRM's proposal of $320. *See infra id.*
[120] This is an average of paper form and electronic submissions.
[121] To allow simple comparison between titles provided on electronic or paper title lists, FRD calculated the cost of processing groups of ten additional works, which is $88.31 when submitted electronically. As a representative example of cost recovery, the Office notes that the cost recovery for processing 118 additional works—the average number of titles submitted for recordation through the online recordation system in fiscal year 2025—would be 28% if submitted electronically. *See* 2025 U.S. COPYRIGHT OFF. ANN. REP. 6 (2026), https://www.copyright.gov/reports/annual/2025/ar2025.pdf.

	Registration, Recordation, and Related Services Referenced in 708(a)(1)–(9)	Current Fee	Proposed New Fee	Cost Recovery[109]
	501 to 1,000 additional works and alternate identifiers	$390	$520	
	1,001 to 10,000 additional works and alternate identifiers	$555	$745	
	10,001 or more additional works and alternate identifiers	$5,550	$745 per additional group of 10,000	
	(iv) Correction of online Public Catalog data due to erroneous electronic title submission (per work or alternate identifier)	$7	$10	N/A
(5)	Recordation of a notice of intention to make and distribute phonorecords (17 U.S.C. § 115)	$75	$100	23%
	(i) Additional titles (per group of 1 to 10 titles) (paper filing)	$20	$25	N/A
	(ii) Additional titles (per group of 1 to 100 titles) (electronic filing)	$10	$15	N/A
(7)	Provision of an additional certificate of registration	$55	$80	N/A
(8)	Certification of other Copyright Office records, including search reports (per hour)	$200	$300	26%
(9)	Search report prepared from official records other than Licensing Records (per hour, two-hour minimum)	$200	$300	46%
	Estimate of search fee (credited to search fee)	$200	$300	36%
	Search report prepared from Licensing Records (per hour, one hour minimum)	$200	$300	42%

B. Analysis

Taking into account the cost study and inflation levels, the Office has determined that most fees should increase to achieve a more sustainable level of cost recovery. These adjustments are necessary to 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, thus bringing cost recovery closer to historic levels and approximating the amounts Congress typically authorizes the Office to access from prior year balances.

Below is a more detailed explanation of the Office's proposals with respect to the various fee categories.

1. Registration Fees

As the United States Government has explained to the Supreme Court, "[r]egistration of creative works confers significant benefits on the Library of Congress and the public."[122] Among other benefits, "[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,"[123] 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."[124] Registration confers valuable enforcement benefits to copyright owners fighting infringement. Registration 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."[125] Finally, registration "serves as a major source of the Library's acquisitions," since deposit copies can be transferred into the Library's collections.[126] For these reasons, it is important for the Office to maintain efficient and effective service. In support of these objectives, registration fees should recover 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 proposed fee schedule and made adjustments to address

---

[122] 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).
[123] *Id.* at 5.
[124] *Id.* at 22.
[125] *Id.* at 11.
[126] *Id.* at 4.

three concerns. First, we sought to address the particular challenges faced by individual authors who may not produce enough works at one time to benefit from group registration options. A number of individual authors opposed the proposal to eliminate the Single Application, citing economic hardship and concerns, and stating that the inability to register would make it more difficult to protect and enforce their rights. Second, we noted the concerns of songwriters who release musical works independently, without major label support. These authors explained that the increase to 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."[127] Third, we reviewed the fee for the option to register updates to news websites and considered comments from small news publishers facing economic challenges.[128] The Office understands the concerns these commenters expressed about the proposal's potential effect on creators with few resources.[129] Accordingly, we propose to retain the Single Application with a modest fee increase to account for inflation, and to reduce the proposed increases for group registration of musical works and updates to news websites. We believe that the adjusted proposal appropriately balances affordable access to registration with our duty to administer the services in a fiscally responsible manner.

At present, registration fees recover approximately 47% of the costs associated with providing registration services. The proposed fee adjustments would increase cost recovery to approximately 59%, bringing the recovery rate closer to historic levels.

a. Claims Submitted on the Standard Application or with a Paper Application

The Copyright Office plans to adopt the following adjustments to the Standard Application and Paper Application fees:

- Fee for applications filed electronically to increase from $65 to $85
- Fee for applications filed on paper to increase from $125 to $185

---

[127] 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").
[128] NMA Comments at App.
[129] *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) ("Sierra Lewis Comments").

These applications 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 Office offers applicants two options for registering these types of works: (1) electronic filing through the eCO system using the Standard Application; and (2) paper filing using a physical application. Currently, the vast majority of applicants use the online filing option; the Office receives approximately 99% of copyright claims through eCO. Electronic filings cost less to process than paper applications. On average, the Office currently requires approximately three months to complete most claims that are filed electronically versus six months to complete most claims filed on paper applications.[130]

In reviewing these 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 the proposed fees, we would recover approximately 66% of the costs associated with processing Standard Applications and substantially all costs associated with processing paper applications.[131]

Many commenters opposed increasing the registration fee for Standard Applications, asserting that a higher fee could discourage registration.[132] One argued that "[t]he costs associated with examination, recordkeeping, and database maintenance primarily support institutional objectives and third-party use, and therefore should not be borne by individual creators."[133] The Office carefully considered these comments, and concludes that the proposed increases remain justified. The current $65 fee was established using cost data that is now a decade old.[134] Since that time, inflation and

---

[130] U.S. COPYRIGHT OFFICE, REGISTRATION PROCESSING TIMES (Oct. 2025–Mar. 2026), https://www.copyright.gov/registration/docs/processing-times-faqs.pdf. Processing times are based on claims that did not require correspondence between October 2025 and March 2026. These figures are higher than those for previous reporting periods, in part, due to the lapse of appropriations from October 1 through November 12, 2025, when the Office continued to receive registration applications but staff could not process them. As the Office recovers from this temporary disruption, processing times are expected to return to the previous average of under 2 months. U.S. COPYRIGHT OFFICE, REGISTRATION PROCESSING TIMES (Apr. 2025–Sep. 2025), https://www.copyright.gov/registration/docs/processing-times-faqs/april-1-2025-september-30-2025.pdf.

[131] *See* Appendix B: Summary of Costs and Fees.

[132] *E.g.*, Annie Brule, Comments Submitted in Response to U.S. Copyright Office's March 20, 2026 Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, at 1 (Apr. 7, 2026); RIAA Comments at 3.

[133] AMI Comments at 3.

[134] *See* 85 Fed. Reg. at 9375, 9378 (proposing $65 fee based on data from fiscal years 2016 and 2017).

other cost increases have substantially increased the cost of examining claims and maintaining registration services. As a result, the current fee recovers only about half of the Office's costs to process Standard Applications. Maintaining a fee that no longer reflects the cost of processing these applications would further reduce cost recovery and affect the provision of efficient and timely service. The proposed $20 increase improves cost recovery while remaining approximately 34% below the full cost of providing the service.

The Office also notes that registration options have expanded significantly since the current fee schedule was adopted. Since 2020, we have implemented five additional group options that allow applicants to register multiple works with one application and filing fee. 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. These options supplemented existing group registration options for photographs, unpublished works, serials, newspapers, newsletters, and contributions to periodicals. Under the Office's proposal, many group options would continue to provide registration at a fee of only a few dollars per work, and in many cases, approximately $13 or less. The continued availability of these lower-cost options helps address commenters' concerns and enhances access to the registration system.

Finally, as noted in the prior fee studies,[135] the substantially higher costs of processing paper applications as compared to the more efficient electronic process under the Standard Application justifies a higher fee for paper applications. Accordingly, the Office continues to propose different filing fees for these applications and proposes increasing the existing $125 fee for paper applications to $185. This proposal will recover the entire processing cost for the inefficiencies of paper filings and incentivize use of the electronic system.[136]

---

[135] *See* U.S. COPYRIGHT OFFICE, PROPOSED SCHEDULE AND ANALYSIS OF COPYRIGHT FEES TO GO INTO EFFECT IN SPRING 2020 24 (2019) ("2020 FEE STUDY"), https://www.copyright.gov/rulemaking/feestudy2018/proposed-fee-schedule.pdf; U.S. COPYRIGHT OFFICE, PROPOSED SCHEDULE AND ANALYSIS OF COPYRIGHT FEES TO GO INTO EFFECT ON OR ABOUT APRIL 1, 2014 16 (2013) ("2014 FEE STUDY"), https://www.copyright.gov/docs/newfees/USCOFeeStudy-Nov13.pdf.

[136] 2014 FEE STUDY at 16; 2020 FEE STUDY at 24. *See, e.g.*, Group Registration of Newspapers, 83 Fed. Reg. 4144, 4145 (Jan. 30, 2018) (requiring applicants to file an online application rather than a paper application to register a group of newspapers); Group Registration of Photographs, 83 Fed. Reg. 2542, 2543 (Jan. 18, 2018) (requiring applicants to file an online application rather than a paper application to register a group of published photographs).

b. Claims Submitted on the Single Application

The Office plans to adopt the following adjustment to the Single Application fee:

- Fee to increase from $45 to $55

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.[137] The lower fee was intended to reflect the relative simplicity of these claims and to "encourage more individuals creators to register their works."[138]

The Office initially proposed eliminating the Single Application due to its administrative complexities and the additional costs imposed on the many applicants who misunderstand the application's eligibility requirements.[139] While a number of commenters supported the elimination of the Single Application,[140] others opposed,[141] asserting that doing so would increase registration costs for "independent authors, who make up a large and growing portion of the publishing landscape."[142]

The Office takes seriously the concern that eliminating the Single Application may affect individual creators' ability to adequately protect and enforce their rights. In light of these concerns, we will retain this option for the time being with only a $10 increase to the current fee to account for inflation. The result will be a fee that is still 30% lower than the fee for the Standard Application. Because the administrative challenges associated with this option remain, the Office does not expect to incorporate it into the new Enterprise Copyright System ("ECS")[143] Registration system currently in

---

[137] Single Application Option, 78 Fed. Reg. 38843, 38845 (June 28, 2013).

[138] *Id.* at 38844.

[139] 91 Fed. Reg. at 13533–34.

[140] *See* AIPLA Comments at 3 (noting that the Office persuasively demonstrated "high error rates, increased refusals, and inefficiencies" of Single Application, such that consolidation into the Standard Application or group registration options is warranted); 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.").

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

[142] Jennifer Fischetto Comments at 1.

[143] Our ECS development includes four main components (registration, recordation, public records, and licensing). Under the Library's centralized IT structure, the Office of the Chief Information Officer ("OCIO") is leading work on user experience design and platform services—that is, the design and architecture capabilities underpinning the ECS.

development, but will continue to explore alternative approaches to structuring registration fees to improve access for individual creators.

The Office also recognizes that some applicants choose to use third-party registration services,[144] which may increase their overall costs to register their works. We note that we provide a variety of educational materials to assist applicants in completing registration applications without the use of such third-party services.[145] In addition, we offer assistance via registration "walk throughs," where applicants are led through each application screen by a trained Office representative.[146]

c. Group Registration Fees

The Office plans to adopt the following adjustments with respect to group registration fees:

- Fee for registration of a claim in a group of serials (per issue, minimum of two issues) to increase from $35 to $50
- Fee for registration of a claim in a group of published photographs or a group of unpublished photographs (up to 750 published or unpublished photographs) to increase from $55 to $85
- Fee for registration of a claim in a group of musical works on an album (up to 20 works) to increase from $65 to $85
- Fee for registration of a claim in a group of sound recordings on an album (up to 20 sound recordings, including photographs, artwork, and liner notes) to increase from $65 to $130
- Fee for registration of a claim in a group of short online literary works (up to 50 works published within three calendar months) to increase from $65 to $130

---

[144] When a third-party service files a Single Application on behalf of a claimant, the service must identify itself in the Correspondent section of the registration application. 37 C.F.R. § 202.3(c)(1).

[145] 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.

[146] *See Application Assistance: Walk Through Request Form*, U.S. COPYRIGHT OFFICE, https://help.copyright.gov/contact/s/walkthrough-form (last visited July 9, 2026).

- Fee for registration of a claim in a group of unpublished works (up to 10 unpublished works) to increase from $85 to $130
- Fee for registration of a claim in a group of two-dimensional artwork to (up to 20 published works) to increase from $85 to $130
- Fee for registration of a claim in a group of contributions to periodicals (published within a 12-month period) to increase from $85 to $130
- Fee for registration of a claim in a group of newspapers or a group of newsletters (published within the same calendar month) to increase from $95 to $130
- Fee for registration of updates to a news website (published within the same calendar month) to increase from $95 to $275
- Fees for registration of updates or revisions to a database that predominantly consists of photographs (published within three calendar months within the same year) to increase from $250 to $700
- Fee for registration of updates or revisions to a database that predominantly consists of non-photographic works (published within three calendar months within the same year) to increase from $500 to $700

Congress gave the Register discretion to allow registration of groups of related works with one application and filing fee.[147] Pursuant to this authority, the Register has promulgated regulations permitting group registration for certain limited categories of works.[148] While group registration options facilitate registration, especially for large-volume creators, they typically increase the density of the examination process.[149] 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

[147] *See* 17 U.S.C. § 408(c)(1).

[148] *See generally* 37 C.F.R. §§ 202.3(b)(5), 202.4.

[149] *See* Registration of Claims to Copyright: Group Registration of Serials, 55 Fed. Reg. 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").

eligibility restrictions that may lead to increased correspondence. Thus, these options cost more to process than claims involving one work.

The Office received numerous comments opposing the proposed increases to the fees for group registration options.[150] After careful consideration, however, we conclude that the proposed adjustments are appropriate and consistent with the objectives of the copyright system.

The Office proposes to simplify the fee schedule by establishing a common fee of $130 for most group registration options. Although these options apply to different categories of works,[151] 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. The proposed fees remain substantially below the costs of providing these services, with cost recovery rates ranging from 7.1% to 64.4%.

Moreover, although the number of works permitted under each group option varies, these options continue to provide significant value compared to registering individual works. For the group options proposed at $130, applicants who submit the maximum number of works permitted under each applicable option will pay no more than $13 per work, and in many cases, substantially less.

We recognize, however, the concerns raised by songwriters that the proposed increase to the group registration option for works on an album "creates a meaningful barrier to access."[152] The Songwriters Guild of America ("SGA") and the Society of Composers & Lyricists ("SCL") advocated for "a framework that distinguishes between individual creators registering their own works and corporate or high-volume registrants."[153] In response, we have reduced the proposed fee for the group option to register musical works published on the same album to improve affordability for independent songwriters and individual creators. Similar to the structure currently in

---

[150] AMI Comments at 3; ImageRights Comments at 3; Larson Skinner PLLC, Comments Submitted in Response to U.S. Copyright Office's March 20, 2026 Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, at 2–5 (May 4, 2026).
[151] These group options include registration of contributions to periodicals, unpublished works, newspapers, newsletters, short online literary works, musical works, sound recordings, and associated literary, pictorial, and graphic works contained on an album, and two-dimensional artwork.
[152] Shelby Scott Comments at 1.
[153] SGA & SCL, Comments Submitted in Response to U.S. Copyright Office's March 20, 2026 Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, at 1 (May 4, 2026).

place, the proposed fee for this option will be the same as the fee for registering one work with the Standard Application ($85).

Although the Office is still proposing to increase the fee for the sound recording group registration option, we note that these options provide different benefits. The option for registering musical works on an album is limited to up 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,[154] which increases processing costs. Given these differences, the Office believes that different fees are appropriate.

The proposed adjustments also address the particular needs of photographers. These creators produce large numbers of works in a short period of time, and have consistently expressed concern regarding the costs associated with protecting those works. For these reasons, the Office proposes a more modest increase for the group options to register published and unpublished works ("GRPPH" and "GRUPH," respectively).[155] Even at the proposed fee of $85, applicants registering the maximum number of photographs permitted (750) would pay an approximate $0.11 per photograph. In addition, we have planned improvements to the registration system that will allow published and unpublished photos to be included in the same submission, and permit larger numbers of photographs to be submitted with each application, further reducing the effective per-work fee for registration.[156] The proposed fees remain below the cost of providing the services, achieving a 56% cost recovery rate for GRUPH and an 80% rate for GRPPH.[157]

---

[154] 37 C.F.R. § 202.4(k)(3) (requiring the applicant to submit "two complete phonorecords containing the best edition of each recording").

[155] 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.

[156] LIB. OF CONG., *Copyright Public Modernization Committee Public Meeting February 2026* (2026), https://www.loc.gov/item/video-11705/.

[157] 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 individual photographers and other 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.

Finally, several commenters 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.[158] 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."[159]

The Office appreciates these concerns and values the critical role news organizations play in disseminating information to the public. Therefore, we have adjusted our proposal for the GRNW fee from $350 to $275. 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.[160] The Office believes this proposal appropriately balances these benefits with our obligation to administer registration services responsibly, recovering an appropriate portion of the costs associated with providing these services.

The Office also notes that the estimated cost of processing the GRNW application is $516.94. The proposed fee for this option 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,[161] proposing a fee that covers just over half of costs does not exceed the Register's authority. We will continue to monitor costs for this service to ensure it is achieving an appropriate cost recovery rate.

More broadly, the Office has determined that certain services used predominantly by corporate and institutional applicants may appropriately bear a greater share of the costs of administering the relevant services. Section 708 authorizes

---

[158] NMA Comments at 7.
[159] *Id.* at 6.
[160] The Office recently proposed to amend the regulations governing the GRNW option to effectively expand the types of websites that qualify for the option. Group Registration of Updates to a News Website, 91 Fed. Reg. 31684 (May 28, 2026).
[161] *See* NMA Comments at 8–9.

the Register to consider the objectives of the copyright system when establishing fees. The Office has long held the position that some services may reasonably recover a greater portion of their costs than others. For corporate and institutional applicants, this policy recognizes the economic value of obtaining the benefits associated with registration (such as eligibility for statutory damages and attorney's fees) for a broad portfolio of works. Accordingly, we conclude that the proposed fees would continue to provide applicants with economical registration options while improving cost recovery from current levels.

d. Other Registration Fees

The Office plans to adopt the following adjustments to certain other registration fees:

- Fee for registration of a claim in a restored copyright (Form GATT) to increase from $100 to $165
- Fee for renewal application to increase from $125 to $165
- Fee for renewal addendum to increase from $100 to $135
- Fee for registration of a correction or amplification to a renewal registration, GATT registration, or group registration for non-photographic databases (Form CA) to increase from $150 to $185
- Fee for registration of a correction or amplification to a claim (electronic filing) to decrease from $100 to $85

The Office has determined that 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).[162] 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. Thus, the

[162] The current cost per transaction is $520.14 for the paper Form GATT.

Office proposes an adjustment to recover a greater portion of the costs of providing the services.

The Office proposes setting the fees for supplementary applications at the same level as the fee for Standard and paper applications. Specifically, we propose decreasing the fee from $100 to $85 for supplementary registrations filed electronically, to match the proposed fee for the Standard Application. Likewise, we propose increasing the paper supplementary registration form fee to $185, to match the fee proposed for the paper application for basic registration. These changes are intended to incentivize applicants to use the supplementary registration process, as the appropriate way to correct or amplify the information in an existing registration. Submitting a duplicate application instead is inefficient and likely to result in a refusal to register.

2. *Section 407 Receipts*

The Office plans to make no change to the following fee:

- Fee for issuance of a receipt for a section 407 deposit to remain at $30

Under section 407(b), a depositor who has furnished copies or phonorecords for the use or disposition of the Library as required under that section may obtain a receipt for the deposit upon payment of the applicable fee.

3. *Recordation of Documents*

The Office plans to adopt the following fees for recordation services:

- Base fee for recording a transfer of ownership or other document pertaining to a copyright with a paper filing to increase from $125 to $350
- Base fee for recording a notice of termination with a paper filing to increase from $125 to $275
- Base fee for recording a document with an electronic filing to increase from $95 to $215
- Fee for recording an additional transfer to increase from $95 to $215
- Fee for recording groups of up to ten additional works and alternate identifiers provided on a paper title list to increase from $60 to $215

- Tiered fee structure for recording additional works and alternate identifiers provided on an electronic title list to be updated as follows:
  - For 1 to 50 additional works and alternate identifiers, the fee is to increase from $60 to $215
  - For 51 to 500 additional works and alternate identifiers, the fee is to increase from $225 to $300
  - For 501 to 1,000 additional works and alternate identifiers, the fee is to increase from $390 to $520
  - For 1,001 to 10,000 additional works and alternate identifiers, the fee is to increase from $555 to $745
  - For more than 10,000 additional works and alternate identifiers, the fee changes from a flat fee of $5,500 to a fee of $745 per additional group of 10,000 works and alternate identifiers
- Fee for correcting public catalog data to increase from $7 to $10

The recordation of transfers of copyright ownership and other documents pertaining to copyright under section 205, as well as notices of terminations under sections 203 and 304, create a public record of copyright ownership.[163] As the Office noted in the NPRM, these services are largely used by corporate entities.[164] We thus proposed increasing the fees to improve cost recovery, as costs generally outpace both the current and proposed fees.[165]

Recordation submissions include the document subject to recordation and a title list identifying the relevant works, which often number in the hundreds or thousands.[166] The Office examines documents for completeness and accuracy, indexes documents into

[163] As noted above, the recordation of a notice of termination is not among the services listed in section 708(a)(1)–(9). It is discussed in this proposal for completeness.

[164] NPRM at 13537.

[165] The average costs of recording documents range from $245.89 to $1,131.50. FRD Report at 28. The low end of the range reflects recording electronic title lists. *Id.*

[166] In fiscal year 2025, the Office recorded 12,310 documents relating to 5,704,306 works, averaging more than 460 works per submission. U.S. COPYRIGHT OFFICE, ANNUAL REPORT FY 2025 5 (2026), https://www.copyright.gov/reports/annual/2025/ar2025.pdf.

the public records, and may also correspond with a remitter to clarify any inconsistencies.

For most document recordations, remitters have the option to submit these materials electronically through the Office's online recordation system.[167] The online system has reduced processing times, yet the costs still exceed the current fees. For example, while electronic recordation represents some of the lowest costs among recordation services,[168] the current base fee of $95 recovers less than half of the costs. Thus, the Office recommends the same fees we proposed in the NPRM. We propose increasing the base fee for recording a document with an electronic filing from $95 to $215, which will recover 53–85% of costs. We similarly propose a parallel increase from $95 to $215 for the per-transfer fee for additional transfers, which applies when a single document involves multiple transfers or other transactions, recovering 51% of costs.

The Office also continues to maintain a mail-based paper submission process. It must be used by remitters recording notices of termination, but it is currently used by only 10% of remitters recording documents under section 205.[169] Processing these submissions is considerably more resource-intensive than those using the online system. For paper submissions with paper title lists, staff must manually transcribe information to index into the public record, which results in higher costs. This process becomes particularly labor-intensive and time-consuming when the recorded document relates to a large number of works. Costs also include the processing of incoming submissions by the Materials Control and Analysis Division, as well as sending recordation certificates to remitters. The Office thus recommends that the base fee for recordation of a transfer of ownership or other document pertaining to a copyright with a paper filing increase from $125 to $350 to achieve a better cost recovery. The increase to the base recordation fee is $30 higher than what we proposed in the NPRM. Similarly, we propose an increase from $60 to $215 for each ten additional works submitted with a paper title list, allowing for greater cost recovery for those lengthier and more complex filings.

The Office is recommending a lower increase to the base fee for recording notices of termination with a paper filing, however, raising the fee to $275 instead of $320, as

---

[167] The online recordation system is not available for notices of termination or for transfers of copyright ownership and other documents pertaining to copyright with more than 10,000 works and alternate identifiers.

[168] *See* FRD Report at 28 (identifying total costs of $245.89 for electronic title list submissions).

[169] U.S. COPYRIGHT OFFICE, ANNUAL REPORT FY 2025 5 (2026), https://www.copyright.gov/reports/annual/2025/ar2025.pdf.

proposed in the NPRM. While notices of termination are costly to provide given their additional scrutiny and examination time—estimated at $1,131,500 in total costs—we note the service's use by individual authors and their heirs.[170] The upward adjustment for transfers of ownership and other documents pertaining to a copyright is intended to accommodate downward adjustments for this and other fees, in line with our general aim to achieve greater cost recovery from services that are used primarily by large business entities.

Remitters filing a paper submission may also submit an electronic title list by including, on portable storage media, an electronic file that identifies the works and provides their indexing information.[171] Just as with the online recordation system, submitting an electronic title list can significantly shorten the processing time and lower costs. The Office thus offers a reduced, tiered filing fee for identifying additional works with an electronic title list, including for submissions through the online recordation system. The tiered fee system consists of five tiers: (1) 1 to 50 additional works and alternate identifiers, which we propose to increase from $60 to $215; (2) 51 to 500 additional works and alternate identifiers, which we propose to increase from $225 to $300; (3) 501 to 1,000 additional works and alternate identifiers, which we propose to increase from $390 to $520; (4) 1,001 to 10,000 additional works and alternate identifiers, which we propose to increase from $555 to $745; and (5) more than 10,000 additional works and alternate identifiers, which we propose to shift from a flat fee of $5,500 to $745 per group of 10,000 additional works and alternate identifiers. The proposed tiered fees for additional works are unchanged from the NPRM.

Consistent with the current fee schedule, the increased fee for up to 50 additional works submitted on an electronic title list under the first tier mirrors the fee for up to 10 additional works submitted on a paper title list. The incremental fee increases under the tiered structure continues to 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 will reduce 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.

---

[170] *See* Authors Alliance, Comments Submitted in Response to U.S. Copyright Office's Mar. 20, 2026, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, at 2–3 (May 3, 2026); 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).

[171] 37 C.F.R. § 201.4(e).

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

The Office received a few comments opposing increases to recordation fees.[172] Commenters highlighted the size of the proposed increases,[173] and predicted that the higher recordation fees would discourage recordation and undermine its purpose and function.[174] One commenter pushed back against the Office's reliance on the predominance of corporate remitters for these services to justify the higher fees.[175] Another suggested that the increases for paper-based recordation services could disproportionately burden remitters who may not practically be able to convert to an electronic process.[176]

While these increases appear large in relative terms, the proposed fees would not recover the full cost of even the simplest recordation. And although remitters vary in size, the Office's current system cannot draw these distinctions, and we therefore consider the predominant type of remitter. We are also aware that some remitters may face challenges in transitioning to the online process. To ease the understanding of and use of the online recordation system for those remitters, we offer a number of public resources, including tutorials and webinars.[177] Because of the higher provision costs that the manual processing of paper submissions incurs, however, we intend to

---

[172] *E.g.*, NMPA Comments at 4–5.

[173] *Id.* at 5 ("These increases range from a minimum of 48% to a staggering 306% for the types of filings music publishers typically make."); AIPLA Comments at 2.

[174] *See* AIPLA Comments at 2 ("[A] sharp increase in even electronic recordation fees may discourage timely recordation or incentivize informal alternatives, potentially undermining the public notice function that recordation is intended to serve."); *see also* 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").

[175] NMPA Comments at 5 ("The NPRM cites to the fact that 'these services are largely used by corporate entities' to justify these numbers. Although that may be true, NMPA respectfully reminds the Office that many users of this service are small businesses with limited budgets, who will be seriously impacted by such steep price hikes.").

[176] AIPLA Comments at 2 ("[C]ertain users, such as estates, archivists, and owners of legacy catalogs, may face practical barriers to electronic conversion. 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.").

[177] *See, e.g.*, *Recordation System Tutorials*, U.S. COPYRIGHT OFFICE, https://copyright.gov/recordation/pilot/tutorial/ (last visited July 9, 2026).

maintain the distinction in fees between paper and electronic filings to encourage increased adoption of the electronic process.

One commenter suggested that the Office reduce or eliminate the fee to record a change in ownership for a single work, analogizing to the no- and lower-cost fees charged by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office ("USPTO") for assignments.[178] Because the USPTO is entirely fee-funded, however, comparisons are not apposite. Given the Office's different funding structure, a significantly lower fee would exacerbate the cost-recovery shortfall for these services, which are already subsidized below cost.

4. *Section 115 Notices of Intention*

The Copyright Office plans to adopt the following fees for the filing of Notices of Intention pursuant to section 115(b):

- Fee for filing a basic notice with a single title to increase from $75 to $100
- Fee for paper filing of additional titles to increase from $20 to $25 per group of ten
- Fee for electronic filing of additional titles to increase from $10 to $15 per group of 100

The Office proposes modest increases to account for inflation.

5. *Record Retrieval, Search Reports, and Certification Fees*

The Copyright Office plans to adopt the following adjustments to our fees for record retrieval, search reports, and certification fees:

- Fee for certification of other Copyright Office records, including search reports, increased from $200 per hour to $300 per hour
- Fee for search report prepared from official records other than Licensing Section records increased from $200 per hour to $300 per hour
- Fee for estimate of retrieval or search fee increased from $200 to $300

[178] Anonymous 12, Comments Submitted in Response to U.S. Copyright Office's Mar. 20, 2026, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (May 4, 2026).

- Fee for retrieval of in-process or completed Copyright Office records or other Copyright Office materials increased from $200 per hour to $300 per hour
- Fee for copying of Copyright Office records by staff increased from $12 for any format to
    - $20 for photocopy
    - $105 for audiocassette
    - $105 for videocassette
    - $55 for CD or DVD
    - $55 for flash drive
    - Varied fee for unsupported formats and other copying of materials by outside providers
- Fee for special handling for records retrieval, search, and certification services increased from $500 to $1,100
- Fee for litigation statement increased from $100 to $320

The proposed 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 proposes charging a variable fee based on the type of media being copied, in a reversion to past practices. This change will better account for the varying complexity of copying different media types. We also propose a fee increase for litigation statements. Demand for this service is relatively inelastic, and an increase to its fee will help offset the cost of other services for which greater cost recovery is unattainable. Finally, the proposed fee increase for expedited records retrieval, search, and certification services is consistent with the special handling fees proposed for other expedited services.

VI. BUDGETARY IMPACT OF PROPOSED FEE CHANGES

The Office's proposed fee schedule represents substantial increases in fees for many services due to rising costs and inflation, but also balances cost recovery against the important national objectives of the registration and recordation systems and related services. As noted above, we estimate that the proposed fees will generate roughly $51 million per year over the next five years, compared to the current schedule's $41 million per year, and will achieve approximately 53% projected cost recovery during the first year of implementation.[179] The projected revenue also approximates the amounts Congress typically authorizes the Office to access from prior year balances. This will help address recent budgetary challenges while maintaining the value and vitality of the copyright system.

VII. ALTERNATIVE STRUCTURES AND FUTURE FEES

As with all fee studies, the fees in this proposed schedule will not remain at this level permanently. Consistent with past practice, the Office expects to adjust fees again in several years.

As the Office enhances our technological capabilities, we are considering possible alternative approaches to how we structure some of our fees. In recent years, copyright owners have urged the Office to adopt alternative fee structures for registration services, such as tiered fees and subscription pricing. Several commenters supported exploring those and other alternative structures in their responses to the NPRM.[180]

While such alternatives are not feasible in the current registration system, the Office is in the midst of building and enhancing our technology infrastructure, to result in the ECS. As ECS continues to develop, the Office is examining alternative structures that we may be able to accommodate as part of the new registration system. To that end, the Office issued a Notice of Inquiry ("NOI") earlier this year, seeking information about copyright owners' current registration practices and how alternative fee structures might affect those practices.[181] The responses to the NOI will help us study the potential economic impact of alternative fee structures, to inform plans for further development of ECS registration.

---

[179] While fee increases may result in reduced demand for some services, the Office expects that lost revenue resulting from reduced demand will be offset by a more consistent long-term cost recovery.

[180] *See, e.g.*, Elizabeth Delaney, Comments Submitted in Response to U.S. Copyright Office's Mar. 20, 2026, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (Apr. 25, 2026) (suggesting lower fees for independent and individual songwriters); Tammy Grace, Comments Submitted in Response to U.S. Copyright Office's Mar. 20, 2026, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (Apr. 16, 2026) (suggesting volume discounts, reduced rates, and subscription-style models); Sierra Lewis Comments (suggesting tiered fee structures distinguishing individuals from corporations); Destiny Slater, Comments Submitted in Response to U.S. Copyright Office's Mar. 20, 2026, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (Mar. 25, 2026) (suggesting reduced fees for individuals, tiered pricing, and expanded group registration).

[181] Alternative Fee Structures for Registration, 91 Fed. Reg. 14724 (Mar. 26, 2026).

VIII. PROPOSALS TO AMEND SECTION 708

The current fee-setting process requires the Register to conduct a study of the Office's costs before adjusting fees. Although this process provides an important opportunity for public participation, it can result in lengthy periods during which fees remain unchanged even as the costs of providing services increase due to inflation.[182] As a result, the Office may recover a smaller share of the costs associated with administering the copyright system over time, which can necessitate larger fee adjustments in each fee study.

This fee study illustrates the challenge. The current fee schedule is based on data collected more than ten years ago, and has remained unchanged for the past six years despite increases in operational costs. This has required the Office to propose significant increases to restore more appropriate cost recovery levels. Smaller, predictable annual adjustments could help maintain fee levels between studies, and cause less shock for users of our services.

During the May 12, 2026, oversight hearing before the Senate Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Intellectual Property, Chairman Thom Tillis asked whether the Office has considered implementing annual inflation-based fee adjustments to obviate the need for larger periodic increases.[183] The Register does not currently possess such authority. As noted above, fee adjustments generally require a lengthy study and a rulemaking proceeding.

The Office recommends that Congress consider amending section 708 to authorize annual inflation adjustments for fees established under title 17. One possible approach would permit the Register to adjust fees annually based on changes in the Consumer Price Index, while preserving her existing authority to conduct broader cost studies and adjust fees through rulemaking when warranted. Such authority would promote predictability and improve long-term cost recovery.

---

[182] For example, formal cost studies can take months to complete, and, in addition to the statutorily required 120-day negative veto period, reviewing and considering comments after the publication of an NPRM may take additional time.

[183] *Oversight of the U.S. Copyright Office, Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Intell. Prop. of the S. Comm. on the Judiciary*, 119th Cong. at 1:12:26 (May 12, 2026) (statement of Sen. Thom Tillis, Chairman, Subcomm. on Intell. Prop., S. Comm. on the Judiciary), https://www.congress.gov/event/119th-congress/senate-event/338383.

Finally, the Office has long advocated for greater discretion to waive fees in appropriate circumstances.[184] The Register's current authority is limited, applying only in a few narrow circumstances (allowing refunds where fees were "paid by mistake or in excess of the fee required,"[185] and waiver in some circumstance for services requested by the U.S. Government and for registration of works that win certain congressional competitions).[186] Expanding the Register's authority would allow greater flexibility to address exceptional circumstances and promote access to Office services when clearly warranted.

IX. CONCLUSION

The Copyright Office has undertaken a careful examination of the costs of providing our services and proposes the fee schedule herein based on a determination that, as required under the Copyright Act, the recommended fees are fair, equitable, and give due consideration to the objectives of the copyright system. The proposed fee adjustments will be implemented unless Congress enacts a law expressing its disapproval with this proposal within the next 120 days. This proposal, including our legislative recommendations, reflect the Office's duty to set fees in a fiscally responsible manner while maintaining broad access to the important services that support the copyright system.

---

[184] *See also* Sierra Lewis Comments (urging the adoption of "[f]ee waivers or reduced rates for creators with active infringement claims").

[185] 17 U.S.C. § 708(d)(1).

[186] *Id.* § 708(c), (e).

APPENDIX A 17 U.S.C. § 708

APPENDIX A

§ 708 · Copyright Office fees

(a) FEES.—Fees shall be paid to the Register of Copyrights—

(1) on filing each 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) on filing each application for registration of a claim for renewal of a subsisting copyright under section 304(a), including the issuance of a certificate of registration if registration is made;

(3) for the issuance of a receipt for a deposit under section 407;

(4) for the recordation, as provided by section 205, of a transfer of copyright ownership or other document;

(5) for the filing, under section 115(b), of a notice of intention to obtain a compulsory license;

(6) for the recordation, under section 302(c), of a statement revealing the identity of an author of an anonymous or pseudonymous work, or for the recordation, under section 302(d), of a statement relating to the death of an author;

(7) for the issuance, under section 706, of an additional certificate of registration;

(8) for the issuance of any other certification;

(9) for the making and reporting of a search as provided by section 705, and for any related services;

(10) on filing a statement of account based on secondary transmissions of primary transmissions pursuant to section 119 or 122; and

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

The Register is authorized to fix fees for other services, including the cost of preparing copies of Copyright Office records, whether or not such copies are certified, based on the cost of providing the service. Fees established under paragraphs (10) and (11) shall be reasonable and may not exceed one-half of the cost necessary to cover reasonable expenses incurred by the Copyright Office for the collection and administration of the statements of account and any royalty fees deposited with such statements.

(b) ADJUSTMENT OF FEES.—The Register of Copyrights may, by regulation, adjust the fees for the services specified in paragraphs (1) through (9) of subsection (a) in the following manner:

(1) The Register shall conduct a study of the costs incurred by the Copyright

Office for the registration of claims, the recordation of documents, and the provision of services. The study shall also consider the timing of any adjustment in fees and the authority to use such fees consistent with the budget.

(2) The Register may, on the basis of the study under paragraph (1), and subject to paragraph (5), adjust fees to not more than that necessary to cover the reasonable costs incurred by the Copyright Office for the services described in paragraph (1), plus a reasonable inflation adjustment to account for any estimated increase in costs.

(3) Any fee established under paragraph (2) shall be rounded off to the nearest dollar, or for a fee less than $12, rounded off to the nearest 50 cents.

(4) Fees established under this subsection shall be fair and equitable and give due consideration to the objectives of the copyright system.

(5) If the Register determines under paragraph (2) that fees should be adjusted, the Register shall prepare a proposed fee schedule and submit the schedule with the accompanying economic analysis to the Congress. The fees proposed by the Register may be instituted after the end of 120 days after the schedule is submitted to the Congress unless, within that 120-day period, a law is enacted stating in substance that the Congress does not approve the schedule.

(c) The fees prescribed by or under this section are applicable to the United States Government and any of its agencies, employees, or officers, but the Register of Copyrights has discretion to waive the requirement of this subsection in occasional or isolated cases involving relatively small amounts.

(d) (1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), all fees received under this section shall be deposited by the Register of Copyrights in the Treasury of the United States and shall be credited to the appropriations for necessary expenses of the Copyright Office. Such fees that are collected shall remain available until expended. The Register may, in accordance with regulations that he or she shall prescribe, refund any sum paid by mistake or in excess of the fee required by this section.

(2) In the case of fees deposited against future services, the Register of Copyrights shall request the Secretary of the Treasury to invest in interest-bearing securities in the United States Treasury any portion of the fees that, as determined by the Register, is not required to meet current deposit account demands. Funds from such portion of fees shall be invested in securities that permit funds to be available to the Copyright Office at all times if they are determined to be necessary to meet current deposit account demands. Such investments shall be in public debt securities with maturities suitable to the needs of the Copyright Office, as determined by the Register of Copyrights, and

bearing interest at rates determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration current market yields on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturities.

(3) The income on such investments shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States and shall be credited to the appropriations for necessary expenses of the Copyright Office.

APPENDIX B SUMMARY OF COSTS

APPENDIX B

I. Registration Fees

A. Claims Submitted on the Standard Application or with a Paper Application

Service Name	Direct Cost	Indirect Cost	Total Cost with E-Deposit	Total Cost with Physical Deposit
Standard Application (Literary Work)	$21.37	$125.14	$146.52	$173.59
Standard Application (Single Serial Issue)	$16.80	$88.64	$105.44	$132.51
Standard Application (Work of the Performing Arts)	$21.87	$121.67	$143.54	$170.61
Standard Application (Sound Recording)	$20.85	$115.58	$136.44	$163.51
Standard Application (Motion Picture/AV Work)	$12.20	$71.26	$83.46	$112.41
Standard Application (Work of the Visual Arts)	$19.20	$111.67	$130.88	$157.94
Paper Form TX (Literary Work)	$27.17	$152.08	$179.25	$206.32
Paper Form SE (Single Serials Issue)	$18.74	$108.63	$127.38	$154.45
Paper Form PA (Motion Picture)	$12.02	$73.87	$85.89	$114.83
Paper Form PA (All Other Works of the Performing Arts)	$28.04	$166.42	$194.46	$221.53
Paper Form SR (Sound Recording)	$24.06	$139.48	$163.54	$190.61
Paper Form VA (Work of the Visual Arts)	$27.21	$155.56	$182.78	$209.85

B. Claims Submitted on the Single Application

Service Name	Direct Cost	Indirect Cost	Total Cost with E-Deposit	Total Cost with Physical Deposit
Single Application (Literary Work)	$18.60	$108.63	$127.24	$154.31
Single Application (Work of the Performing Arts)	$14.34	$80.39	$94.73	$121.80
Single Application (Sound Recording)	$18.30	$104.72	$123.02	$150.09
Single Application (Motion Picture/AV Work)	$15.04	$73.87	$88.91	$117.85
Single Application (Work of the Visual Arts)	$18.05	$106.02	$124.07	$151.14

C. Group Registration Fees

Service Name	Direct Cost	Indirect Cost	Total Cost with E-Deposit	Total Cost with Physical Deposit
Registration of a claim in a group of unpublished works (GRUW)	$30.25	$171.64	$201.89	—
Serials (GRSE)	$10.65	$55.18	$65.84	—
Newspapers (GRNP)	$83.22	$608.33	$691.56	—
Newsletters (GRNL)	$99.63	$554.02	$653.65	—
Updates to a News Website (GRNW)†	$79.37	$437.57	$516.94	—
Contributions to periodicals (GRCP)	$300.45	$1,520.83	$1,821.29	—
Short online literary works (GRTX)	$111.21	$543.15	$654.37	—
Group of updates to a non-photographic database (GRDB)	$65.66	$380.21	—	$506.58
Group of updates to a photographic database†	$79.37	$437.57	—	$577.65
Published photos (GRPPH)	$13.40	$92.12	$105.52	$132.59
Unpublished photos (GRUPH)	$21.28	$129.49	$150.77	$177.84
Registration of a claim in a group of works published on an album of music (GRAM/PA or GRAM/SR)	$34.23	$184.67	$218.90	$245.97

† For infrequent services and new services established within the past twelve months, where neither quantitative nor qualitative time-use data were available, FRD estimated direct time costs based upon the average for other services of the same category.

D. Other Registration Fees

Service Name	Direct Cost	Indirect Cost	Total Cost
Form GATT (registration of foreign works that have been restored to copyright protection)	$146.32	$434.51	$520.14
Supplementary registration (electronic application)	$61.23	$341.54	$402.77
Supplementary registration (paper application/Form CA) †	$58.49	$325.89	$384.39

† For infrequent services where neither quantitative nor qualitative time-use data were available, FRD estimated direct time costs based upon the average for other services of the same category.

E. Renewal Claims

Service Name	Direct Cost	Indirect Cost	Total Cost
Renewal Form RE	$244.77	$1,292.71	$1,537.49
Renewal addendum to Form RE	$246.27	$977.68	$1,163.24

II. Section 407 Receipts

Service Name	Direct Cost	Indirect Cost	Total Cost
Section 407 Receipt†	—	—	—

† Insufficient volume to calculate costs.

III. Recordation of Documents

Service Name	Direct Cost	Indirect Cost	Total Cost with Electronic Submission	Total Cost with Paper Form
Notice/counter notice of termination	$95.68	$1,006.88	$1,102.56	$1,131.50
Transfer of ownership/Other document pertaining to a copyright	$37.55	$366.08	$403.63	$432.58
Title list (electronic)	$21.28	$224.62	$245.89	$274.84
Title list (paper)	$36.83	$383.34	$420.17	$449.12
Additional works and alternate identifiers (paper; per group of 10)	$20.22	$224.62	$244.83	—
Additional works and alternate identifiers (electronic; per group of 10)	$6.85	$81.46	$88.31	—
Special handling for recorded documents	$377.49	$3,743.59	$4,121.08	$4,150.03

IV. Section 115 Notices of Intention

Service Name	Direct Cost	Indirect Cost	Total Cost
Recordation of a notice of intention to make and distribute phonorecords for first title	$40.95	$402.96	$443.91

V. Record Retrieval, Search Reports, and Certification Fees

Service Name	Direct Cost	Indirect Cost	Total Cost
Copies and Certifications Records	$45.21	$1,121.28	$1,166.49
Estimate of retrieval or search fee	$51.10	$775.07	$826.18
Other search and retrieval activities (hourly cost)	$56.17	$598.97	$655.14
Copying of Copyright Office Records by Staff	$36.18	$449.23	$485.41
Litigation Statements (Form LS)	$12.06	$149.74	$161.80

APPENDIX C 37 C.F.R. § 201.3 – PROPOSED SCHEDULE OF FEES

APPENDIX C

§ 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.*

Registration, recordation, and related services	Current Fee ($)	Proposed Fee ($)
(1) 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, SR)	125	185
(2) Registration of a claim in a group of contributions to periodicals	85	130
(3) Registration of updates or revisions to a database that predominantly consists of non-photographic works	500	700
(4) Registration of a claim in a group of published photographs or a claim in a group of unpublished photographs	55	85
(5) Registration for a database that predominantly consists of photographs and updates thereto:		
(i) Electronic filing	250	700
(ii) Paper filing	250	700
(6) 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
(7) Registration of a claim in a group of serials (per issue, minimum two issues):	35	50
(8) Registration of a claim in a group of newspapers or a group of newsletters	95	130
(9) Registration of a group of works on an album:		
(i) Musical works	65	85
(ii) Sound recordings, photographs, artwork, and liner notes	65	130
(10) Registration of a claim in a group of unpublished works or a claim in a group of two-dimensional artwork	85	130
(11) Registration of a claim in a group of unpublished works	85	130

Registration, recordation, and related services	Current Fee ($)	Proposed Fee ($)
(12) Registration of a claim in a group of short online literary works	65	130
(13) Registration of a group of updates to a news website	95	350
(14) Registration of a claim in a restored copyright (Form GATT)	100	165
(15) Preregistration of certain unpublished works	200	320
(16) 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
(17) Registration of a claim in a mask work (Form MW)	150	650
(18) Registration of a claim in a vessel design (Form D/VH)	500	650
(19) Provision of an additional certificate of registration	55	80
(20) Certification of other Copyright Office records, including search reports (per hour)	200	300
(21) Search report prepared from official records other than Licensing Section records (per hour, 2 hour minimum)	200	300
(22) Estimate of retrieval or search fee (credited to retrieval or search fee)	200	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)	200	300
(ii) Retrieval of digital records (per hour, half hour minimum, quarter hour increments)	200	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)	125	275
(B) Paper filing for all other recordations	125	350
(C) Electronic	95	215
(ii) Additional transfer (per transfer) (for documents	95	215

Registration, recordation, and related services	**Current Fee ($)**	**Proposed Fee ($)**
recorded under 17 U.S.C. 205)		
(iii) Additional works and alternate identifiers:		
(A) Paper (per group of 10 or fewer additional works and alternate identifiers)	60	215
(B) Electronic:		
(1) 1 to 50 additional works and alternate identifiers	60	215
(2) 51 to 500 additional works and alternate identifiers	225	300
(3) 501 to 1,000 additional works and alternate identifiers	390	520
(4) 1,001 to 10,000 additional works and alternate identifiers	555	745
(5) Per group of 10,000 above 10,000 additional works and alternate identifiers	5,500[1]	745
(iv) Correction of online Public Catalog data due to erroneous electronic title submission (per title)	7	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	6	25
(26)(i) Schedule of pre-1972 sound recordings, or supplemental schedule of pre-1972 sound recordings (single sound recording)	75	160
(ii) Additional sound recordings (per group of 1 to 100 sound recordings)	10	80
(27) Removal of pre-1972 sound recording from Office's database of indexed schedules (single sound recording)	75	160
(28) Notice of noncommercial use of pre-1972 sound recording	50	160
(29) Opt-out notice of noncommercial use of pre-1972 sound recording	50	160
(30) Issuance of a receipt for a section 407 deposit	30	30
(31) Removal of PII from Registration Records:		
(i) Initial request, per registration record	100	100
(ii) Reconsideration of denied requests, flat fee	60	135

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

(d) *Special service fees.*

Special services	Current Fee ($)	Proposed Fee ($)
(1) Service charge for deposit account overdraft	285	305
(2) Service charge for dishonored deposit account replenishment check	500	535
(3) Service charge for an uncollectible or non-negotiable payment	115	125
(4) Appeals:		
(i) First appeal (per claim)	350	535
(ii) Second appeal (per claim)	700	1,200
(5) Secure test examining fee (per staff member per hour)	250	375
(6) Copying of Copyright Office records by staff	12[2]	
Photocopy		20
Audiocassette		105
Videocassette		105
CD or DVD		55
Flash drive		55
Unsupported formats and other copying of materials by outside providers, at cost of provider		Varied
(7)(i) Special handling fee for a claim	800	1,100
(ii) Handling fee for each non-special handling claim using the same deposit	50	60
(8) Small claims expedited registration fee per registration application request	50	55
(9) Special handling fee for recordation of a document	550	1,100
(10) Handling fee for extra deposit copy for certification	50	55
(11) Full-term retention of a published deposit:		
(i) Physical deposit	540	640
(ii) Electronic deposit	220	320
(12) Voluntary cancellation of registration	150	320
(13) Matching unidentified deposit to deposit ticket claim (per hour, one hour minimum)	40	50
(14) Special handling fee for records retrieval, search, and certification services (per hour, 1 hour minimum)	500	1,100
(15) Litigation statement (Form LS)	100	320
(16)(i) Notice to libraries and archives	50	55

[2] The current fee covers copying for all media types.

Special services	**Current Fee ($)**	**Proposed Fee ($)**
(ii) Each additional title	20	20
(17) Service charge for Federal Express mailing	45	105
(18) Service charge for delivery of documents via facsimile (per page, 7 page maximum)	1	10

(e) *Licensing Section service fees.*

Licensing Section services	**Current Fee ($)**	**Proposed Fee ($)**
(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