

THE CURRENCY OF CREATIVITY: EXPLORING MUSIC ROYALTIES

Ananya Kudesia*

ABSTRACT

The analysis highlights significant disparities in music streaming compensation, regional regulatory variations, and challenges with data accessibility. Major labels dominate the industry, often leaving independent artists struggling for fair compensation. Initiatives aimed at equitable revenue sharing are more prevalent in industrialized nations, which significantly impacts diversity and fair compensation on a global scale. Emerging technologies such as blockchain present potential new revenue sources, yet regulatory frameworks have not kept pace with these advancements. Recommendations to address these issues include democratizing data access, promoting diversity, and empowering artists. Collaborative strategies are essential to tackle regional challenges and support equitable compensation for all artists. Ensuring fair compensation and fostering diversity throughout the music value chain is crucial for maintaining a vibrant and inclusive music ecosystem. Additionally, there is a need for ongoing research and policy development to adapt to the fast-evolving landscape of music streaming and digital distribution, ensuring that all stakeholders, particularly independent artists, can thrive in this dynamic environment. The future of music depends on these concerted efforts.

Keywords: Music Royalties, Streaming Platforms, Major Labels, Independent Artists, Equitable Revenue Sharing, Regulatory Frameworks, Emerging Technologies, Diversity, Data Availability, Recommendations.

INTRODUCTION

The intricacy of music royalties is well-known; if you were expecting a straightforward situation where the artist receives a certain amount of money because their song had a certain number of plays on Spotify, you're going to be disappointed. There are a tonne of different parties involved, some of which are intermediaries taking a share and collecting royalties, while others are full proprietors of copyrights. Consider the following scenario: you are a songwriter or vocalist and Spotify is your music provider. Spotify will pay you various

*BBA LLB, THIRD YEAR, IIM ROHTAK.

royalties for each play, and in addition to Spotify, there will probably be a record label, publisher, distributor, and collective management organisation involved.

The dynamics of music royalties are multifaceted, influenced by a myriad of factors ranging from streaming algorithms to copyright laws, from artist contracts to consumer preferences. Understanding these dynamics requires a comprehensive exploration that goes beyond surface-level analysis. This study aims to peel back the layers of complexity surrounding music royalties, shedding light on the economic principles and practices that underpin this crucial aspect of the music industry.

One of the central themes that emerge when examining the economics of music royalties is the concept of compensation. At its essence, music royalties serve as a form of compensation for artists and rights holders, reflecting the value of their creative contributions. However, the question of what constitutes fair compensation remains a subject of debate and contention. Artists argue for greater transparency and equity in royalty distribution while streaming platforms strive to balance the need for profitability with the desire to support the creative community.

Furthermore, the economics of music royalties extend beyond the realm of artists and streaming platforms to encompass broader issues of copyright law, licensing agreements, and international regulations. As music transcends geographical boundaries and cultural barriers, the challenge of navigating the global landscape of music royalties becomes increasingly complex. Behind the melodies that captivate our ears lie intricate systems of compensation, distribution, and negotiation that determine how artists, record labels, and streaming platforms navigate the ever-evolving landscape of digital music consumption. This study aims to illuminate the path towards a more equitable and sustainable music ecosystem.

WHAT ARE MUSIC ROYALTIES?

The remuneration that songwriters, composers, recording artists, and their respective representatives receive as compensation for the permission to use their music is known as music royalties. The majority of the time, intermediary bodies collect these fees on behalf of the rights holders from institutions that use the music, such as TV channels, radio stations, venues, streaming platforms, and more. There are situations in which the user will pay royalties to rights holders directly; take the case of a big label receiving payment for

streaming services, for instance. Let's not, however, get ahead of ourselves. We need to define the two subgroups of music rights before we can fully discuss the many kinds of music royalties.

Every piece of music that has ever been recorded is subject to two different sets of music rights:

Composition: The harmony, melody, and lyrics are the property of songwriters and their music publishers. Every time a genuine and original musical composition is committed to a tangible medium, such as a notepad, sheet music, or even a single tweet, composition copyright is acquired.

Master: When a composition is transformed into a sound recording, it becomes a master, which is protected by copyright. Recording artists and their record companies hold masters if a recording deal is in place.

As a result, royalties for the licenced use of sound recordings and royalties for the approved use of compositions are the two main categories of music royalties. Different kinds of royalties may be generated by these two music rights, depending on how they are used and in which nation.

There are various categories into which music royalties fall. Royalties from music are generated in a variety of ways. Learn about the two most typical ones below:

Master Recording Royalties: These are the fees paid to producers, labels, and recording artists each time their works' sound recordings are purchased, downloaded, or streamed.

Neighbouring Rights Royalties: The performing artists and/or recording labels that own the copyright to the sound recording get adjacent royalties. Thus, they are next to performance rights from a legal standpoint, which is why they are referred to as "neighbouring rights."

Other types of music royalties:

Public performance royalties: are the sums of money that publishers and composers receive from Performing Rights Organisations (PROs) each time their music is aired in public.

Mechanical Royalties: When a songwriter's copyrighted musical composition is circulated or replicated in both physical and digital media, they are paid mechanical royalties.

Digital Performance Royalties: are the fees that webcasters and streaming music providers such as Pandora and SiriusXM are charged for using their content. Sound Exchange is used to compensate artists and owners of intellectual property.

Synchronisation royalties: describes the money made from the distribution of a copyrighted musical composition in video formats or other media, such as TV shows, movies, video games, or ads. Record labels and recording artists receive these royalties

WHO GETS PAID WHEN ROYALTY IS DEALT?

Recording Artists: A portion of all profits on the master side go to recording artists, who are considered partial proprietors of a master recording. This includes both featured and non-featured artists, who receive the majority of the royalties. The agreement recording artists sign with record labels and distributors specifies the precise percentage of royalties they earn. Thus, the following kinds of royalties are given to recording artists:

1. Mechanical royalties
2. Sync licensing fees (synchronization license)
3. Performance royalties

Record Labels: If a recording deal is in place, royalties on the master side are normally divided between the record companies and the recording artists. Record labels usually provide funding for production and/or release promotion in exchange for a sizeable portion of future master royalties. As a result, record companies receive a portion of all royalties owed to music artists.

Distributors: In a nutshell, the distributor's duties include getting the music of the artists onto streaming services, promoting the artists' work so that it is accessible on digital stores, and collecting streaming royalties for the artists. Like the PROs in composition, distributors receive a portion of royalties or a fixed fee for each payout in exchange. Distributors won't participate in neighbouring royalties or sync payments, though, as they typically just work on the streaming side of things. The recording royalties pipeline is made up of labels, distributors, and recording artists.

Licensing Companies and Syn Agencies: Sync agencies provide links between music users and the right owners by working with both the master and compositional sides of the music industry (keep in mind, syncs need to be cleared with both artists and songwriters). Typically, licencing businesses take a percentage of all sync costs that flow through them, whether they are assisting an artist to obtain a sync placement in the newest blockbuster or, conversely, helping the movie producers discover the music to fit the scene.

Songwriters: Songwriters own the composition and get a portion of the composition royalties, much like recording artists own a portion of the master recording and receive a portion of the master royalties. The writer's share and the publisher's share, each worth 50%, are allocated equal shares of copyright for any musical work that is created; however, this is only applicable in the United States. PROs pay writers directly for their writer's share; publishers are the only ones who can pick up the publisher's share. Thus, a songwriter without the support of a publishing house—even if that company is a self-established one—will forfeit this portion. To sum up, songwriters get:

1. Performance royalties
2. Mechanical royalties
3. Sync licensing fees (synchronization license)

Publishers: The songwriter is entitled to 50% of the performance and mechanical royalties, as previously mentioned. The publisher owns the remaining 50%. It is the publisher's responsibility to collect this portion of the royalties; however, this does not imply that the publisher keeps 50% of the royalties. In exchange for their administrative and/or promotional assistance in obtaining and optimising the composition royalties on behalf of the songwriter, the publishers usually take a cut of this share.

The precise conditions of the publishing agreement the publisher has with the songwriters determine the exact share that the publisher takes. Then, occasionally a sub-publisher—typically a huge, global corporation—will enter the picture and offer smaller publishers administrative services in exchange for a tiny cut of the royalties.

PROs (and other collective management agencies): On behalf of composers and publishers, PROs are the organisations that gather performance royalties and neighbouring rights. They are the composition's distributors, granting licences to listeners and distributing the proceeds to the rightful publishers and songwriters. Depending on the nation, there may

be one PRO handling all royalties, a few organisations handling different kinds of royalties (MCO for mechanical royalties, PRO for public performance), or even several rival PROs handling different kinds of royalties (as in the US, where ASCAP, BMI, and SESAC offer the same service). Additionally, regional PROs typically have partnerships with international PROs, forming a global network of organisations.

HOW DO ROYALTIES WORK?

→ Creation:

The process begins with creation: a songwriter composes a piece, and an artist records a song. As a result, two sets of the master and composition copyrights are made. Then, in order to market and financially support their work, artists typically sign a contract with a committed partner (publishers for composers, and labels for recording artists).

→ Intermediaries are contacted by artists and their representatives:

To access future royalties, the work must thereafter be distributed and/or registered. To licence music to streaming sites, recording artists and their labels must collaborate with distributors on the master side. Songwriters and publishers register their compositions with the PRO.

→ Putting it out in public:

The actual act of listening to music is the next phase, albeit it can take on almost any form. The song was played on local radio stations, which resulted in a public performance and possibly some nearby royalties. When a user of the streaming service hits the play button, royalties from streaming, mechanical, and public performance all start to accrue at the same time.

→ Royalties are distributed and collected by the intermediaries:

This phase can take many different forms, depending on the kind of royalties and music used. Essentially, though, the intermediary is paid by music consumers and also gets information about what, when, and how the music was listened to. The intermediary will then utilise that information to pay the appropriate rightful owners with the money that was collected. Sometimes, this function of identifying what receives what can be taken up by

music users themselves. For example, Spotify will keep track of all music played on the platform and award rights to the artists themselves; PROs and distributors will then only share the revenue.

→ **Payment is made to owners of rights:**

At last, the songwriters and artists receive payment, and they split the earnings with their collaborators, record labels and publishers. A portion of the streaming royalties, neighbouring royalties, digital performance royalties, and sync fees go to the artists and record labels. The sync fees, mechanical royalties, and performance royalties are all paid to the publisher and composers simultaneously (with a portion going to the PROs and distributors)

STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

The intricate economics of music royalties pose a multifaceted problem, as artists, labels, and streaming platforms grapple with equitable compensation amidst evolving digital consumption trends. This study aims to dissect the complexities surrounding royalty calculation, distribution, and their impact on artist livelihoods. Additionally, it seeks to address disparities in royalty earnings between established acts and independent musicians, shedding light on potential solutions to foster a more equitable and sustainable music ecosystem.

Journal of Legal Research and Juridical Sciences

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

1. To analyse the implications of the 2012 Copyright Act amendments on royalties for film and music.
2. To analyse the implications of online music distribution for independent artists.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Royalties for Artists versus Royalties for Authors and Composers by Henry Hansmann & Marina Santilli (2001):

The author here compares the possible justifications for the now-established systems of royalty rights for authors and composers with the justifications for visual artists' resale royalties. This comparison is particularly interesting because the economic justification for

paying authors royalties has not been well examined, and because some of the main objections stated against the resale royalties of visual artists also apply to authors' royalties.

Copyrights, Competition and Development: The Case of the Music Industry by Birgitte Andersen (2000):

This paper examines the connection between copyright and revenue generation in the audiovisual industry, specifically in the music industry, and makes the case that proper copyright administration is crucial to establishing the framework for a sustainable music industry. developing nations. However, further institutional arrangements will be required in nations hoping to better utilise their musical resources, as an effective copyright policy is not enough to ensure a thriving music business on its own.

Opening the Black Box of Music Royalties with the Help of Hybrid Intelligence by Philipp Ebel (2021):

With the combination of human and machine intelligence, the hybrid intelligence system presented in this article improves the current state of affairs. In the music industry, this study suggests design specifications for hybrid intelligence systems. By putting its ideas in a different environment, will, overall, increase the corpus of information about hybrid intelligence research. To further study and create hybrid intelligence in the music industry and beyond, academics and practitioners will build upon the outlined design criteria.

Journal of Legal Research and Juridical Sciences
Enforcement of Law of Copyright Infringement and Forgery with the Rise of the Digital Music Industry by Nevey Varida Ariani (2021):

The author discussed that in order for their artistic works to generate moral and financial benefits, musicians are encouraged by the present pandemic condition to be productive in producing digital works like as songs and music. On the other hand, digital music works are frequently copied and violated. In Indonesia's digital music market, royalties remain a problem, posing fresh difficulties for aggregators and Collective Management Organisations.

The issue raised by this research is how the rise of the digital business has affected the way copyright infringement and forgery laws are enforced.

Copyright Laws and Digital Piracy in Music Industries: The Relevance of Traditional

Copyright Laws in the Digital Age and How Music Industries should cope with the ongoing Piracy Culture by Rai, Prabin (2020):

The author discussed that in the twenty-first century, with the advent of the digital era, copyright rules that originated in the publishing age of the eighteenth century have gone a long way. Several conventions have been in place up to this point, including the Statute of Anne in 1710, the Music Modernization Act in the United States, and Article 17 in the European Union in 2018, however, problems in the music industries still exist or are becoming even more prevalent. However, with the introduction and widespread use of the internet, digital technologies have grown quickly, drastically altering old music business structures. Even after the RIAA was able to successfully shut down Napster, the music industry still suffered significant annual financial losses as a result of growing digital piracy.

Music streaming: is it a level playing field? by Daniel Antal (2020):

The competition between recordings on streaming platforms is one of these concerns, and this study explains and evaluates its foundation. It contends that the type of compensation limits the possibility of fair competition. playlists, agreements between artists and streaming services, and the significant bargaining power of large labels. The study indicates that a user-centric payment mechanism and more openness of the processes involved in creating playlists and negotiating agreements should be given immediate attention.

METHODOLOGY USED Legal Research and Juridical Sciences

The research methodology which has been used in the present research is doctrinal. Doctrinal research focuses on legal propositions and theories. It deals with doing an analytical study of current laws, related cases, and reliable literature on a given subject. The study will be focused on secondary sources. Secondary sources for the topic include scholarly books, research reports, journals, dissertations, textbooks, and relevant websites. These secondary sources have been examined for the present research to analyse ADR in Indian criminal disputes.

New Film and Music Rights under the 2012 Copyright Act

Regardless of whether they may have assigned the copyright in those works or whether they may not be entitled to the enjoyment of a performer's right, the Copyright Amendment Act,

2012 (the "2012 Act") clearly states that film performers (as mentioned in a film's credits) and the authors of certain underlying works used in cinematograph films and sound recordings have a (largely non-assignable) right to continuing royalties for the use of their works or live performances in certain circumstances. "Cinematograph films" refers to both feature films and television serials under the Copyright Act; nonetheless, for ease of use, "films" has been used here rather than "cinematograph films.")

The following sections of the 2012 Act are pertinent to the authors of underlying works included in motion pictures and sound recordings and deal with their ongoing claim to royalties:

New provisos added to section 18 of the Copyright Act.

“Provided also that the author of the literary or musical work included in a cinematograph film shall not assign or waive the right to receive royalties to be shared on an equal basis with the assignee of copyright for the utilization of such work in any form other than for the communication to the public of the work along with the cinematograph film in a cinema hall, except to the legal heirs of the authors or to a copyright society for collection and distribution and any agreement to contrary shall be void:

Provided also that the author of the literary or musical work included in the sound recording but not forming part of any cinematograph film shall not assign or waive the right to receive royalties to be shared on an equal basis with the assignee of copyright for any utilization of such work except to the legal heirs of the authors or to a collecting society for collection and distribution and any assignment to the contrary shall be void. ”

New sub-clauses added to section 19 of the Copyright Act,

“19(8) The assignment of copyright in any work contrary to the terms and conditions of the rights already assigned to a copyright society in which the author of the work is a member shall be void.

19(9) No assignment of copyright in any work to make a cinematograph film shall affect the right of the author of the work to claim an equal share of royalties and consideration payable in case of utilization of the work in any form other than for the communication to the public of the work, along with the cinematograph film in a cinema hall.

19(10) No assignment of the copyright in any work to make a sound recording which does not form part of any cinematograph film shall affect the right of the author of the work to claim an equal share of royalties and consideration payable for any utilization of such work in any form.”

As a result, the Copyright Act requires numerous "new" groups of people to receive royalties from individuals involved in the production of motion pictures:

S. No. Work Persons Amount Use

1. Film Scriptwriter, lyricist & composer Royalties are to be shared on an equal basis with the assignee of the copyright. Non-theatrical use
2. Film (including sound recording) Performer (who in the case of a film is not an ‘extra’) Unspecified Commercial use of their performances
3. Non-film sound recordings Lyricist, composer Royalties to be shared on an equal basis with the assignee of copyright. Any utilization of the underlying works in any form.

But the provisions don't exactly set the standard for clarity. In addition to the 2012 Act's use of ambiguous language to specify the types of uses for which royalties will be paid to the authors of underlying works, one of the main areas of misunderstanding is the amount and identity of the royalty payers.

Journal of Legal Research and Juridical Sciences

RESPONSIBILITY TO PAY THE ASSESSED ROYALTIES

Nobody is mentioned in any of the clauses pertaining to the requirement that royalties be paid to the designated writers and performers regarding who would be in charge of handling the royalty payments. The assignees, or the people to whom the authors granted rights (usually producers), would presumably be in charge of making sure the royalties were paid. The law does not, however, specifically say that assignees are in charge of making sure that these payments are made.

"The business of issuing or granting licence in respect of literary, dramatic, musical, and artistic works incorporated in [a] cinematograph films or sound recordings shall be carried out only through a copyright society duly registered under this Act," is all that the 2012 Act says in a proviso to Section 33. This appears to be limited to allowing content aggregators

to carry on with their business of widely licencing copyrights that are present in works free from statutory restrictions.

Therefore, it would be wise for those purchasing rights from assignees, in the absence of statutory guidance, to include clauses in their content acquisition agreements that expressly state that producers will make sure that performers and authors of underlying works receive the royalties that are due under the 2012 Act, and that assignees will indemnify those to whom they grant rights for any consequences of non-payment.

CALCULATION OF ROYALTY

The other matter that is quite confusing is the amount of royalties that must be paid. Regarding performers, the 2012 Act does not provide any clear indication of their entitlements. A reading of Sections 38A, 39A, 18 and 19, which grant the authors of the underlying works in films and sound recordings a continuing right to royalties, as well as Sections 38A, 39A, 18 and 19, and Sections 19, may collectively indicate that performers are entitled to an equal share of royalties in a manner similar to that of the authors of underlying works. This argument may be made in support of Section 38A, which grants performers the right to royalties. As with a lot of things in this field of law, it is speculation as to whether or not this is the case.

Regarding the writers of the underlying works, it is not entirely apparent how exactly the royalties will be determined. Regarding the authors of underlying works, the 2012 Act mentions "royalties to be shared on an equal basis with the assignee of copyright," although it's unclear exactly what this implies and there are a number of possibilities. A portion of the royalties obtained for the performance of the work would be the royalty owed to the author of the underlying work. Therefore, the only performance right for which a royalty would be due is the appropriate underlying work's performance right. For instance, if one were to look at the profits from song sales alone:

Option 1-

It is plausible that the rights contained in a work would not be distinguished, and the song's earnings—rather than the sound recording—would be regarded as indivisible property. Should it be the case,

Royalties would be split equally between the assignee, composer, and lyricist. Three people would presumably each be entitled to 33.33% if there were three parties involved. However, this amount would depend on the number of lyricists and composers, and the assignee's and authors' shares would decrease as the number of parties entitled to royalties increased.

Option 2-

It's feasible that rights inside work would be divided and that the song's earnings would be seen as having a divisible share of rights. In the event that each right was taken into account separately:

If there was only one composer, the assignee and the composer would split the earnings from the music right equally at 50%. If there were two composers, the assignee would receive thirty-three per cent, and the composers' share would decrease as the number of people entitled to royalties increased.

Because of this, it is unclear and how much royalty would be due, even while it is obvious that writers of underlying works in motion pictures and sound recordings, together with performers, do have an ongoing claim to royalties.

Implications of Online Music Distribution for Independent Artists

Streaming music facilitates accessibility, propagation, and exploration.

Journal of Legal Research and Juridical Sciences

Although commentators have been criticising the low payout per stream and/or the ambiguous explanations of how those payouts are split amongst rights holders in recent years, the latest research indicates that music streaming does offer independent musicians a number of benefits; in fact, the majority of them voluntarily post their music on the platforms. With the use of in-service 14 tools like artist radios, playlists featuring new artists, discovery algorithms, and other enhanced material, streaming platforms drastically reduce the cost of reaching big audiences and encourage the discovery of new artists. Both digital home recording and internet music streaming have significantly reduced the cost of music creation and delivery. Any unknown musician can simply have their music made available on Spotify, Apple Music, and other sites by paying a nominal charge to a "music aggregator" middle-entity like CD Baby or TuneCore. The distributor then gets paid by streamers on behalf of the artists. According to CD Baby's 2017 announcement, the company has paid out

\$80.1 million to independent musicians. As more artists utilise the service, these amounts are anticipated to rise (Rys).

Streaming services make money when users listen to more music, so they make a point of making sure users are discovering new artists. This increases the likelihood that independent musicians will gain a following, which is far higher than if they were to market their products without the help of streaming services. In order to discover listeners for their artists, Spotify, for example, employs an algorithm to match listeners with musicians that they would like. This is a successful use of analytics, something that independent artists find difficult to accomplish on their own. According to research by economists Luis Aguiar and Joel Waldfogel, the music industry tripled the number of new songs available between 2000 and 2008, just as online music distribution was taking off. This is strong evidence that music streaming has fueled large increases in new independent artists and music.

Even though record labels continue to play a significant role in the "superstar" music industry and get better streaming cuts than independent musicians, the same streaming behemoths that face criticism for their unjust payment policies have all but eliminated record labels' role as the "gatekeepers" of the music industry. These days, any musician may produce music that can be heard by millions of people, and their tracks can be found in the same internet streaming collection as Justin Bieber or Taylor Swift. Thus, music streaming has greatly democratised access to and distribution within a once controlled sector; regrettably, however, the compensation for digital music does not yield as favourable of results for independent performers.

Independent Artists Are Paid Differently for Music Streaming

The fact that streaming services pay very little to independent artists for each song stream has been made widely known by artists and the media in recent years. In 2018, for example, Apple Music paid \$0.00735 per stream, Spotify paid \$0.00473 per stream, and Amazon Music paid \$0.00402 per song stream. However, what many consumers are unaware of is that all major streaming groups pay artists through a pro rata payout system, which distributes user-generated revenue proportionately to all listening times. All user-generated revenue is allocated proportionately to all listening times under the pro rata concept. As a result, even if a music lover only listened to one artist, the musician would still receive a portion of the fan's payment from Spotify based on the artist's percentage of all Spotify

streams, with the majority going to "superstar" artists who receive the majority of streams. Money is allocated proportionately to each stream in the pro rata approach, which underpays independent artists and benefits stars.

The "user-centric model" is an alternate payout system that was proposed in 2017 by Finnish researcher Jari Muikku in collaboration with the Finnish Music Publishers' Association. Under this arrangement, a fan's payout revenue is restricted to the artists that the fan specifically listened to. Muikku created the following models for the two payout methods-

$$\text{Pro rata artist payout} = \frac{\text{Total streams of song}}{\text{Total platform streams}} * \text{Total platform revenue}$$

$$\text{User-centric payout} = \frac{\text{Total stream of songs by Listener A}}{\text{Total streams by Listener A}} * \text{Total revenue from Listener A}$$

According to Muikku's research, the user-centric payout model increased payouts to smaller artists while having no discernible negative impact on the payout rate of popular artists. This is because the model takes into account the possibility that some fans are only listening to a small selection of artists and may not be 16 years old when they listen to the top 25 "superstars." To put it succinctly, the user-centric compensation model is considerably more egalitarian and accurate because a fan's dollar only supports artists that

they find enjoyable. Songs and artists who account for a significant portion of a platform's stream traffic are granted an advantage under the Pro Rata compensation model.

Typically, streaming services like Spotify give seventy percent to rights holders ("More for Fewer for More") and retain thirty percent of subscription and ad revenue. In theory, Taylor Swift's rights holders would get two percent of the seventy percent of Spotify's revenue that goes towards paying artists if she accounted for two percent of all music streamed on the platform. This is known as Pro Rata rewards. The user-centric model, on the other hand, offers niche artists a significant advantage. For example, if a niche indie jazz artist has less than 100 listeners per month but their fan base is extremely loyal and primarily listens to that one band, then all of the payout revenues from those listeners would go to that one band exclusively. They would make a few hundred dollars a month instead of a few dollars for a tiny portion of all platform streams since they would keep all the money their devoted fans made.

Sadly, there are drawbacks to the user-centric streaming approach as well. For example, if stream revenue is distributed according to each listener's preferences, artists would profit more if a listener solely listened to their music, which would encourage a less diversified audience. Though less significant under the pro-rata approach, fans are aware that even with the current paradigm, their listening is what generates streaming money for artists. In conclusion, listeners would have significantly more control over where their money is spent in the music industry if a user-centric approach were used.

Distribution of Digital Music Boosts Alternative Income Streams

Apart from the impact on artist discovery and music royalties, artists have observed a rise in changes related to the source of the majority of their money. Where did artists go to make ends meet when industry profits collapsed with the death of the CD and the emergence of Napster and music piracy? Nowadays, revenue sources including touring, merchandise, and crowdfunding have all contributed to replace music's earnings as a commodity in addition to streaming. Pollstar study found that the average cost of a concert ticket has increased over time, with prices averaging eighty-six dollars in 2018 compared to an average of sixty dollars in 2008. Additionally, the average number of tickets sold for a musician's concert increased from 7,327 in 2008 to 8,637 in 2018 (according to the Mid-Year Business Analysis, page 18).

Even while it has always been a major source of revenue for artists, touring is now more important than ever to the business plans of many of them. Artists can efficiently distribute their music at little or no cost through audio streaming, which has lower payout rates but offers wonderful tools for discoverability. The idea is to build a fan base that will purchase concert tickets and merchandising. Furthermore, the majority of streaming services advertise artists' performances on their individual artist pages, which makes it simpler than ever for fans to get in touch and locate events to go to. Since 2000, purchased music—physical or digital—has steadily decreased (interestingly, save for vinyl albums); conversely, since the same year, concert and streaming revenue have increased practically inversely (“Putting the Band Back Together”). The International Federation of the Phonographic Industry's 2019 global report states that while digital downloads make up 12% of revenue, physical music sales only make up 25%. As of right now, digital downloads account for 37% of total revenue. The worldwide music industry's total download revenue fell by more than twenty percent in 2018 alone. Physical sales, which were already a small portion of their previous

level, fell by ten percent. Currently, thirty-four percent of industry revenues come from streaming (IFPI Global Report, 2019).

Apart from streaming and touring, "crowdfunding," which is essentially "the act of gathering funds for a project from a crowd," is another revenue stream that independent artists are using more and more. Artists will use websites like Kickstarter or GoFundMe to solicit contributions from their fan base in order to assist in financing album sessions or tour expenses. Frequently, tier-based benefits like autographed items or exclusive performances are used to advertise various donation levels. For instance, the "A Visual History" project campaign by the alternative music group Pixies raised \$234,450 via crowdsourcing.

These changes in revenue streams—streaming, touring, and crowdfunding—all serve to further distance artists from the necessity of a record company. Through crowdfunding, fans may effectively act as their own capital investors in the musicians they support, giving independent artists greater money and creative freedom—two things that are typically mutually exclusive in the music industry. It's crucial to remember that, despite the modifications to the revenue structure, the average annual income of musicians has remained relatively stable in recent years, averaging \$21,300 (according to the first Music Industry Research Association Survey of Musicians, 3).

Therefore, the methods used to collect that income are changing rather than the actual amount of income.

Journal of Legal Research and Juridical Sciences

OBSERVED TRENDS

The compensation of artists in the music streaming sector exhibits notable disparities. Major labels with a combined 66.1% global market share, including Warner Music Group, Sony Music Entertainment, and Universal Music Group, are able to provide artists with greater financial and administrative support, and they are more inclined to fund artists who can clearly show a return on investment. Thus, when an artist signs with a large label, their visibility on major streaming services increases, increasing their exposure and earning potential. A selected group of artists with sizable fan bases prior to their release are favoured under the Market-centric payment system (MCPS), the most popular revenue-sharing mechanism in the streaming sector. This is demonstrated by the fact that, in 2020, Spotify gave its top 57,000 musicians about 20.7 billion USD, while the remainder 7.94 million artists on the site took home 2.3 billion USD.

Most projects advocating equitable revenue sharing in the music streaming sector are situated in industrialised nations or have strong ties to them. Presently, developing-nation initiatives tend to be more dependent on financial and technical support from wealthy nations. Initiatives in the Global South, which typically support accessibility to the larger music industry and skills development, are given a different focus as a result of the digital access and skills gap, while initiatives in the Global North focus more on the music streaming industry itself, including syndication, data generation, and regulation.

There are significant regional variations in the maturity of regulatory and monitoring frameworks. Certain nations, primarily those in the Global North, have set up agencies tasked with keeping an eye on every stage of the value chain and promoting the growth of procedures like data reporting and publication, which have in turn assisted in the development of a more resilient and open ecosystem. Others, on the other hand, lack the infrastructure needed to implement laws against syndication, copyright infringement, and the protection of intellectual property rights that are tailored for the digital ecosystem. The disparity has specifically impacted how much diversity and fair compensation have been taken into account along the music streaming industry's value chain.

While the number and variety of online revenue streams and payment options for musicians are growing, legislation and policy pertaining to these models have not kept up. Blockchain and non-fungible tokens are two examples of new technologies that have emerged as potential sources of income for artists. Because these new revenue distribution mechanisms are frequently decentralised, artists get paid more quickly and with fewer middlemen. The pace at which these new technologies have developed, however, has made the discrepancy between actual implementation and related regulations worse. These events underscore the necessity for regulatory agencies to collaborate with industry professionals and other technology sector players in developing regulatory frameworks, particularly given the ongoing difficulty in regulating the streaming industries.

The availability and openness of data is a persistent problem that affects every stage of the music streaming value chain. Data is now more readily available and quantifiable because of the rise of streaming platforms and data-gathering businesses like Chartmetric. But information—especially on diversity and compensation—is frequently hard to get for all parties involved, and it's possible that artists at the bottom of the cultural value chain don't always receive it in an understandable way. Large volumes of streaming data are available

thanks to publications like Spotify's yearly Loud&Clear reports, but formalising regulation and monitoring also requires making sure that the data is accurate, consistent, comprehensive, and presented in a way that policymakers can easily understand and use. Additionally, there is a general dearth of trustworthy data to evaluate gender representation and diversity.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is imperative to democratise access to solid data for all parties involved in the music streaming value chain. Clear comprehension of the local music streaming ecosystem has been made impossible in several regions by the persistent lack of data creation, accessibility, and transparency; this has had especially negative effects on fair compensation for artists. Therefore, data efforts like Revenue Streams for African Musicians may be useful in helping musicians find the most effective ways for them to get paid. In order to gather more precise data, publicise it, and utilise it to create targeted policies, further data disaggregation (e.g., by gender, age, ethnicity, etc.) is also required for policymaking. Clear and quantitative indicators should be jointly created by industry stakeholders and put into practice on a global scale to help coordinate efforts towards shared objectives of enhancing the equity and openness of compensation structures and promoting variety.

Encourage diversity in music streaming and elsewhere. To protect and promote the diversity of cultural expressions, both within and beyond music streaming, it is imperative to invest in diversity-centric training, develop support schemes that empower stakeholders who belong to marginalised groups, involve experts in equality, diversity, and inclusion in the development of policies, and improve cultural and artistic education.

To guarantee that each individual action has the greatest possible impact, a comprehensive and cooperative strategy needs to be used. An integrated strategy that takes into account issues that are more common in some areas than others (such as lack of access to technology and the digital skills gap) needs to be implemented, both regionally and within the music streaming sector. All parties involved in the local streaming industry—including label executives and streaming platform employees— must be provided with the chance to participate in strategic conversations, for example, by forming syndicates or holding open forums or participatory policymaking sessions, in order to jointly decide how equitable compensation and diversity can be more effectively supported throughout the music value

chain. To lessen regional difficulties, these programmes might be expanded internationally through worldwide networks and peer-learning programmes. Furthermore, through investments, subsidies, or training to assist in scaling proof-of-concepts, policymakers can support stakeholders who prioritise diversity and fair compensation in their business models. They can also contribute to funding research aimed at continuously improving these two goals.

Artists ought to have the authority to capitalise on the importance and influence of patronage or fan-focused compensation schemes. Programmes ought to assist musicians who desire to use streaming services to connect with their audience and give them the resources and know-how to make money off of such connections. In the current environment, expanding the number of digital platforms where their music is available and diversifying their digital strategy are probably the greatest ways for musicians to make money from music streaming.

CONCLUSION

Music royalties play a crucial role in compensating artists for their creative work and ensuring they receive fair compensation for their contributions to the entertainment industry. The landscape of music royalties has undergone significant changes over the years, particularly with the advent of online music distribution platforms and amendments to copyright laws, such as the 2012 Copyright Act amendments. These changes have had both positive and negative implications for artists, particularly independent musicians.

The 2012 Copyright Act amendments introduced several provisions aimed at updating copyright laws to better address the digital age and protect the rights of creators. One significant change introduced by the 2012 amendments was the clarification of the rights of performers and producers in relation to the digital distribution of their works. This included provisions for the payment of royalties for the online streaming and downloading of music, ensuring that artists receive compensation for the use of their recordings on digital platforms. These amendments were intended to modernize copyright laws and address the challenges posed by digital piracy and online distribution. However, while they provided increased protection for artists in some respects, they also raised concerns about the concentration of power in the hands of major record labels and digital platforms. With longer copyright terms and stricter enforcement measures, independent artists may find it more difficult to access and use older recordings without facing legal repercussions or exorbitant licensing fees.

On the other hand, the economics of streaming and online distribution can be challenging for independent artists, particularly in terms of royalties. Streaming services typically pay artists a fraction of a cent per stream, which can result in relatively low earnings, especially for artists with smaller fan bases. While major label artists may still generate significant income from streaming due to their large audiences, independent musicians often struggle to make a living solely from streaming royalties. Furthermore, the rise of streaming has led to concerns about the fair distribution of royalties within the music industry. Critics argue that streaming services disproportionately benefit major labels and established artists at the expense of independent musicians. The algorithms used by streaming platforms to curate playlists and recommend music tend to favor popular and mainstream artists, making it difficult for independent musicians to compete for listeners' attention and earn royalties.

In this context, the role of music royalties becomes even more critical for independent artists seeking to sustain their careers and livelihoods. While streaming royalties may represent only a portion of an artist's income, they can still provide a valuable source of revenue, especially when combined with income from live performances, merchandise sales, and other sources. However, to maximize their earnings from streaming, independent artists must often navigate complex licensing agreements, distribution deals, and marketing strategies, which can be challenging without the support of a record label or management team.

Moreover, the COVID-19 pandemic highlighted the importance of diverse revenue streams for musicians, as live performances and tours were severely impacted by lockdowns and restrictions on public gatherings. Many independent artists turned to online platforms to livestream concerts, sell virtual tickets, and engage with fans directly, demonstrating the potential for new revenue opportunities in the digital realm.

In conclusion, music royalties are a crucial aspect of the music industry, providing artists with compensation for their creative work and ensuring that they can continue to pursue their careers. The 2012 Copyright Act amendments have introduced important changes to copyright laws, extending protections for artists and addressing the challenges of digital distribution. However, these changes have also raised concerns about the concentration of power and the economic challenges facing independent musicians.

The rise of online music distribution platforms has transformed the way music is consumed

and distributed, presenting both opportunities and challenges for independent artists. While streaming services offer the potential for global reach and exposure, they also raise questions about fair compensation and equitable distribution of royalties within the industry. Moving forward, it will be important for policymakers, industry stakeholders, and artists themselves to work together to ensure that music royalties continue to support a vibrant and diverse music ecosystem.



REFERENCES

STATUTES:

Indian Copyright Act, 1957.

Copyright (Amendment) Act, 2012

WEBSITES/ JOURNAL:

Global Music Report: The industry in 2019. IFPI. Available at: https://www.ifpi.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/Global_Music_Report-the_Industry_in_2019-en.pdf (Accessed: 22 February 2024).

Hansmann, H. and Santilli, M. Royalties for artists versus royalties for authors and Composers- Journal of Cultural Economics, SpringerLink. Available at: <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1023/A:1017923625973> (Accessed: 22 February 2024).

Innovation, Economic Development, and Intellectual Property in India, Oapen. Available at: <https://library.oapen.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.12657/23269/1006887.pdf?sequence=1> (Accessed: 22 February 2024).

Jaggi, N.K. (2023) Music industry rights under the copyright law., Jaggi Jaggi & Jaggi. Available at: <https://www.jjandjattorneys.com/post/music-industry-rights-under-the-copyright-law> (Accessed: 22 February 2024).

Jaipuriar, A. (2022) Right to royalty for underlying works: Conundrum in law and underlying issues - copyright - India, Right To Royalty For Underlying Works: Conundrum In Law And Underlying Issues - Copyright - India. Available at: <https://www.mondaq.com/india/copyright/1159656/right-to-royalty-for-underlying-works-conundrum-in-law-and-underlying-issues> (Accessed: 23 February 2024).

Bhalla, G. (2021) Know your rights under the Indian Copyright Laws, Lexology. Available at: <https://www.lexology.com/library/detail.aspx?g=3039effd-4a69-47fa-ba9b-e353abf16aa0> (Accessed: 23 February 2024).

Apps, S.G. link F.T.P.E.O. and May 25, 2012 (no date) New film and music royalties

under the 2012 copyright act, New Film and Music Royalties under the 2012 Copyright Act. Available at: <https://copyright.lawmatters.in/2012/05/new-film-and-music-royalties-under-2012.html> (Accessed: 23 February 2024).

Pitt, I.L. (2010) Superstar effects on royalty income in a performing rights organization - Journal of Cultural Economics, SpringerLink. Available at: <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10824-010-9123-1> (Accessed: 23 February 2024).

Revenue distribution and transformation in the music Available at: https://www.unesco.org/creativity/sites/default/files/medias/fichiers/2023/01/2-policy_perspectives_music_en-web.pdf (Accessed: 23 February 2024).

Mulligan, M. (2021) Music market shares: Independent labels and artists are even bigger than you thought, MIDiA Research. Available at: <https://www.midiaresearch.com/blog/music-market-shares-independent-labels-and-artists-are-even-bigger-than-you-thought> (Accessed: 23 February 2024).

Loud and Clear by Spotify (2024) Loud and Clear. Available at: <https://loudandclear.byspotify.com/> (Accessed: 23 February 2024).

The case of the music industry. Available at: https://unctad.org/system/files/official-document/dp_145.en.pdf (Accessed: 23 February 2024).

Hawaii Available at: <https://scholarspace.manoa.hawaii.edu/server/api/core/bitstreams/ee1d0238-9c28-47fc-9f9e-f129657a83eb/content> (Accessed: 23 February 2024).

Opening the black box of music royalties with the help ... Available at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/348232147_Opening_the_Black_Box_of_Music_Royalties_with_the_Help_of_Hybrid_Intelligence (Accessed: 23 February 2024).

Kozul-Wright, R. (2021) Copyrights, competition and development: The case of the music industry, Academia.edu. Available at: https://www.academia.edu/57698861/Copyrights_Competition_and_Development_The_Case_of_the_Music_Industry (Accessed: 23 February 2024).

The role of copyright in Creative Industry Development. Available at:

<https://www.researchgate.net/publication/319228869> The Role of Copyright in Creative Industry Development (Accessed: 23 February 2024).

Ariani, N.V. Law enforcement to copyright infringement of songs on the ..., Research Gate. Available at:

<https://www.researchgate.net/publication/328144382> Law Enforcement to Copyright Infringement of Songs on the Internet Media (Accessed: 23 February 2024).

Rai, P. (2021) Copyright laws and digital piracy in Music Industries : The ..., Research Gate. Available at:

<https://www.researchgate.net/publication/349494949> Copyright Laws and Digital Piracy in Music Industries The Relevance of Traditional Copyright Laws in the Digital Age and How Music Industries should cope with the ongoing Piracy Culture (Accessed: 23 February 2024).

Antal, D. (2021) Music streaming: Is it A level playing field? Data & Lyrics. Available at: https://dataandlyrics.com/publication/music_level_playing_field_2021/ (Accessed: 23 February 2024).

Hesmondhalgh, D. et al. (2022) Music creators' earnings in the Digital Era, SSRN. Available at: https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=4089749 (Accessed: 23 February 2024).

“copyright. lawmatters.in,

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0301679X23000014>,

ir.library.oregonstate.edu

en.unesco.org

www.ijlmh.com

www.unctad.org, law.kiit.ac.in, hdl.handle.net, uia.brage.unit.no, papers.ssrn.com, nypost.com, ueaeprints.uea.ac.uk, www.alexandria.unisg.ch, ipera.in”