

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:

- 171 - The artist shall be presumed innocent.
- 172 - The burden of proof lies with the platform or distributor.
- 173 - If the investigation confirms wrongful removal, the following
174 remedies must be enacted:
 - 175 - Return of all withheld royalties.
 - 176 - Compensation for damages, including financial loss and career
177 harm.
 - 178 - A formal public acknowledgment of the mistake by the
179 responsible entity.
 - 180 - Restoration of platform visibility, algorithmic parity, and search
181 functionality. No shadowbanning, downranking, or related
182 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 The freeze mechanism described in this Act does not apply to
284 every individual takedown. Rather, injunctive relief may be
285 sought by NOMES when a documented pattern of wrongful
286 removals is established — specifically, removals conducted
287 without verifiable evidence across multiple artists. This class
288 action threshold trigger is a recognized legal mechanism that

289 targets systemic abuse rather than isolated disputes, making
290 enforcement both practical and legally defensible.

291

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

299

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

311

312 This clause also affirms the national economic impact of
313 independent music. By ensuring fair treatment and accurate
314 oversight, NOMES may work with the Internal Revenue Service
315 (IRS) to trace royalty flows and verify that U.S. artists are
316 receiving their legally earned income — thereby promoting
317 proper taxation, financial transparency, and revenue collection in
318 support of American citizens and the broader creative economy.

319

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

321 In today’s industry culture, artists are often judged not by the
322 quality or impact of their music, but by their ability to generate
323 content for social media. This has led to a false and harmful

324 standard: that success on streaming platforms must be reflected by
325 proportional growth on social platforms — or else it’s assumed to
326 be fraudulent. This clause rejects that standard entirely and affirms
327 the validity of all legitimate organic success, regardless of social
328 media presence.

329 **Policy Provisions:**

330 1. Distinct Ecosystems, Distinct Metrics:

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

335 2. The Replayability Principle:

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

340 3. DSP-Only Success Is Valid:

341 A creator may experience significant organic growth on streaming
342 platforms without corresponding growth on social media. This
343 growth is valid, protected, and shall not be treated as evidence of
344 fraud.

345 4. Dark Virality Exists:

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

350 5. Prohibition on Metric Comparison for Fraud Detection:

351 Distributors and DSPs are prohibited from flagging artists as
352 fraudulent based solely on perceived mismatches between social
353 media and streaming performance.

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

355 Artists may experience uneven performance across streaming
356 platforms — for example, a song may thrive on Apple Music but
357 underperform on Spotify, or vice versa. These platform-specific
358 differences are natural and cannot be used as sole indicators of
359 fraud or manipulation.

360 7. Replayable Music Reaching the Right Audience Is a Positive 361 Outcome:

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

365
366 If a streaming platform surfaces a song that connects deeply with
367 real listeners, even when the artist has minimal social media
368 presence, that is evidence that the system worked.

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

379

380 DSPs must learn to distinguish between flash-in-the-pan content
381 and meaningful, slow-burn success — and recognize the latter as
382 an essential function of a healthy, human-centered music
383 ecosystem.

384 8. Organic Sharing Exists Outside Social Media:

385 Music can spread through human networks that leave no digital
386 footprint. Word-of-mouth recommendations, private text
387 messages, group chats, in-person interactions, or even hearing a
388 song played at a local business — these are all valid and time-
389 tested pathways of musical discovery.

390

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

395

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

400 **Cultural Respect Clause:**

401 Music is not content.

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

405

406 Streaming platforms must respect the artist's right to exist outside
407 of the social media algorithm — and within the streaming services
408 algorithm. A song's worth is not defined by how many followers the

409 artist has, but by how deeply it resonates when played. Whether it
410 spreads through private playlists, emotional connection, or cultural
411 moment, it deserves protection and respect.

412 **Real-World Context:**

413 This clause was informed by the experience of independent artist
414 and producer Kenan Ali Erkan, known as Ali Prod, who reached
415 over 500,000 streams without a large social media following —
416 only to be wrongfully flagged due to an industry assumption that
417 success without virality must mean fraud.

418 **Final Cultural Dagger:**

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

422

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

427

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

429 This section establishes federal oversight of music distributors,
430 labels, and digital service providers (DSPs) to ensure accurate
431 royalty payments, transparent artist treatment, and accountability
432 for mismanagement or fraud.

433 **3.1 — Royalty Accuracy Standards**

- 434 - Distributors and DSPs must provide artists with clear, itemized
- 435 royalty statements.
- 436 - Statements must disclose total streams, payout per stream, fees
- 437 deducted, and destination of funds.
- 438 - All financial statements must be audit-ready and retained for 7
- 439 years.

440 **3.2 — Mandatory Royalty Transparency Tools**

- 441 - Platforms must display real-time earnings and streaming data to
- 442 artists.
- 443 - Earnings must be broken down by DSP, territory, and currency.
- 444 - Artists must be able to track royalties from DSP to distributor to
- 445 payout.

446 **3.3 — NOMES Audit Authority**

- 447 - NOMES may audit distributors and DSPs on a rolling basis (every
- 448 3–6 months).
- 449 - Failure to comply or obstruction of audit will result in legal
- 450 penalties.
- 451 - NOMES may refer fraud, tax evasion, or royalty theft to the DOJ
- 452 and IRS.

453 **3.4 — Illegal Practices and Penalties**

- 454 - It is illegal to remove music, withhold royalties, or shadowban
- 455 artists without verified cause and due process.
- 456 - Violators must return royalties, pay damages, and face civil or
- 457 criminal charges.
- 458 - Repeated offenses may lead to federal takeover of artist
- 459 distribution for affected American creators.

460 **3.5 — Fair Access for Independent Artists**

- 461 - Distributors must not deny service or remove content based
- 462 solely on volume of streams or perceived risk.
- 463 - Algorithms and fraud detection systems must be independently
- 464 verified and transparent to NOMES.
- 465 - All takedown actions must be reviewed by a human, not solely AI
- 466 or automation.

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

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

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

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

476 This information must be clearly displayed in two locations:

- 477 1. The artist-facing dashboard (e.g., Spotify for Artists, YouTube
- 478 Studio)
- 479 2. The public-facing track or album interface, accessible to any user
- 480 (e.g., via an information panel, toggle, or expanded playback
- 481 metadata)

482 **Listener Playback Normalization Toggle**

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

- 485 • Included in the platform’s playback or audio settings
- 486 • Available to both free and paid users
- 487 • Accompanied by a clear explanation stating:
- 488 “Normalization reduces volume differences between songs.

489 Disabling this will allow playback using the artist’s original
490 dynamics and loudness.”

491 **Optional Artist Bypass for Preserved Masters**

492 Artists may request normalization bypass if their master meets the
493 following conditions:

- 494 • The track has a true peak of -1.0 dBTP or lower
- 495 • The file is certified free from audible distortion or clipping
- 496 • The artist or mastering engineer submits a playback integrity
497 declaration

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

501 **Purpose**

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

505

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

507 This section establishes clear guidelines for how DSPs and
508 distributors must handle fraud detection, investigations, and
509 communication. The goal is to eliminate vague or arbitrary
510 enforcement and protect artists from wrongful accusations rooted
511 in flawed data or misused technology.

512 **4.1 — Verified Evidence Standard**

513 No fraud-based takedown or penalty may occur without a
514 documented audit trail showing verified evidence of artificial

515 activity. Anonymous tips, vague algorithmic red flags, or
516 assumptions based on genre or region do not meet this standard.

517 **4.2 — Disclosure of Reason for Takedown**

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

- 520 - The specific reason for the flag
- 521 - The data that triggered it (e.g., unusual geographic activity,
522 repeated IPs, etc.)
- 523 - Whether the evidence was reviewed by a human

524 **4.3 — NOMES Audit Rights**

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

529 **4.4 — Artificial Streaming Penalty Elimination**

530

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

- 534 1. Demonstrate a transparent and reproducible investigation,
535 and
- 536 2. Prove the artist intentionally engaged in fraudulent behavior
537 through documented, verifiable evidence.

538

539 Digital Service Providers (DSPs) must formally acknowledge their
540 role in cultivating and profiting from an ecosystem that enables

541 artificial streaming — including but not limited to phone farms, bot
542 networks, exploitative ad algorithms, and manipulative playlist
543 curators. DSPs may no longer offload liability for this flawed
544 infrastructure onto artists who operate in good faith.

545

546 Any deduction of royalties, account penalties, or takedowns based
547 on unproven or algorithmically inferred suspicions shall be
548 classified as unauthorized seizure of income and subject to legal
549 and financial restitution under this Act.

550

551 Enforcement and Oversight:

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

558

559

560 **4.5 — Timeline for Review**

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

564 **4.6 — False Positive Accountability**

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

- 567 - Full restoration of royalties and visibility
- 568 - A formal apology
- 569 - Compensation for proven career damages
- 570 - Public correction of fraud designation

571 **4.7 — Ban on Passive Enforcement**

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

575 **4.8 — Economic Safeguards**

576 Wrongful takedowns that result in lost royalties impact not only
577 the artist, but also the broader economy. NOMES will track all such
578 cases and include lost taxes and unpaid royalties in national music
579 economy reports.

580 **4.9 — Indicators of Cultural Negligence and Required** 581 **Investigation**

582

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

586 This negligence is not isolated — it reflects a deeper cultural
587 problem within the music tech elite. Spotify CEO Daniel Ek, whose
588 company dominates global streaming, has openly referred to music
589 as “just content” and publicly questioned, “What even is music?”
590 These statements, coming from the highest levels of power in the
591 industry, betray a fundamental misunderstanding — or outright
592 disregard — for the cultural, emotional, and economic value of
593 music as art. When both DSPs and distributors normalize this

594 detachment from the art itself, it reinforces the urgency for federal
595 oversight, artist protections, and legally enforceable standards.

596 These attitudes extend beyond Spotify. The CEO of DistroKid, one
597 of the largest independent distributors, has publicly downplayed
598 artist concerns and mocked complaints about fraud, takedowns,
599 and metadata issues across social media. When top executives treat
600 artist livelihoods like memes or marketing talking points, the
601 message is clear: the people profiting from the music economy
602 have little respect for the people creating it.

603

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

608

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

611

612 Amid numerous artist complaints about withheld royalties,
613 wrongful removals, and unanswered support tickets, a public reply
614 stated:

615

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

620

621 Days later, the distributor followed up with:

622

623 “Sometimes I want to ask a question or advice here on Twitter, but
624 too scared it’ll get misconstrued & turn into a huge Twitter pile-on
625 (has happened). Is there a Twitter without pitchforks where
626 people (or companies) can be more open?” — @DistroKid, January
627 9, 2021, 12:06 AM

628

629 These public statements, issued during a period of industry-wide
630 disruption, reflect a concerning disregard for professional
631 responsibility and artist welfare.

632

633 As a distributor entrusted with the delivery and monetization of
634 American music — and thus with direct influence over U.S.
635 intellectual property, royalty flow, and creative labor — DistroKid
636 and other involved parties are expected to uphold the highest
637 standards of transparency and conduct.

638

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

643

644 Mandated Investigation

645

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

- 649 - Spotify (as the primary platform where many removals occurred),
- 650 - DistroKid (as the distributor named in numerous public
651 complaints), and
- 652 - Any additional DSPs or distributors shown to have participated in
653 mass content purges without notice, evidence, or appeal access.

654

655 This investigation shall include review of:

- 656 - Internal communications
- 657 - Fraud flag criteria used at the time
- 658 - Support system activity logs
- 659 - Royalty records before and after removals
- 660 - Third-party contractor involvement or playlist suppression

661

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

667

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

672 **Section 5 — National Oversight for Music Economic Safety** 673 **(NOMES)**

674 This section introduces NOMES, a federally established agency
675 responsible for auditing, investigating, and enforcing industry-wide
676 compliance in matters relating to artist royalties, fraudulent
677 takedowns, distributor negligence, metadata tampering, and
678 streaming fraud.

679 NOMES shall operate as an independent oversight body — not a
680 sub-branch of any existing agency — but shall work in formal
681 coordination with the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) and the
682 U.S. Copyright Office to leverage existing enforcement
683 infrastructure and legal authority. NOMES shall be funded through
684 a combination of congressional appropriations and civil penalties
685 collected from platforms and distributors found in violation of this
686 Act, with dedicated funding mandated by law to prevent defunding
687 or institutional neglect.

688 **5.1 — NOMES Overview and Mission**

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

695 **5.2 — Audit Powers and Reporting Timelines**

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

701 **5.3 — Enforcement and Penalties**

702 Distributors, labels, or DSPs found to have committed fraud,
703 withheld royalties, or manipulated copyrights without cause will be
704 subject to federal penalties, including seizure of relevant financial
705 data, reimbursement of artist damages, and referral to the DOJ or
706 IRS for criminal review.

707 **5.4 — Clean Platform Standard (Anti-Bot Mandate)**

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

712 **5.5 — Distribution Takeover Clause**

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

717 **5.6 — Copyright Integrity and Metadata Safety**

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

722 **5.7 — National and International Scope**

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

728 **5.8 — Payment Verification and Tax Compliance**

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

733 **5.9 — Emergency Oversight Trigger**

734 In the event of mass artist takedowns, catalog disappearances, or
735 widespread fraud, NOMES may trigger emergency oversight
736 procedures to freeze further removals, secure artist data, and
737 initiate federal inquiries.

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

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

744 **6.1 — Clear Takedown Protocols**

745 Platforms must clearly define their takedown processes in public
746 documentation. These processes must include:

- 747 • A notice to the artist before any removal.
748 • An explanation of the reason.
749 • A chance to appeal within a specified timeframe.
750 • Human review before a final decision.
751 Failure to provide these steps may result in a NOMES-led audit and
752 government intervention.

753 **6.2 — Fraud Flag Disclosures**

754 Artists must be informed of:

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

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

760 **6.3 — Anti-Gaslighting Clause**

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

767 **6.4 — Platform Contradictions Must End**

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

771

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

775 **6.5 — National Economic Impact of Platform Negligence**

776 Unlawful takedowns and account deletions:

- 777 • Undermine U.S. labor and innovation
778 • Remove taxable income from the national economy
779 • Create economic loss for independent creators and future
780 entrepreneurs

781 Congress must treat this issue as a matter of national economic
782 security.

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

784 This section defines enforcement mechanisms, outlines
785 investigatory powers, and introduces collective protections for
786 artists through cooperatives. It prioritizes transparency, legal
787 oversight, and shared governance to ensure accountability across
788 all levels of the music distribution ecosystem.

789 **7.1 — Federal Oversight & NOMES Authority**

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

- 792 • Distributors
793 • DSPs (Digital Service Providers)
794 • Music labels and platform intermediaries

795
796 Investigations will occur every 3–6 months and include:

- 797 • Audits of royalty payments
798 • Examination of metadata integrity and catalog ownership
799 • Review of artist account lockouts, shadowbans, or takedowns

800 NOMES shall be established within 12 months of the Act’s passage,
801 with operational intake and artist appeal systems active within 18
802 months.

803 **7.2 — Enforcement Measures**

804 If NOMES determines there has been:

- 805 • Fraud
- 806 • Royalty theft
- 807 • Copyright manipulation
- 808 • Unlawful shadowbanning

809

810 Then the distributor, label, or DSP may face:

- 811 • Federal charges
- 812 • Mandatory royalty reimbursement
- 813 • Public accountability, including apology statements and reversal
- 814 of punitive actions

815 **7.3 — Economic Safeguards for American Consumption**

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

- 819 • Redirecting royalty payments to verified American artists
- 820 • Ensuring tax accountability
- 821 • Preventing international misallocation of U.S.-earned revenue

822 **7.4 — Distribution Failures and Emergency Support**

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

827 **7.5 — Artist Cooperatives & Legal Standing**

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

830 These cooperatives:

- 831 • May join the NOMES registry
- 832 • Have legal standing in appeals and investigations
- 833 • Can file class-action claims on behalf of members

834 **7.6 — Executive-Level Oversight Inquiry**

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

- 837 • Major DSPs (e.g., Spotify)
- 838 • Prominent music distributors (e.g., DistroKid, Tunecore, Horus
839 Music)
- 840 • Leading music label conglomerates

841

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

844 **7.7 — Legal Aid Fund for Artists**

845

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

854 Eligibility will be based on income thresholds, with priority given
855 to artists who are locked out of their accounts, facing repeated
856 fraud flags, or subject to mass catalog removals. The Legal Aid Fund
857 may be financed through a combination of public funding and civil
858 penalties collected from platforms and distributors found to have
859 violated this Act. Legal representation may be provided through a

860 network of vetted attorneys, nonprofit law centers, or government-
861 assigned counsel specializing in creative rights and digital labor
862 protections.

863 **7.8 — Transparency & Oversight**

864

865 NOMES shall publish an annual public report detailing the scope
866 and outcomes of its investigations. This shall include: the number
867 of fraud cases reviewed, takedowns reversed, royalty repayments
868 issued, class action activity supported, and repeat offenders
869 identified among DSPs or distributors. The report shall be made
870 accessible on a public government website and shared with
871 congressional oversight committees to ensure ongoing
872 accountability.

873

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

875 This section addresses the need for transparency, fairness, and
876 accountability in the playlist ecosystem, where algorithmic and
877 editorial decisions significantly impact artist exposure, income, and
878 career opportunities.

879 **8.1 — Playlist Transparency Requirements**

880 DSPs must provide artists with access to detailed data regarding
881 playlist placements, including:

- 882 • Playlist name and curator identity
- 883 • Date of addition and removal
- 884 • Engagement statistics (e.g., saves, skips, streams)

885 **8.2 — Ban on False Justifications**

886 Distributors and DSPs may not cite repeated fan listening (e.g.,
887 someone listening on repeat at the gym or a club DJ playing a track
888 several times) as evidence of fraud unless confirmed to be artificial.
889 This clause protects cultural phenomena such as Kendrick Lamar’s
890 repeated performance of 'Not Like Us' and Jay-Z & Kanye West’s
891 record-setting repetition of 'N****s in Paris.'

892 **8.3 — Clean Platform Standard**

893 DSPs must actively monitor and remove:

- 894 • Bot-created playlists
- 895 • Pay-for-playlists operated by fraudulent third parties
- 896 • Internal promotional playlists misrepresented as 'organic growth'

897
898 Failure to maintain a clean ecosystem will result in:

- 899 • NOMES-led audit of all playlists operated on the DSP
- 900 • Referral to the FTC for deceptive practices or artist defrauding

901 **8.4 — Algorithmic and Editorial Accountability**

902 DSPs must disclose:

- 903 • The logic behind editorial and algorithmic placements
- 904 • Whether a playlist features real engagement or bot traffic
- 905 • Any removal rationale that affects artist placement

906
907 Verified editorial or algorithmic playlists may be prioritized in
908 artist transparency dashboards.

909 **8.5 — No Penalty for Personal Playlists**

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

912 **8.6 — Fraudulent Playlist Investigations**

913 NOMES will investigate any playlist ecosystem—especially internal
914 distributor playlists (e.g., 'DistroKid Artists' on Spotify)—that
915 appears to generate artificial streams or is tied to royalty fraud.
916 DSPs and distributors must cooperate fully.

917 **8.7 — Fraudulent Ad Disclosure Requirement**

918
919 Any individual or company promoting playlist inclusion, stream
920 boosting, or music exposure services through paid
921 advertisements — particularly on social media platforms — must
922 clearly disclose whether their playlists and traffic sources are
923 verified and organic. Ads that promote playlists tied to bots,
924 phone farms, or artificial stream inflation are considered
925 fraudulent advertising under this Act.

926
927 When such campaigns result in artificial traffic to a DSP, both the
928 digital platform (DSP) and the advertiser are subject to
929 investigation. The DSP is responsible for maintaining a clean
930 ecosystem and must proactively detect and block traffic
931 stemming from fraudulent advertisements. The advertiser, not
932 the artist, shall be treated as the party attempting to commit
933 fraud.

934
935 NOMES shall treat repeated inaction by DSPs, or repeated
936 offenses by advertisers, as grounds for fraud referral, financial
937 penalties, and potential FTC investigation. Independent curators
938 operating in good faith, with no use of artificial traffic, are not
939 subject to this clause. This provision targets deceptive marketing
940 practices that mislead artists and corrupt platform integrity
941

942 **Section 9 — Metadata Integrity, Sampling Clarity & Legacy Rights**

943 Section 9 outlines protections for artist metadata, ensures clarity
944 around derivative works (such as covers and samples), and secures
945 rights for families of deceased artists.

946 **9.1 — Metadata Protection**

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

950 NOMES will maintain a verified archive of metadata history to
951 prevent tampering and ensure artists can recover misattributed or
952 stolen work.

953 **9.2 — Reinstatement & Visibility Rights**

954 If an artist is exonerated following a fraud claim, the platform must
955 fully restore their prior standing. This includes:

- 956 • Playlist positions
- 957 • Stream counts
- 958 • Algorithmic ranking
- 959 • Artist dashboard access and visibility

960 **9.3 — Legacy Artist Protections**

961 Families of deceased artists may register with NOMES to protect
962 the legacy of the artist and prevent wrongful takedowns or
963 metadata tampering. They are entitled to:

- 964 • Receive any withheld royalties
- 965 • Challenge fraud flags or removals

- 966 • Request takedown of false or misattributed works

967 **9.4 — Covers, Samples, and Derivatives**

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

- 970 • May not remove such works without verifiable evidence of
971 infringement
- 972 • Must review derivative works under NOMES guidance before
973 any takedown
- 974 • Cannot auto-flag creative reinterpretations such as
975 transformative lofi covers without due process

976 **9.5 — International Protections & Reciprocity**

977 While this Act is grounded in U.S. law, it encourages international
978 collaboration in the enforcement of artist rights. NOMES shall work
979 to establish data-sharing and reciprocal protection agreements
980 with allied nations to ensure that foreign artists using U.S.-based
981 DSPs and distributors receive the same due process and fraud
982 protections outlined in this bill. U.S. artists using international
983 distribution services shall also be covered through reciprocal
984 agreements where available.

985

986

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

988

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

992

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

997

998 We now live in an era where independent creators are the
999 backbone of culture and commerce. Yet, they are the most
1000 vulnerable to abuse by platforms, labels, and distributors. Without
1001 legislative protection, American innovation, labor, and economic
1002 value will continue to be lost to systemic negligence.

1003

1004 By establishing NOMES (National Organization of Music Economic
1005 Safety), this Act provides due process, transparency, data integrity,
1006 and financial oversight — while incentivizing platforms and
1007 distributors to clean up their practices or face consequences.

1008

1009 The Artist Rights & Platform Accountability Act is not just a call for
1010 justice — it is a national economic intervention. Billions in revenue,
1011 jobs, and creative exports are on the line. The time to act is now.

1012

1013 We urge lawmakers, artists, industry professionals, and the public
1014 to support this legislation in defense of creative freedom, economic
1015 fairness, and the soul of the American music industry.

1016 **Closing Statement**

1017

1018 “An artist’s duty is to reflect the times in which we live.”

1019 — Nina Simone

1020

1021 The Artist Rights & Platform Accountability Act was written in
1022 response to a growing crisis facing the independent music
1023 community — a crisis of invisibility, exploitation, and digital
1024 erasure. When artists can be silenced by automated fraud flags,

1025 denied royalties without cause, and removed from platforms
1026 without explanation, the very foundation of cultural production is
1027 at risk.

1028
1029 This legislation is not a demand for favoritism — it is a call for
1030 fairness, transparency, and due process. It challenges the toxic
1031 belief that music must go viral to have value, and reminds
1032 lawmakers that behind every song is a human being, a taxpayer,
1033 and a citizen with rights.

1034
1035 But this is not only a cultural emergency — it is an economic
1036 one. Misapplied fraud flags, missing royalties, and metadata
1037 erasure have real financial consequences — not just for
1038 creators, but for the U.S. economy. When platforms and
1039 distributors mishandle revenue, it disrupts IRS oversight,
1040 reduces taxable income, and allows offshore laundering to thrive
1041 unchecked.

1042
1043 If passed, this Act would lay the groundwork for a more ethical,
1044 accountable, and artist-centered digital economy. It affirms that
1045 music is not disposable content — it is art, and it deserves to be
1046 treated with dignity under the law. By enforcing transparency and
1047 protecting digital labor, the Act also strengthens the nation's
1048 creative workforce and ensures that American-made culture
1049 continues to generate value — not just artistically, but
1050 economically, for the country as a whole.

1051
1052 Respectfully submitted,
1053 Kenan Ali Erkan
1054 Artist Name: Ali Prod™
1055 Date: May 2025
1056 All rights reserved to the author.

1057

1058 **A Note from the Author**

1059

1060 This Act represents a foundational shift in how artists are treated
1061 by the platforms that profit from their work — but it s only the
1062 beginning.

1063

1064 Future legislation — including proposals like the Artist Economic
1065 Reparations and Credit Act — will aim to recover lost royalties,
1066 create credit systems for removed artists, and build long-term
1067 financial protections for creators harmed by digital negligence.

1068

1069

1070 For press or legislative inquiries, contact: AliProd.Net@gmail.com

1071

1072 For artist support or testimony, please include “ARTISTS
1073 RIGHTS” in your subject line.

1074

1075

1076

1077 [Author’s Note on Process and Authorship](#)

1078

1079 This legislative proposal was not written in isolation, nor
1080 generated in a single pass. It was created through a deliberate,
1081 multi-stage process combining lived human experience with
1082 artificial intelligence — not as a shortcut, but as a tool for deep
1083 research, structured debate, and accelerated ideation.

1084

1085 Since first integrating AI into my creative workflow, I’ve spent
1086 over 120 hours using ChatGPT not just as a co-author, but as a
1087 real-time career strategist, branding advisor, and thought
1088 partner. Across over 2,200 messages, I’ve used this tool to
1089 reflect on personal experiences in the music industry, test ideas
1090 for my business, analyze my work, develop content strategies,

1091 build out website language, and refine my artistic identity as Ali
1092 Prod™.

1093

1094 That foundation of career-based dialogue gave me the clarity
1095 and confidence to begin building this legislation. More than 100
1096 of those hours were ultimately dedicated to this bill — developed
1097 through daily conversations, structured ideation, and focused
1098 collaboration.

1099

1100 I, Kenan Ali Erkan (Ali Prod), worked with the model in real-time
1101 dialogue, building this legislation section by section, one idea at
1102 a time. Each clause was debated, clarified, and refined under my
1103 full creative and intellectual supervision. Every theme, safeguard,
1104 and policy solution was rooted in my lived experience as an
1105 independent artist navigating systemic abuse in the modern
1106 music economy.

1107

1108 Importantly, this document could not have been created by
1109 simply “asking AI to write a bill.” If a random person attempted to
1110 generate this same policy using their own AI, the result would
1111 reflect their level of experience and the quality of their own
1112 discourse — not mine. AI does not generate conviction, nuance,
1113 or urgency. It reflects it.

1114

1115 I used AI to compress and organize complex information, but the
1116 logic, framework, and voice behind the Artist Rights & Platform
1117 Accountability Act are mine. The document is human-led from
1118 start to finish.

1119

1120 The Artist Rights & Platform Accountability Act is more than a
1121 policy proposal — it is a blueprint for artist empowerment and
1122 platform reform, made possible by blending firsthand struggle
1123 with modern tools. This method of authorship — tech-assisted
1124 but experience-led — is part of the message.

1125

1126 — Kenan Ali Erkan

1127 Ali Prod™

1128 May 2025

1129 All rights reserved to the author.

1130

1131 And yes — this was also AI-generated... through debate and
1132 discourse.

1133

1134

1135

1136

1137

1138

1139

1140

1141

1142

1143

1144

1145 Table of Contents

1146 • Introduction & Purpose pg. 1

1147 • Bill Objectives pg. 2

1148

1149 Section 1 — Definitions pg. 2

1150 Section 2 — Protected Rights for Artists pg. 5

1151 Section 3 — Distribution Oversight and Royalty Protections pg. 15

1152 Section 4 — Transparent Fraud Review Standards pg. 16

1153 Section 5 — National Oversight for Music Ecosystem Safety ... pg. 23

1154 Section 6 — Platform Accountability & Transparency Standards ... pg. 25

1155 Section 7 — Oversight, Enforcement & Artist Cooperatives pg. 27

1156 Section 8 — Playlist Ecosystem & Platform Accountability pg. 31

1157 Section 9 — Metadata Integrity, Sampling Clarity & Legacy Rights ... pg. 33

1158 Section 10 — Final Summary & Call to Action pg. 35

1159 Closing Statement pg. 36

1160 Signature & Note from the Author pg. 37

1161 Table of Contents (this page) pg. 41

1162

1163

1164

1165

1166

1167

1168

1169

1170

1171

1172

1173

1174

1175

1176

1177

1178