

be beneficial.<sup>21</sup> They agreed, however, that current law is properly construed to provide such protection.<sup>22</sup>

## II. Request for Comment

In light of uncertainty among some courts regarding the nature and scope of the making available and communication to the public rights, and to facilitate the study requested by Representative Watt, the Copyright Office seeks public comments on the three main issues listed above. The Office poses additional questions on these three topics below, and requests that commenters identify the questions they are answering in their responses.

### 1. Existing Exclusive Rights Under Title 17

a. How does the existing bundle of exclusive rights currently in Title 17 cover the making available and communication to the public rights in the context of digital on-demand transmissions such as peer-to-peer networks, streaming services, and downloads of copyrighted content, as well as more broadly in the digital environment?

b. Do judicial opinions interpreting Section 106 and the making available right in the framework of tangible works provide sufficient guidance for the digital realm?

### 2. Foreign Implementation and Interpretation of the WIPO Internet Treaties

a. How have foreign laws implemented the making available right (as found in WCT Article 8 and WPPT Articles 10 and 14)? Has such implementation provided more or less legal clarity in those countries in the context of digital distribution of copyrighted works?

b. How have courts in foreign countries evaluated their national implementation of the making available right in these two WIPO treaties? Are there any specific case results or related legislative components that might present attractive options for possible congressional consideration?

### 3. Possible Changes to U.S. Law

a. If Congress continues to determine that the Section 106 exclusive rights

provide a making available right in the digital environment, is there a need for Congress to take any additional steps to clarify the law to avoid potential conflicting outcomes in future litigation? Why or why not?

b. If Congress concludes that Section 106 requires further clarification of the scope of the making available right in the digital environment, how should the law be amended to incorporate this right more explicitly?

c. Would adding an explicit “making available” right significantly broaden the scope of copyright protection beyond what it is today? Why or why not? Would existing rights in Section 106 also have to be recalibrated?

d. Would any amendment to the “making available” right in Title 17 raise any First Amendment concerns? If so, how can any potential issues in this area be avoided?

e. If an explicit right is added, what, if any, corresponding exceptions or limitations should be considered for addition to the copyright law?

If there are any pertinent issues not discussed above, the Office encourages interested parties to raise those matters in their comments.

## III. Public Roundtable

On May 5, 2014, the Copyright Office will hold a public roundtable to hear stakeholder views and to initiate discussion of the three topics identified above. The agenda and the process for submitting requests to participate in the public roundtable will be available on the Copyright Office Web site on or about April 7, 2014.

## IV. Requests To Participate

Requests to participate in the public roundtable should be submitted online at [http://www.copyright.gov/docs/making\\_available/](http://www.copyright.gov/docs/making_available/). Nonparticipants who wish to attend and observe the discussion should note that seating is limited and, for nonparticipants, will be available on a first come, first served basis.

Dated: February 20, 2014.

**Maria A. Pallante,**

*Register of Copyrights.*

[FR Doc. 2014-04104 Filed 2-24-14; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 1410-30-P**

## MILITARY COMPENSATION AND RETIREMENT MODERNIZATION COMMISSION

### Cancellation of a Meeting of the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission

**AGENCY:** Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice of cancellation of public meetings and town hall meeting.

**SUMMARY:** This notice cancels the hearings and town hall that were to be held on Tuesday, February 25, 2014.

**DATES:** The public hearings and town hall originally scheduled for Tuesday, February 25, 2014, are cancelled.

**ADDRESSES:** The hearings and town hall were to be held Tuesday, February 25, 2014 at the Embassy Suites Fayetteville Fort Bragg, 4760 Lake Valley Drive, Fayetteville, North Carolina 28303.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Christopher Nuneviller, Associate Director, Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission, P.O. Box 13170, Arlington VA 22209, telephone 703-692-2080, fax 703-697-8330, email [christopher.nuneviller@mcrmc.gov](mailto:christopher.nuneviller@mcrmc.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** A notice of public hearings and town hall meeting that appeared in the **Federal Register** on February 18, 2014 (79 FR 9285) announced that the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission (Commission) was to hold public hearings and a town hall meeting on Tuesday, February 25, 2014, to seek the views of service members, retirees, their beneficiaries and other interested parties regarding pay, retirement, health benefits and quality of life programs of the Uniformed Services. The Commission was to also hear from senior commanders of local military commands and their senior enlisted advisors, unit commanders and their family support groups, local medical and education community representatives, and other quality of life organizations.

The public hearings and town hall meeting will be rescheduled for a later date.

**Christopher Nuneviller,**

*Associate Director, Administration and Operations.*

[FR Doc. 2014-04126 Filed 2-24-14; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE P**

<sup>21</sup> See Statement of David Nimmer, Professor, UCLA School of Law, *The Scope of Copyright Protection*, supra note 20 (“Nimmer Statement”); Statement of Glynn S. Lunney, Jr., Professor, Tulane University School of Law, *The Scope of Copyright Protection*, supra note 20 (“Lunney Statement”). These witness statements are available at <http://docs.house.gov/Committee/Calendar/ByEvent.aspx?EventID=101642>.

<sup>22</sup> See Nimmer Statement at 2-3; Lunney Statement at 1-4.