

4. Whether it was a material error of law for the CRJs to conclude that they have no discretion over a settlement establishing rates and terms, even to the extent of determining whether the provisions are contrary to law, unless a participant files an objection;

5. Whether it was a material error of law for the CRJs to adopt a regulation in section 385.11, which states categorically that “An interactive stream is an incidental digital phonorecord delivery under 17 U.S.C. 115(c)(3)(c) and (D)” when such a provision appears to include transmissions that do not result in delivery of a phonorecord within the definition of DPDs;

6. Whether it was a material error of law for the CRJs to adopt a regulation in section 385.16, which provides that “A compulsory license under 17 U.S.C. 115 extends to all reproduction and distribution rights that may be necessary for the provision of the licensed activity, *solely* for the purpose of providing such licensed activity (*and no other purpose*)” (emphasis added), when 17 U.S.C. 115(a)(1) allows a person to obtain a compulsory license “if his or her *primary* purpose in making phonorecords is to distribute them to the public for private use, including by means of a digital phonorecord delivery” (emphasis added);

7. When the previous rates appear to cover all DPDs including promotional DPDs (except perhaps for those that would be considered incidental DPDs), was it a material error of law for the CRJs to adopt a regulation in section 385.14(e), which allows retroactive application of promotional royalty rates, when 17 U.S.C. 803(d)(2)(B) states that “In cases where rates and terms have not, prior to the inception of an activity, been established for that particular activity under the relevant license, such rates and terms shall be retroactive to the inception of activity under the relevant license covered by such rates and terms”;

8. Whether it was a material error of law for the CRJs to adopt a regulation in section 385.15, which alters the timing of payments, when 17 U.S.C. 115(c)(5) states that “Royalty payments shall be made on or before the twentieth day of each month and shall include all royalties for the month next preceding;” and

9. Whether it was a material error of law for the CRJs to adopt a regulation in section 385.12(b)(4), which allows for calculation of royalty payments in the absence of play information when 17 U.S.C. 115(c)(5) requires the Register to prescribe regulations “under which detailed cumulative annual statements of account” shall be filed, and that “regulations covering both the monthly and annual statements of account shall prescribe the form, content, and manner of certification with respect to the number of records made and distributed.”

Any participant in the proceeding who wishes to offer views regarding these questions must submit its views in writing to the Office of the General Counsel of the Copyright Office no later than 5:00 p.m. on January 15, 2009. Any such submissions will be made part of the official record of the Office’s review of the CRJs’ final determination.

The participants' written views should be hand delivered to the Library of Congress, U.S. Copyright Office, Room 401, 101 Independence Avenue, SE, Washington, DC 20559, between 8:30 a.m. and 5 p.m. The envelope should be addressed as follows: Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Copyright Office.

For further information contact Stephen Ruwe, Attorney Advisor, Copyright GC/I&R, P.O. Box 70400, Washington, DC 20024. Telephone: (202) 707-8380 Telefax: (202)-707- 8366. Email: sruwe@loc.gov

SO REQUESTED.

Marybeth Peters,
Register of Copyrights.

BY: Tanya M. Sandros
Tanya M. Sandros
Deputy General Counsel

DATED: January 8, 2009