

1 **The Artist Rights & Platform Accountability Act**

2 **Introduction & Purpose**

3 The Artist Rights & Platform Accountability Act is a federal
4 legislative proposal designed to protect independent musicians and
5 creators from unjust fraud accusations, metadata tampering,
6 premature removal from streaming services, and digital erasure.
7 These practices harm artistic careers, erase cultural contributions,
8 and misallocate income on a national scale.

9

10 In 2023, the U.S. music industry generated over \$10.3 billion in
11 revenue (RIAA). Yet independent artists — the backbone of that
12 growth — are increasingly silenced by fraud flags with no appeals
13 process, takedowns without notice, and distributors who profit
14 from royalty misdirection without transparency or consequence.

15

16 This isn't just a cultural issue — it's an economic one. Misapplied
17 fraud flags and royalty theft don't just impact creators — they
18 reduce taxable income, distort the digital labor market, and
19 undermine confidence in the music economy. Improper takedowns
20 and untraceable royalties enable offshore laundering, disrupt IRS
21 revenue collection, and weaken oversight of a multi-billion-dollar
22 sector.

23

24 The Act establishes a centralized oversight agency (NOMES),
25 restores due process for artists, and demands accountability from
26 platforms, curators, and distributors alike — not only to protect

27 creative rights but to safeguard U.S. cultural and financial
28 infrastructure in the digital age

29

30 **Bill Objectives**

31 This legislation is built around four pillars: Accountability, Royalty
32 Oversight, Economic Protection, and Artist Empowerment. Its
33 enforcement will be overseen by a new independent agency:
34 NOMES (National Organization for Music and Economic Safety).

35 Repetition is not coordinated fraud. Fans don't loop music to boost
36 payouts — they loop music because it resonates, emotionally or
37 socially. Platforms that misinterpret this behavior risk penalizing
38 the very engagement they depend on.

39 Neglecting due process causes career collapses, tax revenue losses,
40 and misallocated royalties — all of which ripple into the U.S.
41 economy. Music isn't just art; it's labor and business.

42 **Artist Rights & Platform Accountability Act**

43 **Section 1 — Definitions**

44 **1.1 Digital Service Provider (DSP)**
45 Any platform that streams, sells, or monetizes music digitally,
46 including but not limited to Spotify, Apple Music, YouTube Music,
47 Amazon Music, and Tidal.

48 **1.2 Distribution Partner**
49 Any company or entity responsible for delivering music to DSPs on
50 behalf of the artist, including but not limited to DistroKid,
51 TuneCore, CD Baby, Horus Music, UnitedMasters, and Amuse.

52 1.3 Streaming Fraud

53 The use of artificial, deceptive, or automated methods to inflate
54 play counts or generate royalties. Includes, but is not limited to:
55 phone farms, bots, repeated stream loops, or services that offer
56 guaranteed streams for a fee.

57

58 Cultural Context of Repetition — Not Fraud

59

60 Listening to music on repeat is not inherently suspicious — it's
61 cultural. From workouts to weddings, fans repeat songs because
62 they love them, not to exploit streaming systems.

63

64 This was made clear when Kendrick Lamar performed "Not Like
65 Us" six times in a row at his Juneteenth Pop Out concert in Los
66 Angeles — an iconic, culturally resonant moment. Similarly, Jay-Z
67 and Kanye West performed "N***** in Paris" twelve times in one
68 night while touring Paris. These moments reflect how musical
69 repetition is celebration, not manipulation.

70

71 Listeners don't repeat songs to increase payouts. They repeat them
72 because a track speaks to them — emotionally, socially, or
73 culturally. Criminalizing that behavior devalues how people
74 experience music.

75

76 This bill clarifies: Repetition by fans is not fraud unless clear,
77 automated manipulation is proven.

78

79

80 1.4 Bot

81 An automated or non-human process used to inflate streaming
82 numbers. Includes AI-generated listeners, device farms, and
83 automated replay software.

84 1.5 Locked-Out Artist

85 An artist who is unable to access their DSP or distributor accounts
86 due to account termination, content removal, or denial of appeal.
87 These artists are denied due process and often become invisible on
88 DSPs despite continued platform activity involving their content.

89 1.6 Fraudulent Playlist

90 A playlist composed or operated by bad actors (including bots or
91 pay-for-play curators) that is not supported by genuine listener
92 activity, often used to inflate streams artificially.

93 1.7 Algorithmic Playlist

94 A playlist generated by a DSP's internal algorithms, such as
95 Spotify's Discover Weekly or Release Radar, based on user
96 behavior and engagement patterns.

97 1.8 Internal Playlist

98 A playlist created by a distributor, DSP, or affiliated third party and
99 branded in a way that resembles public, editorial, or organic
100 playlists. These must be disclosed as internal when used for
101 promotion or marketing purposes.

102 1.9 Editorial Playlist

103 A playlist curated by official editorial teams or DSP-appointed
104 curators. These playlists are widely followed and presented as
105 organic, trustworthy sources of music discovery.

106 1.10 Metadata

107 All information tied to a musical work or recording, including artist

108 name, songwriter, producer credits, ISRC codes, publishing splits,
109 and release date.

110 **1.11 Transparency Tools**

111 Platforms such as Spotify for Artists or Apple Music for Artists,
112 which are intended to give creators visibility into playlisting,
113 demographics, and royalty flow. This bill mandates improvements
114 to these tools.

115 **1.12 Royalty Theft**

116 Any failure to pay or intentional withholding of royalties owed to
117 an artist, including the removal of songs or catalogs after revenue
118 has been earned, without fair compensation or due process.

119 **1.13 Shadowbanning**

120 A form of soft censorship wherein an artist's music remains live but
121 is removed from visibility in searches, recommendations, or
122 playlists. Often used to quietly suppress accounts without formal
123 takedown.

124 **1.14 NOMES (National Organization for Music Economic Safety)**

125 The federally supervised body proposed in this bill to oversee
126 fraud reviews, enforce transparency, and protect artists' rights in
127 the digital music economy.

128 **1.15 Innocent Until Proven Fraudulent Clause (Universal
129 Protections)**

130 A core principle of this bill that assumes the artist's innocence until
131 verifiable, independently reviewed evidence of fraud is established.
132 Applies to all artists, curators, and rightsholders — regardless of
133 registry status.

134 **Section 2 — Protected Rights for Artists**

135 This section affirms the foundational rights of artists operating
136 within the digital music economy. It ensures fair treatment, due
137 process, transparency, and mechanisms for recourse in cases of
138 wrongful removal, fraud accusations, or account access denial.

139 **2.1 — Right to Due Process Prior to Takedown**

140 No distributor, label, or digital service provider (DSP) may remove
141 an artist's work from streaming platforms without providing prior
142 written notice and an opportunity for the artist to respond.
143 Automated detection or algorithmic suspicion alone does not
144 constitute sufficient justification for takedown.

145 **2.2 — Notice and Evidence Requirement**

146 Before initiating a takedown or account suspension, platforms
147 must provide the artist with:
148 - A formal explanation outlining the basis for the action, including
149 the specific nature of the alleged violation.
150 - Access to relevant data, logs, or reports used to justify the
151 decision.
152 - A minimum of fifteen (15) business days to respond, dispute the
153 claim, or file an appeal.

154 **2.3 — Right to Appeal Through NOMES**

155 Artists shall have the right to appeal any takedown or suspension
156 through the National Organization of Music Economic Safety
157 (NOMES). Upon receipt of an appeal, NOMES shall:
158 - Conduct an independent investigation of the claim.
159 - Notify the relevant distributor, DSP, or label of the appeal.

160 - Temporarily freeze further punitive action until the appeal is
161 resolved.

162 **2.4 — Protocol for Locked-Out Artists**

163 Artists who have been locked out of their distributor or DSP
164 account—rendering them unable to respond—may report the issue
165 directly to NOMES. These cases shall be flagged for expedited
166 investigation, and NOMES shall make good-faith efforts to contact
167 the artist via alternative means. Such cases will be treated as
168 potential violations of artist rights.

169 **2.5 — Presumption of Innocence and Burden of Proof**

170 If a takedown occurs before a NOMES investigation is completed:

- The artist shall be presumed innocent.
- The burden of proof lies with the platform or distributor.
- If the investigation confirms wrongful removal, the following remedies must be enacted:
 - Return of all withheld royalties.
 - Compensation for damages, including financial loss and career harm.
 - A formal public acknowledgment of the mistake by the responsible entity.
 - Restoration of platform visibility, algorithmic parity, and search functionality. No shadowbanning, downranking, or related retaliation may occur.

183

184 **2.6 — Metadata Misattribution Accountability**

185 Artists have the right to accurate representation of their
186 intellectual property across all platforms. Distributors and digital
187 service providers (DSPs) shall be held accountable for any

188 metadata errors that result in a release being uploaded to the
189 wrong artist profile, misattributed to another party, or mislabeled
190 in title, artwork, or credits. These mistakes are not cosmetic — they
191 fracture audience engagement, misdirect royalties, and jeopardize
192 an artist's digital footprint. Distributors and DSPs must implement
193 quality control systems to prevent such errors, offer clear channels
194 for urgent metadata corrections, and publicly acknowledge
195 significant attribution issues. If not resolved within 14 days of
196 notice by the artist, the issue shall trigger enforcement measures,
197 including financial penalties, mandatory royalty reimbursements,
198 and access to independent arbitration.

199

200 **2.7 — National Economic Protection**

201 These rights are not only a matter of fairness for individual
202 artists—they also support national economic integrity by:
203 - Ensuring accurate royalty payments.
204 - Preventing revenue loss through unlawful removal.
205 - Enabling proper taxation of music-related income.

206

207 Wrongful takedowns, unreviewed fraud flags, and unnotified
208 account suspensions contribute to the suppression of legitimate
209 American labor, undermine small businesses, and disrupt the flow
210 of royalties into the broader U.S. economy.

211 **2.8 — Data Portability and Pre-Takedown Access**

212

213 Artists shall retain the right to access and export all data related
214 to their content prior to or during any fraud investigation. This
215 includes but is not limited to: streaming statistics, earnings
216 reports, metadata records, playlist placements, advertising
217 spend, and traffic origin breakdowns.

218

219 In the event of a fraud flag or takedown, digital platforms and
220 distributors must provide a downloadable report within 7
221 business days of notice — regardless of whether the artist's
222 account has been locked or removed.

223
224 This ensures that artists are not severed from their own work,
225 cannot be gaslit by manipulated data, and retain the ability to
226 defend their career, royalties, and reputation with transparency.

227
228 Any failure to comply with these data access requirements shall
229 constitute grounds for investigation under NOMES oversight.

230

231 **2.9 Cultural Impact and Erasure**

232
233 The removal or suppression of independent artists does not
234 occur in a vacuum — it actively threatens cultural memory,
235 representation, and legacy. When artists are silenced due to
236 false fraud accusations, algorithmic takedowns, or negligent
237 oversight, the public loses access to potentially transformative
238 works. Music is not only a form of expression — it is a record of
239 social history.

240
241 Imagine if artists like Eminem, whose music helped define the
242 early 2000s and inspired films like 8 Mile, had been deplatformed
243 before reaching the mainstream. Or if Black artists who
244 contributed to the Black Panther soundtrack — a landmark
245 moment for cultural representation — had their work removed
246 without due process. Even in more recent years, artists like Billie
247 Eilish, whose minimalist bedroom pop redefined mainstream
248 aesthetics, or Playboi Carti, whose experimental approach
249 reshaped the sound of an entire generation, could have been
250 prematurely silenced under today's opaque fraud systems.
251 These are not hypotheticals for the next wave of creators. Artists
252 working today deserve the same chance to shape culture without
253 the looming threat of invisible censorship, misclassification, or
254 unaccountable removals.

255

256 **Section 2.10 — Educational & Nonprofit Exemption**

257

258 Music released by nonprofit organizations, accredited schools, or
259 educational programs — including student projects, therapeutic
260 recordings, or community initiatives — shall not be subject to
261 automatic fraud flags based solely on irregular streaming
262 behavior. These works must be reviewed within context, with
263 consideration for their noncommercial nature. NOMES shall
264 provide special intake procedures for nonprofit groups to report
265 wrongful takedowns or fraud flags and receive expedited
266 resolution.

267

268 **2.11 — Minimum Appeal Window**

269

270 Artists shall have no less than 3 months from the date of content
271 removal to file an appeal, regardless of any internal policy from
272 digital platforms or distributors. In cases involving locked
273 accounts, mental health hardship, or lack of legal support,
274 NOMES may extend this appeal window to a maximum of 6
275 months upon request.

276

277 Once an appeal is filed, no artist's content shall be permanently
278 removed or hidden from streaming platforms until NOMES
279 independently verifies and confirms fraudulent activity.
280 Premature takedowns before a confirmed finding constitute a
281 violation of this Act.

282

283 For complex or high-impact fraud allegations, NOMES may
284 extend its investigation window up to 8–12 months to ensure
285 thorough and impartial review. Once a final determination is
286 made, the artist shall immediately become eligible for all
287 restorative measures under this Act — including reinstatement,
288 royalty repayment, and metadata correction, as outlined in
289 Section 2.6 and Section 7.7.

290
291 Under this Act, the fraud allegation process begins when a DSP
292 or distributor formally submits a report to NOMES. However,
293 neither party shall take punitive action — including removals,
294 account lockouts, royalty withholding, or visibility suppression —
295 until NOMES completes its investigation and confirms the fraud
296 claim. The artist shall retain access to all rights and revenues
297 during the investigation unless NOMES determines otherwise
298 through due process. This ensures that the platforms responsible
299 for ecosystem integrity are held accountable for premature
300 enforcement, and that artists are not punished for unverified
301 claims or third-party misconduct.

302
303 This clause also affirms the national economic impact of
304 independent music. By ensuring fair treatment and accurate
305 oversight, NOMES may work with the Internal Revenue Service
306 (IRS) to trace royalty flows and verify that U.S. artists are
307 receiving their legally earned income — thereby promoting
308 proper taxation, financial transparency, and revenue collection in
309 support of American citizens and the broader creative economy.
310

311 **Subsection 2.12— Social Media ≠ Streaming Value**

312 In today's industry culture, artists are often judged not by the
313 quality or impact of their music, but by their ability to generate
314 content for social media. This has led to a false and harmful
315 standard: that success on streaming platforms must be reflected by
316 proportional growth on social platforms — or else it's assumed to
317 be fraudulent. This clause rejects that standard entirely and affirms
318 the validity of all legitimate organic success, regardless of social
319 media presence.

320 **Policy Provisions:**

- 321 1. Distinct Ecosystems, Distinct Metrics:

322 Social media metrics (followers, likes, engagement) and DSP
323 metrics (streams, saves, playlist adds) operate in different digital
324 ecosystems. Their growth patterns are not required to mirror each
325 other, nor do they validate one another.

326 2. The Replayability Principle:

327 The most valuable music is often defined not by its social media
328 shareability, but by its replay value and lasting emotional
329 resonance. From Kendrick Lamar to underground beat tapes, many
330 culturally vital works succeed in silence — not virality.

331 3. DSP-Only Success Is Valid:

332 A creator may experience significant organic growth on streaming
333 platforms without corresponding growth on social media. This
334 growth is valid, protected, and shall not be treated as evidence of
335 fraud.

336 4. Dark Virality Exists:

337 Some songs spread through closed communities, private sharing,
338 or offline scenes. These listening patterns may not generate visible
339 shares — but they generate real replay value. Platforms must
340 recognize and respect this form of cultural movement.

341 5. Prohibition on Metric Comparison for Fraud Detection:

342 Distributors and DSPs are prohibited from flagging artists as
343 fraudulent based solely on perceived mismatches between social
344 media and streaming performance.

345 6. Inter-DSP Discrepancies Are Not Evidence of Fraud:

346 Artists may experience uneven performance across streaming
347 platforms — for example, a song may thrive on Apple Music but
348 underperform on Spotify, or vice versa. These platform-specific

349 differences are natural and cannot be used as sole indicators of
350 fraud or manipulation.

351 7. Replayable Music Reaching the Right Audience Is a Positive
352 Outcome:

353 Discrepancies between DSP performance and social media growth
354 — or between one DSP and another — should be interpreted as
355 signs of algorithmic success, not fraud.

356
357 If a streaming platform surfaces a song that connects deeply with
358 real listeners, even when the artist has minimal social media
359 presence, that is evidence that the system worked.

360
361 A song like “what the hell what the helly” may go viral due to
362 absurdity or meme value — similar to the satirical music of Yuno
363 Miles, which thrives on platforms like TikTok and Instagram
364 through its intentionally bizarre aesthetic. These songs may
365 succeed as memes — and that success is valid in its own lane. In
366 contrast, a composition like “Weird Fishes / Arpeggi” by Radiohead
367 has no dance challenge, no algorithm bait, and no viral trend — yet
368 it continues to be one of the most replayed and emotionally
369 resonant tracks in modern music history.

370
371 DSPs must learn to distinguish between flash-in-the-pan content
372 and meaningful, slow-burn success — and recognize the latter as
373 an essential function of a healthy, human-centered music
374 ecosystem.

375 8. Organic Sharing Exists Outside Social Media:

376 Music can spread through human networks that leave no digital
377 footprint. Word-of-mouth recommendations, private text

378 messages, group chats, in-person interactions, or even hearing a
379 song played at a local business — these are all valid and time-
380 tested pathways of musical discovery.

381

382 A track's share value cannot be measured solely by its performance
383 on social platforms. An artist may reach large audiences simply by
384 having a strong personal network, community support, or cultural
385 relevance in offline spaces.

386

387 DSPs and fraud detection systems must recognize that real
388 listeners often discover and share music in ways that are not
389 tracked by likes, shares, or retweets — and that this organic spread
390 is not only valid, but vital to music culture.

391 **Cultural Respect Clause:**

392 Music is not content.

393 The music industry must recognize that not every song is a meme,
394 a trend, or a viral dance. Some are compositions. Some are
395 movements. Some are just good music.

396

397 Streaming platforms must respect the artist's right to exist outside
398 of the social media algorithm — and within the streaming services
399 algorithm. A song's worth is not defined by how many followers the
400 artist has, but by how deeply it resonates when played. Whether it
401 spreads through private playlists, emotional connection, or cultural
402 moment, it deserves protection and respect.

403 **Real-World Context:**

404 This clause was informed by the experience of independent artist
405 and producer Kenan Ali Erkan, known as Ali Prod, who reached
406 over 500,000 streams without a large social media following —

407 only to be wrongfully flagged due to an industry assumption that
408 success without virality must mean fraud.

409 **Final Cultural Dagger:**

410 “In meetings with labels and distributors, artists are increasingly
411 asked: What’s your social media strategy? instead of What’s your
412 next musical project?”

413

414 This inversion of values signals a systemic failure — one that
415 prioritizes content output over creative output. The Artist Rights &
416 Platform Accountability Act demands that we reverse this trend
417 and return music to the center of the music industry.

418

419 **Section 3 — Distribution Oversight and Royalty Protections**

420 This section establishes federal oversight of music distributors,
421 labels, and digital service providers (DSPs) to ensure accurate
422 royalty payments, transparent artist treatment, and accountability
423 for mismanagement or fraud.

424 **3.1 — Royalty Accuracy Standards**

- 425 - Distributors and DSPs must provide artists with clear, itemized
426 royalty statements.
- 427 - Statements must disclose total streams, payout per stream, fees
428 deducted, and destination of funds.
- 429 - All financial statements must be audit-ready and retained for 7
430 years.

431 **3.2 — Mandatory Royalty Transparency Tools**

432 - Platforms must display real-time earnings and streaming data to
433 artists.
434 - Earnings must be broken down by DSP, territory, and currency.
435 - Artists must be able to track royalties from DSP to distributor to
436 payout.

437 **3.3 — NOMES Audit Authority**

438 - NOMES may audit distributors and DSPs on a rolling basis (every
439 3–6 months).
440 - Failure to comply or obstruction of audit will result in legal
441 penalties.
442 - NOMES may refer fraud, tax evasion, or royalty theft to the DOJ
443 and IRS.

444 **3.4 — Illegal Practices and Penalties**

445 - It is illegal to remove music, withhold royalties, or shadowban
446 artists without verified cause and due process.
447 - Violators must return royalties, pay damages, and face civil or
448 criminal charges.
449 - Repeated offenses may lead to federal takeover of artist
450 distribution for affected American creators.

451 **3.5 — Fair Access for Independent Artists**

452 - Distributors must not deny service or remove content based
453 solely on volume of streams or perceived risk.
454 - Algorithms and fraud detection systems must be independently
455 verified and transparent to NOMES.
456 - All takedown actions must be reviewed by a human, not solely AI
457 or automation.

458 **Section 3.6 — Loudness Transparency and Playback Control**

459 **Artist & Public Access to Loudness Normalization Data**

460 All digital streaming platforms (DSPs) shall publicly disclose loudness
461 normalization information for every published audio work. The
462 following data must be made available:

463 • The original LUFS (integrated) level of the uploaded master
464 • The gain adjustment applied during normalization (e.g., “-3.1
465 dB”)
466 • The final playback LUFS level as rendered to listeners

467 This information must be clearly displayed in two locations:

468 1. The artist-facing dashboard (e.g., Spotify for Artists, YouTube
469 Studio)
470 2. The public-facing track or album interface, accessible to any user
471 (e.g., via an information panel, toggle, or expanded playback
472 metadata)

473 **Listener Playback Normalization Toggle**

474 All DSPs must provide end users with the ability to enable or disable
475 loudness normalization during playback. This toggle shall be:

476 • Included in the platform’s playback or audio settings
477 • Available to both free and paid users
478 • Accompanied by a clear explanation stating:
479 “Normalization reduces volume differences between songs.
480 Disabling this will allow playback using the artist’s original
481 dynamics and loudness.”

482 **Optional Artist Bypass for Preserved Masters**

483 Artists may request normalization bypass if their master meets the
484 following conditions:

485 • The track has a true peak of -1.0 dBTP or lower
486 • The file is certified free from audible distortion or clipping

487 • The artist or mastering engineer submits a playback integrity
488 declaration

489 In such cases, the DSP shall honor the bypass request and render the
490 track without gain reduction by default, unless the user has
491 normalization enabled in their settings.

492 **Purpose**

493 This section ensures transparency in loudness manipulation, protects
494 artistic intent, and empowers both artists and listeners to control the
495 dynamic and playback integrity of published works.

496

497 **Section 4 — Transparent Fraud Review Standards**

498 This section establishes clear guidelines for how DSPs and
499 distributors must handle fraud detection, investigations, and
500 communication. The goal is to eliminate vague or arbitrary
501 enforcement and protect artists from wrongful accusations rooted
502 in flawed data or misused technology.

503 **4.1 — Verified Evidence Standard**

504 No fraud-based takedown or penalty may occur without a
505 documented audit trail showing verified evidence of artificial
506 activity. Anonymous tips, vague algorithmic red flags, or
507 assumptions based on genre or region do not meet this standard.

508 **4.2 — Disclosure of Reason for Takedown**

509 If a track or profile is flagged for fraud, the distributor or DSP must
510 disclose:

511 - The specific reason for the flag
512 - The data that triggered it (e.g., unusual geographic activity,

513 repeated IPs, etc.)

514 - Whether the evidence was reviewed by a human

515 **4.3 — NOMES Audit Rights**

516 NOMES reserves the right to request full internal logs and
517 investigation data from any platform accused of false fraud
518 enforcement. Platforms must retain such data for at least 18
519 months after a takedown.

520 **4.4 — Artificial Streaming Penalty Elimination**

521

522 All charges, penalties, and financial seizures from DSPs related to
523 alleged “artificial streaming” are hereby suspended unless the
524 platform can:

525 1. Demonstrate a transparent and reproducible investigation,
526 and

527 2. Prove the artist intentionally engaged in fraudulent behavior
528 through documented, verifiable evidence.

529

530 Digital Service Providers (DSPs) must formally acknowledge their
531 role in cultivating and profiting from an ecosystem that enables
532 artificial streaming — including but not limited to phone farms, bot
533 networks, exploitative ad algorithms, and manipulative playlist
534 curators. DSPs may no longer offload liability for this flawed
535 infrastructure onto artists who operate in good faith.

536

537 Any deduction of royalties, account penalties, or takedowns based
538 on unproven or algorithmically inferred suspicions shall be

539 classified as unauthorized seizure of income and subject to legal
540 and financial restitution under this Act.

541

542 **Enforcement and Oversight:**

543 The National Organization for Music and Economic Safety (NOMES)
544 shall be tasked with auditing DSP fraud claim procedures and
545 handling artist appeals related to artificial streaming accusations.
546 NOMES will maintain a national database of artist complaints and
547 ensure platforms comply with this provision or face federal
548 penalties and public reporting of non-compliance.

549

550

551 **4.5 — Timeline for Review**

552 Distributors and DSPs must review flagged accounts within 15
553 business days. Delays or silence beyond this period will be
554 considered negligent under this Act.

555 **4.6 — False Positive Accountability**

556 If an artist is found innocent after being flagged for fraud, they are
557 entitled to:

- 558 - Full restoration of royalties and visibility
- 559 - A formal apology
- 560 - Compensation for proven career damages
- 561 - Public correction of fraud designation

562 **4.7 — Ban on Passive Enforcement**

563 Platforms may not use passive enforcement tactics like
564 shadowbanning, silence, or indefinite withholding of royalties
565 without formal communication, review, and the option for appeal.

566 **4.8 — Economic Safeguards**

567 Wrongful takedowns that result in lost royalties impact not only
568 the artist, but also the broader economy. NOMES will track all such
569 cases and include lost taxes and unpaid royalties in national music
570 economy reports.

571 **4.9 — Indicators of Cultural Negligence and Required
572 Investigation**

573

574 Public-facing behavior from DSP CEOs and distributors during
575 mass takedown periods may reveal deeper issues of negligence,
576 mismanagement, or lack of oversight.

577 This negligence is not isolated — it reflects a deeper cultural
578 problem within the music tech elite. Spotify CEO Daniel Ek, whose
579 company dominates global streaming, has openly referred to music
580 as “just content” and publicly questioned, “What even is music?”
581 These statements, coming from the highest levels of power in the
582 industry, betray a fundamental misunderstanding — or outright
583 disregard — for the cultural, emotional, and economic value of
584 music as art. When both DSPs and distributors normalize this
585 detachment from the art itself, it reinforces the urgency for federal
586 oversight, artist protections, and legally enforceable standards.

587 These attitudes extend beyond Spotify. The CEO of DistroKid, one
588 of the largest independent distributors, has publicly downplayed
589 artist concerns and mocked complaints about fraud, takedowns,

590 and metadata issues across social media. When top executives treat
591 artist livelihoods like memes or marketing talking points, the
592 message is clear: the people profiting from the music economy
593 have little respect for the people creating it.

594

595 In January 2021, during a widespread wave of artist removals from
596 major streaming platforms, representatives of a leading U.S.-based
597 distributor made light of the situation on social media platform
598 Twitter (now known as X), posting the following:

599

600 “What food goes with whiskey? Planning my night.” — @DistroKid,
601 January 4, 2021, 4:55 PM (Twitter for iPhone)

602

603 Amid numerous artist complaints about withheld royalties,
604 wrongful removals, and unanswered support tickets, a public reply
605 stated:

606

607 “You should plan on either responding to my email and paying me
608 what’s owed or getting a defense lawyer because I’m going to be
609 owning a part of distrokid by the time I’m done.” — @PrestoX2,
610 January 4, 2021

611

612 Days later, the distributor followed up with:

613

614 "Sometimes I want to ask a question or advice here on Twitter, but
615 too scared it'll get misconstrued & turn into a huge Twitter pile-on
616 (has happened). Is there a Twitter without pitchforks where
617 people (or companies) can be more open?" — @DistroKid, January
618 9, 2021, 12:06 AM

619

620 These public statements, issued during a period of industry-wide
621 disruption, reflect a concerning disregard for professional
622 responsibility and artist welfare.

623

624 As a distributor entrusted with the delivery and monetization of
625 American music — and thus with direct influence over U.S.
626 intellectual property, royalty flow, and creative labor — DistroKid
627 and other involved parties are expected to uphold the highest
628 standards of transparency and conduct.

629

630 Behavior like this, particularly when paired with mass removals
631 and lack of due process, constitutes a red flag for mismanagement
632 of American revenue, metadata, and artist rights. NOMES shall treat
633 such conduct as justification for formal audit and review.

634

635 **Mandated Investigation**

636

637 NOMES shall launch a retrospective investigation into the
638 coordinated or simultaneous artist removals that occurred in and
639 around January 2021, with specific attention to:

640 - Spotify (as the primary platform where many removals occurred),
641 - DistroKid (as the distributor named in numerous public
642 complaints), and
643 - Any additional DSPs or distributors shown to have participated in
644 mass content purges without notice, evidence, or appeal access.

645

646 This investigation shall include review of:

647 - Internal communications
648 - Fraud flag criteria used at the time
649 - Support system activity logs
650 - Royalty records before and after removals
651 - Third-party contractor involvement or playlist suppression

652

653 This clause is not solely based on online documentation or
654 community reports — it is also informed by the direct experience
655 of the bill's author, Kenan Ali Erkan (Ali Prod), who was among the
656 artists purged during this 2021 takedown wave without notice or
657 due process.

658

659 The goal of this investigation is to determine whether artists were
660 wrongfully removed, defrauded of royalties, or suppressed through
661 collusion between DSPs and distributors — and to recommend
662 corrective actions or criminal referrals where applicable.

Section 5 — National Oversight for Music Economic Safety (NOMES)

665 This section introduces NOMES, a federally established agency
666 responsible for auditing, investigating, and enforcing industry-wide
667 compliance in matters relating to artist royalties, fraudulent
668 takedowns, distributor negligence, metadata tampering, and
669 streaming fraud.

670 5.1 — NOMES Overview and Mission

671 NOMES (National Organization of Music Economic Safety) will
672 serve as a neutral body for protecting independent artists,
673 investigating fraud, and ensuring the fair and accurate distribution
674 of music royalties across platforms and distributors. It will operate
675 with government backing to audit, arbitrate, and intervene in cases
676 of suspected abuse or misconduct.

677 5.2 – Audit Powers and Reporting Timelines

678 NOMES will audit all U.S.-based and international music
679 distributors servicing American citizens, with mandatory reviews
680 every 3–6 months, aligned with royalty reporting periods.
681 Investigations will assess compliance with artist rights, proper
682 royalty payments, copyright integrity, and ecosystem transparency.

683 5.3 — Enforcement and Penalties

684 Distributors, labels, or DSPs found to have committed fraud,
685 withheld royalties, or manipulated copyrights without cause will be
686 subject to federal penalties, including seizure of relevant financial
687 data, reimbursement of artist damages, and referral to the DOJ or
688 IRS for criminal review.

689 **5.4 — Clean Platform Standard (Anti-Bot Mandate)**

690 DSPs must maintain a clean digital ecosystem. Failure to remove
691 known bots, phone farms, or fraudulent playlists will result in
692 NOMES-led investigations, and possibly FTC referral for deceptive
693 business practices.

694 **5.5 — Distribution Takeover Clause**

695 If a distributor or DSP is found unfit to manage artist royalties for
696 U.S. citizens, NOMES may assume oversight of their American-
697 facing catalog and facilitate temporary distribution through a
698 government-supervised portal or verified domestic partner.

699 **5.6 — Copyright Integrity and Metadata Safety**

700 NOMES will maintain secure logs of artist metadata (credits, splits,
701 copyright ownership) to prevent unauthorized tampering. Any
702 distributor that removes, edits, or misattributes this data without
703 consent will be held accountable.

704 **5.7 — National and International Scope**

705 NOMES protects American artists both domestically and abroad. It
706 will investigate cases where international distributors, labels, or
707 platforms extract value from U.S. audiences while violating artist
708 rights. All U.S.-based royalty flows, regardless of destination, fall
709 under NOMES jurisdiction.

710 **5.8 — Payment Verification and Tax Compliance**

711 To ensure accurate royalty tracking and federal taxation, NOMES
712 will verify royalty disbursements through social security numbers
713 and IRS channels. This ensures artists receive what they're owed,
714 while strengthening national economic visibility.

715 **5.9 — Emergency Oversight Trigger**

716 In the event of mass artist takedowns, catalog disappearances, or
717 widespread fraud, NOMES may trigger emergency oversight
718 procedures to freeze further removals, secure artist data, and
719 initiate federal inquiries.

720 **Section 6 — Platform Accountability & Transparency Standards**

721 This section outlines the legal responsibilities of digital streaming
722 platforms (DSPs) and distributors to maintain fair, transparent,
723 and non-exploitative environments for artists. Platforms cannot
724 simultaneously profit from creators while punishing them for
725 systemic issues beyond their control.

726 **6.1 — Clear Takedown Protocols**

727 Platforms must clearly define their takedown processes in public
728 documentation. These processes must include:

- 729 • A notice to the artist before any removal.
- 730 • An explanation of the reason.
- 731 • A chance to appeal within a specified timeframe.
- 732 • Human review before a final decision.

733 Failure to provide these steps may result in a NOMES-led audit and
734 government intervention.

735 **6.2 — Fraud Flag Disclosures**

736 Artists must be informed of:

- 737 • The precise stream(s) and date(s) triggering a fraud flag.
- 738 • Any suspicious playlists or traffic sources.
- 739 • Whether the distributor or DSP initiated the fraud report.

740 This protects against false claims and gives artists the ability to
741 correct the record or appeal via NOMES.

742 **6.3 — Anti-Gaslighting Clause**

743 If an artist is removed for 'fraudulent streaming' yet receives no
744 proof and no platform or partner claims responsibility, then
745 NOMES will investigate for collusion or coordinated negligence.
746 Platforms may not obscure responsibility or deny knowledge if
747 they participate in data handling or revenue withholding. These
748 actions are subject to investigation.

749 **6.4 — Platform Contradictions Must End**

750 Platforms like Spotify promote themselves as empowering artists,
751 while issuing vague fraud takedowns and charging \$10 per track
752 for 'artificial streaming'.

753
754 This bill directly challenges that contradiction: platforms cannot
755 profit from artists, offer playlist pitching, and sell ads to them while
756 removing their work without due process.

757 **6.5 — National Economic Impact of Platform Negligence**

758 Unlawful takedowns and account deletions:

- 759 • Undermine U.S. labor and innovation
- 760 • Remove taxable income from the national economy
- 761 • Create economic loss for independent creators and future
762 entrepreneurs

763 Congress must treat this issue as a matter of national economic
764 security.

765 **Section 7 — Oversight, Enforcement & Artist Cooperatives**

766 This section defines enforcement mechanisms, outlines
767 investigatory powers, and introduces collective protections for
768 artists through cooperatives. It prioritizes transparency, legal

769 oversight, and shared governance to ensure accountability across
770 all levels of the music distribution ecosystem.

771 **7.1 — Federal Oversight & NOMES Authority**

772 The National Organization of Music Economic Safety (NOMES) will
773 have investigatory authority over:

774 • Distributors
775 • DSPs (Digital Service Providers)
776 • Music labels and platform intermediaries

777
778 Investigations will occur every 3–6 months and include:

779 • Audits of royalty payments
780 • Examination of metadata integrity and catalog ownership
781 • Review of artist account lockouts, shadowbans, or takedowns

782 NOMES shall be established within 12 months of the Act's passage,
783 with operational intake and artist appeal systems active within 18
784 months.

785 **7.2 — Enforcement Measures**

786 If NOMES determines there has been:

787 • Fraud
788 • Royalty theft
789 • Copyright manipulation
790 • Unlawful shadowbanning

791
792 Then the distributor, label, or DSP may face:

793 • Federal charges
794 • Mandatory royalty reimbursement
795 • Public accountability, including apology statements and reversal
796 of punitive actions

797 **7.3 — Economic Safeguards for American Consumption**

798 NOMES may take temporary control over U.S.-based distributions if
799 providers are unable to comply with fair royalty practices. This
800 includes:

801 • Redirecting royalty payments to verified American artists
802 • Ensuring tax accountability
803 • Preventing international misallocation of U.S.-earned revenue

804 **7.4 — Distribution Failures and Emergency Support**

805 In cases of mass lockouts or platform negligence, NOMES will serve
806 as an emergency distribution hub or assign a verified domestic
807 partner under federal supervision to ensure artists retain access to
808 streaming platforms and royalties.

809 **7.5 — Artist Cooperatives & Legal Standing**

810 Creators may form registered artist cooperatives, including shared
811 legal teams, indie labels, or unions.

812 These cooperatives:

813 • May join the NOMES registry
814 • Have legal standing in appeals and investigations
815 • Can file class-action claims on behalf of members

816 **7.6 — Executive-Level Oversight Inquiry**

817 Given potential national economic harm, NOMES will suggest an
818 oversight inquiry into the leadership of:

819 • Major DSPs (e.g., Spotify)
820 • Prominent music distributors (e.g., DistroKid, Tunecore, Horus
821 Music)
822 • Leading music label conglomerates

823

824 If fraud or negligence is confirmed, referrals may be made to the
825 DOJ and IRS for appropriate legal action.

826 **7.7 — Legal Aid Fund for Artists**

827

828 NOMES shall establish and oversee a federally supported Legal Aid
829 Fund to provide independent artists with access to legal
830 representation in cases involving wrongful takedowns, royalty
831 theft, metadata tampering, or platform retaliation. This fund will
832 cover services including arbitration counsel, fraud appeal support,
833 contract review, and class action participation. The goal is to
834 ensure that artists are not silenced or bankrupted simply because
835 they cannot afford private legal defense.

836 Eligibility will be based on income thresholds, with priority given
837 to artists who are locked out of their accounts, facing repeated
838 fraud flags, or subject to mass catalog removals. The Legal Aid Fund
839 may be financed through a combination of public funding and civil
840 penalties collected from platforms and distributors found to have
841 violated this Act. Legal representation may be provided through a
842 network of vetted attorneys, nonprofit law centers, or government-
843 assigned counsel specializing in creative rights and digital labor
844 protections.

845 **7.8 — Transparency & Oversight**

846

847 NOMES shall publish an annual public report detailing the scope
848 and outcomes of its investigations. This shall include: the number
849 of fraud cases reviewed, takedowns reversed, royalty repayments
850 issued, class action activity supported, and repeat offenders
851 identified among DSPs or distributors. The report shall be made
852 accessible on a public government website and shared with

853 congressional oversight committees to ensure ongoing
854 accountability.

855

856 **Section 8 — Playlist Ecosystem & Platform Accountability**

857 This section addresses the need for transparency, fairness, and
858 accountability in the playlist ecosystem, where algorithmic and
859 editorial decisions significantly impact artist exposure, income, and
860 career opportunities.

861 **8.1 — Playlist Transparency Requirements**

862 DSPs must provide artists with access to detailed data regarding
863 playlist placements, including:

- 864 • Playlist name and curator identity
- 865 • Date of addition and removal
- 866 • Engagement statistics (e.g., saves, skips, streams)

867 **8.2 — Ban on False Justifications**

868 Distributors and DSPs may not cite repeated fan listening (e.g.,
869 someone listening on repeat at the gym or a club DJ playing a track
870 several times) as evidence of fraud unless confirmed to be artificial.

871 This clause protects cultural phenomena such as Kendrick Lamar's
872 repeated performance of 'Not Like Us' and Jay-Z & Kanye West's
873 record-setting repetition of 'N****s in Paris.'

874 **8.3 — Clean Platform Standard**

875 DSPs must actively monitor and remove:

- 876 • Bot-created playlists

877 • Pay-for-playlists operated by fraudulent third parties
878 • Internal promotional playlists misrepresented as 'organic growth'
879
880 Failure to maintain a clean ecosystem will result in:
881 • NOMEs-led audit of all playlists operated on the DSP
882 • Referral to the FTC for deceptive practices or artist defrauding

883 **8.4 — Algorithmic and Editorial Accountability**

884 DSPs must disclose:
885 • The logic behind editorial and algorithmic placements
886 • Whether a playlist features real engagement or bot traffic
887 • Any removal rationale that affects artist placement
888

889 Verified editorial or algorithmic playlists may be prioritized in
890 artist transparency dashboards.

891 **8.5 — No Penalty for Personal Playlists**

892 This bill does not penalize personal playlists created by users. It
893 only targets malicious or misleading playlist ecosystems.

894 **8.6 — Fraudulent Playlist Investigations**

895 NOMEs will investigate any playlist ecosystem—especially internal
896 distributor playlists (e.g., 'DistroKid Artists' on Spotify)—that
897 appears to generate artificial streams or is tied to royalty fraud.
898 DSPs and distributors must cooperate fully.

899 **8.7 — Fraudulent Ad Disclosure Requirement**

900
901 Any individual or company promoting playlist inclusion, stream
902 boosting, or music exposure services through paid
903 advertisements — particularly on social media platforms — must
904 clearly disclose whether their playlists and traffic sources are
905 verified and organic. Ads that promote playlists tied to bots,

906 phone farms, or artificial stream inflation are considered
907 fraudulent advertising under this Act.
908
909 When such campaigns result in artificial traffic to a DSP, both the
910 digital platform (DSP) and the advertiser are subject to
911 investigation. The DSP is responsible for maintaining a clean
912 ecosystem and must proactively detect and block traffic
913 stemming from fraudulent advertisements. The advertiser, not
914 the artist, shall be treated as the party attempting to commit
915 fraud.
916
917 NOMES shall treat repeated inaction by DSPs, or repeated
918 offenses by advertisers, as grounds for fraud referral, financial
919 penalties, and potential FTC investigation. Independent curators
920 operating in good faith, with no use of artificial traffic, are not
921 subject to this clause. This provision targets deceptive marketing
922 practices that mislead artists and corrupt platform integrity
923

924 **Section 9 — Metadata Integrity, Sampling Clarity & Legacy Rights**
925 Section 9 outlines protections for artist metadata, ensures clarity
926 around derivative works (such as covers and samples), and secures
927 rights for families of deceased artists.

928 **9.1 — Metadata Protection**

929 It is illegal to alter, erase, or overwrite artist metadata — including
930 name, credits, and royalty splits — during or after takedown,
931 without formal NOMES approval.

932 NOMES will maintain a verified archive of metadata history to
933 prevent tampering and ensure artists can recover misattributed or
934 stolen work.

935 **9.2 — Reinstatement & Visibility Rights**

936 If an artist is exonerated following a fraud claim, the platform must
937 fully restore their prior standing. This includes:
938 • Playlist positions
939 • Stream counts
940 • Algorithmic ranking
941 • Artist dashboard access and visibility

942 **9.3 — Legacy Artist Protections**

943 Families of deceased artists may register with NOMEs to protect
944 the legacy of the artist and prevent wrongful takedowns or
945 metadata tampering. They are entitled to:

946 • Receive any withheld royalties
947 • Challenge fraud flags or removals
948 • Request takedown of false or misattributed works

949 **9.4 — Covers, Samples, and Derivatives**

950 This bill affirms that remixes, covers, and sampled works must
951 follow existing copyright law. Distributors and platforms:

952 • May not remove such works without verifiable evidence of
953 infringement
954 • Must review derivative works under NOMEs guidance before
955 any takedown
956 • Cannot auto-flag creative reinterpretations such as
957 transformative lofi covers without due process

958 **9.5 — International Protections & Reciprocity**

959 While this Act is grounded in U.S. law, it encourages international
960 collaboration in the enforcement of artist rights. NOMES shall work
961 to establish data-sharing and reciprocal protection agreements
962 with allied nations to ensure that foreign artists using U.S.-based
963 DSPs and distributors receive the same due process and fraud
964 protections outlined in this bill. U.S. artists using international
965 distribution services shall also be covered through reciprocal
966 agreements where available.

967

968

969 **Section 10 — Final Summary & Call to Action**

970

971 This Act was not written out of abstract theory or speculation — it
972 was written in response to real harm, experienced by real creators,
973 inside a system that currently lacks accountability.

974

975 From unauthorized catalog removals to shadowbanning, from
976 royalty theft to the unchecked rise of artificial streaming fraud, this
977 legislation identifies core vulnerabilities in the modern music
978 ecosystem and offers bold, balanced reforms.

979

980 We now live in an era where independent creators are the
981 backbone of culture and commerce. Yet, they are the most
982 vulnerable to abuse by platforms, labels, and distributors. Without
983 legislative protection, American innovation, labor, and economic
984 value will continue to be lost to systemic negligence.

985

986 By establishing NOMES (National Organization of Music Economic
987 Safety), this Act provides due process, transparency, data integrity,

988 and financial oversight — while incentivizing platforms and
989 distributors to clean up their practices or face consequences.
990

991 The Artist Rights & Platform Accountability Act is not just a call for
992 justice — it is a national economic intervention. Billions in revenue,
993 jobs, and creative exports are on the line. The time to act is now.
994

995 We urge lawmakers, artists, industry professionals, and the public
996 to support this legislation in defense of creative freedom, economic
997 fairness, and the soul of the American music industry.

998 **Closing Statement**

999
1000 “An artist’s duty is to reflect the times in which we live.”
1001 — Nina Simone

1002
1003 The Artist Rights & Platform Accountability Act was written in
1004 response to a growing crisis facing the independent music
1005 community — a crisis of invisibility, exploitation, and digital
1006 erasure. When artists can be silenced by automated fraud flags,
1007 denied royalties without cause, and removed from platforms
1008 without explanation, the very foundation of cultural production is
1009 at risk.

1010
1011 This legislation is not a demand for favoritism — it is a call for
1012 fairness, transparency, and due process. It challenges the toxic
1013 belief that music must go viral to have value, and reminds
1014 lawmakers that behind every song is a human being, a taxpayer,
1015 and a citizen with rights.

1016
1017 But this is not only a cultural emergency — it is an economic
1018 one. Misapplied fraud flags, missing royalties, and metadata
1019 erasure have real financial consequences — not just for
1020 creators, but for the U.S. economy. When platforms and
1021 distributors mishandle revenue, it disrupts IRS oversight,

1022 reduces taxable income, and allows offshore laundering to thrive
1023 unchecked.

1024
1025 If passed, this Act would lay the groundwork for a more ethical,
1026 accountable, and artist-centered digital economy. It affirms that
1027 music is not disposable content — it is art, and it deserves to be
1028 treated with dignity under the law. By enforcing transparency and
1029 protecting digital labor, the Act also strengthens the nation's
1030 creative workforce and ensures that American-made culture
1031 continues to generate value — not just artistically, but
1032 economically, for the country as a whole.

1033
1034 Respectfully submitted,

1035 Kenan Ali Erkan

1036 Artist Name: Ali Prod™

1037 Date: May 2025

1038 All rights reserved to the author.

1039

1040 **A Note from the Author**

1041
1042 This Act represents a foundational shift in how artists are treated
1043 by the platforms that profit from their work — but it's only the
1044 beginning.

1045
1046 Future legislation — including proposals like the Artist Economic
1047 Reparations and Credit Act — will aim to recover lost royalties,
1048 create credit systems for removed artists, and build long-term
1049 financial protections for creators harmed by digital negligence.

1050
1051 For press or legislative inquiries, contact: AliProd.Net@gmail.com

1052
1053 For artist support or testimony, please include “ARTISTS
1054 RIGHTS” in your subject line.

1055
1056

1057

1058

1059 **Author's Note on Process and Authorship**

1060

1061 This legislative proposal was not written in isolation, nor
1062 generated in a single pass. It was created through a deliberate,
1063 multi-stage process combining lived human experience with
1064 artificial intelligence — not as a shortcut, but as a tool for deep
1065 research, structured debate, and accelerated ideation.

1066

1067 Since first integrating AI into my creative workflow, I've spent
1068 over 120 hours using ChatGPT not just as a co-author, but as a
1069 real-time career strategist, branding advisor, and thought
1070 partner. Across over 2,200 messages, I've used this tool to
1071 reflect on personal experiences in the music industry, test ideas
1072 for my business, analyze my work, develop content strategies,
1073 build out website language, and refine my artistic identity as Ali
1074 Prod™.

1075

1076 That foundation of career-based dialogue gave me the clarity
1077 and confidence to begin building this legislation. More than 100
1078 of those hours were ultimately dedicated to this bill — developed
1079 through daily conversations, structured ideation, and focused
1080 collaboration.

1081

1082 I, Kenan Ali Erkan (Ali Prod), worked with the model in real-time
1083 dialogue, building this legislation section by section, one idea at
1084 a time. Each clause was debated, clarified, and refined under my

1085 full creative and intellectual supervision. Every theme, safeguard,
1086 and policy solution was rooted in my lived experience as an
1087 independent artist navigating systemic abuse in the modern
1088 music economy.

1089

1090 Importantly, this document could not have been created by
1091 simply “asking AI to write a bill.” If a random person attempted to
1092 generate this same policy using their own AI, the result would
1093 reflect their level of experience and the quality of their own
1094 discourse — not mine. AI does not generate conviction, nuance,
1095 or urgency. It reflects it.

1096

1097 I used AI to compress and organize complex information, but the
1098 logic, framework, and voice behind the Artist Rights & Platform
1099 Accountability Act are mine. The document is human-led from
1100 start to finish.

1101

1102 The Artist Rights & Platform Accountability Act is more than a
1103 policy proposal — it is a blueprint for artist empowerment and
1104 platform reform, made possible by blending firsthand struggle
1105 with modern tools. This method of authorship — tech-assisted
1106 but experience-led — is part of the message.

1107

1108 — Kenan Ali Erkan

1109 Ali Prod™

1110 May 2025

1111 All rights reserved to the author.

1112

1113 And yes — this was also AI-generated... through debate and
1114 discourse.

1115

1116

1117

1118

1119

1120

1121

1122

1123

1124

1125

1126

1127 Table of Contents

1128 • Introduction & Purpose pg. 1

1129 • Bill Objectives pg. 2

1130

1131 Section 1 — Definitions pg. 2

1132 Section 2 — Protected Rights for Artists pg. 5

1133 Section 3 — Distribution Oversight and Royalty Protections pg. 15

1134 Section 4 — Transparent Fraud Review Standards pg. 16

1135 Section 5 — National Oversight for Music Ecosystem Safety ... pg. 23

1136 Section 6 — Platform Accountability & Transparency Standards ... pg. 25

1137	Section 7 — Oversight, Enforcement & Artist Cooperatives	pg. 27
1138	Section 8 — Playlist Ecosystem & Platform Accountability	pg. 31
1139	Section 9 — Metadata Integrity, Sampling Clarity & Legacy Rights ...	pg. 33
1140	Section 10 — Final Summary & Call to Action	pg. 35
1141	Closing Statement	pg. 36
1142	Signature & Note from the Author	pg. 37
1143	Table of Contents (this page)	pg. 41
1144		
1145		
1146		
1147		
1148		
1149		
1150		
1151		
1152		
1153		
1154		
1155		
1156		
1157		
1158		
1159		
1160		