TECHNICAL REPORT (PART B)

COVER PAGE

Part B of the Technical Report must be downloaded from the Portal Technical Report (Part B)/Termination Report screen, completed and then assembled and re-uploaded as PDF on that screen.

Note:

For EIC Accelerator actions: Please use this reporting template only for the final report. For additional prefinancing requests, this template should be replaced by the PPT used for the progress meeting (i.e. upload the PPT in place of the additional prefinancing report).

PROJECT	
Project number:	[101094872]
Project name:	[A 360 DEGREES PERSPECTIVE ON THE VALUE OF MUSIC]
Project acronym:	[Music360]

REPORTING PERIOD ⚠ *Please note that you must report on the entire reporting period.*	
RP number:	*[1]*
Duration:	from [01/03/2023] to [29/02/2024] M1 – M12

#@PER-REP-HE@#
#@PRO-GRE-PG@# [This document is tagged. Do not delete the tags; they are needed for the processing.]

1. Explanation of the work carried out and Overview of the progress

The Music360 project set out to meet three challenges in the European music industry:

(C1) **Distribution fairness.** Improve fairness of distribution of author- and neighboring rights by basing it on the actual use of music;
(C2) **Fair compensation.** Develop a method to measure the value of music, that can be used to motivate fair compensation for the use of music;
(C3) **Transparency.** Make the information about actual use of music, and of its value available to stakeholders and decision makers, respecting confidentiality requirements

To meet these challenges, we formulated five goals, each of which has been achieved in a workpackage.

1. We defined a conceptual framework that defines monetary and non-monetary value of music, and defines ways to measure it. This contributes to fair compensation.
2. We defined a decentralized data architecture to collect data from CMOs that preserves ownership of the data by CMOs. This contributes to distribution fairness.
3. We implemented the Music360 platform to collect data and present its value to stakeholders and decision makers, preserving confidentiality. This contributes to transparency.
4. We developed a business model for the platform that demonstrates its viability in the long run. This contributes to the uptake of our solution after the project is finished.

We validated the definition of value, the measurement method, the decentralized architecture and the platform by means of living labs in several European countries, performed by the CMOs in the project. The business model was validated by collecting feedback from musicians, the CMOs, from the worldwide associations of CMOs SCAPR and CISAC, and from EU policy makers.

1.1 Objectives

We separated goal 3 into two parts, reporting to stakeholders about the use of their music, and reporting to policy makers about the use of music in the entire ecosystem. This gives us five objectives.

Objective 1: Conceptualization and measurement of monetary and non-monetary value of music

This objective has been achieved. The results are documented in deliverable D1.2 (A framework to quantify and qualify the value of music – version 2).

Objective 2: Standardized, trusted and unified collection and representation of music metadata.

This objective has been partly achieved. The results are documented in three deliverables:

- D2.4: An ontology of the value of music – version 2
- D2.5: A distributed architecture and implementation for music data collection, representation, and distribution -version 2
- D2.6: Secure and trusted sharing of music data – version 2.

D2.4 and D2.5 are finished results validated by our living lab experiments. D2.6 defines a first version of a trusted architecture, but needs more work because current scientific results in secure multi-party computing turned out to have a larger distance to practice than we expected at the outset of the project.

Objective 3: Stakeholder-level reporting and analysis of the value of music.

This objective has been achieved and the results are documented in D3.2 (Reusable dashboards to present and analyze the value of music – version 2), which was validated in the living labs and focus group sessions with musicians and policy makers.The dashboard requires users to log in using the author identifier (IPI) and/or performer identifier (IPN) known by their CMO. This allows relating author and performer identifiers as well as relating the international standard codes for works (ISWC) and recordings (ISRC). This has not been achieved by any other system yet, and is an important contribution to the music sector.

Objective 4: Ecosystem-level reporting and analysis of music value creation, distribution and consumption.

Reporting to policy makers, journalists, researchers etc. requires aggregate data about the entire ecosystem that preserves anonymity. This objective was partially achieved and documented in D4.2 (Dashboard for ecosystem level value analysis -version 2). We created a dashboard that shows the structure of the music ecosystem and how each party in it creates and consumes value. Our intention was to automate the aggregation of data collected from CMOs but this proved too ambitious, because there is no uniform algorithm that transforms the available data into a form needed for the dashboard. In our demonstration of the dashboard we therefore performed this transformation manually. Our results do show that ecosystem-level reporting about value flows is an important decision support tool for policy makers.

Objective 5: Sustainable business model of the Music360 dashboard.

This objective has been achieved and the results are documented in D5.2 (Sustainable business model of Music360 dashboard – version 2). The business model of the Music360 dashboard is an extension of the ecosystem model developed for Objective 4 by including the dashboard in the model and indicating how it creates and receives value. We additionally defined a possible governance structure for the dashboard. The dashboard has been validated by collecting feedback from musicians, the CMOs, from the worldwide associations of CMOs SCAPR and CISAC, and from EU policy makers.

Each of these objects has been worked on by a workpackage. In addition, **Workpackage 6** performed experiments in living labs in the Netherlands, Ireland, Finland, Spain and Portugal.These were performed as intended.

Finally, **Workpackages 7, 8** and **9** dealt with dissemination, project management and ethics.

1.2 Explanation of the work carried out per WP

	Objective 1: Conceptualization and measurement of monetary and non-monetary value of music	**Objective 2: Standardized, trusted and unified collection and representation of music metadata.**	**Objective 3: Stakeholder-level reporting and analysis of the value of music.**	**Objective 4: Ecosystem-level reporting and analysis of music value creation, distribution and consumption.**	**Objective 5: Sustainable business model of the Music360 dashboard.**
WP1:	x				

Conceptualization and measurement of monetary and non-monetary value of music					
WP2: Standardized, trusted and unified collection of music metadata		x			
WP3: Stakeholder-level reporting and analysis of the value of music			x		
WP4: Ecosystem-level reporting and analysis of music value creation, distribution and consumption				x	
WP5: Sustainable business model of Music360 solution					x
WP6: Living labs	x	x	x	x	x
WP7: Dissemination, communication and exploitation			x		
WP8: Project management and data management					
WP9: Ethics guidelines					

Summary – *[VU-Jaap]*

- The Annex 1 to the Grant Agreement is known as your Description of Action (DoA).
- You must not replicate all the information you have in your deliverables, or copy/paste such information.
- It's important here to keep it a highlight of activities that allowed you to make progress towards or achieve your specific objectives, as you will be detailing these activities in the next section 1.2.
  In your proposal before you set objective related KPIs. So in this part of the report, you could add a table of those KPIs, with the related objectives, names, planned targets and the progress until the moment of reporting, together with some remarks if need be for additional explanations.

1.2.1 Work Package 1- Conceptualization and measurement of monetary and non-monetary value of music:

Explain the work carried out in WP1 during the reporting period giving details of the work carried out by each beneficiary/affiliated entity involved.

1. *Work Package 1- Conceptualization and measurement of monetary and non-monetary value of music:*

Explain the work carried out in WP1 during the reporting period giving details of the work carried out by each beneficiary/affiliated entity involved.

** You must not replicate all the information you have in your deliverables, or copy/paste such information.)*

** I have copied the text for information and convenience. Text highlighted in yellow will be deleted.*

Lead: [GMT → UPV]

Input: [VU, TVE, UPV → GTM,BMAT,IMRO]

WP1 - Conceptualization and measurement of monetary and non-monetary value of music:

The aim of Music360 is to capture the full spectrum of values associated with background music, extending beyond purely economic metrics. In this context, the tasks carried out in WP1, led by GMT and UPV, constituted the foundation for the ontology developed in WP2 and for the subsequent configuration of the dashboard. WP1 identified, defined and measured all relevant value dimensions of background music to provide robust information on stakeholders involved in value creation, the types of venues to be selected for experimentation, and the specific value outcomes to be pursued. This work was developed in close coordination with WP6, ensuring regular exchange of information and alignment across the project.

Consortium meetings were central to consolidating and refining this work:

Valencia, September 2023: initial discussions defined the set of value dimensions to be included in the model and clarified the relationships between variables and expected outcomes.

UPV, April 2024: dedicated sessions on the living labs and on the value-analysis dashboard helped align conceptual development, data requirements and technical specifications.

Dublin, September 2024: the consortium reviewed the status of the living labs, discussed lessons learned for the second round, and conducted a specific workshop on Deliverable D1.2.

Finland, April 2025: partners worked on integrating social and health value dimensions into the dashboard and reviewed the expected outputs for each living lab.

Lisbon, September 2025: the consortium revisited the progress and results of the living labs in the context of D6.6 and prepared contributions for the final reporting.

This iterative and collaborative process ensured strong coherence between the conceptualisation in WP1, the experimentation carried out in WP6 and the technical requirements transferred to the platform, reinforcing the internal consistency of the project.

Description of work progress

As a result of WP1, a comprehensive framework for quantifying and qualifying the value of music has been established. The development process followed an iterative three-step approach: 1) a systematic review of previous studies on the value of background music; 2) the adaptation of different value-assessment models to the specific contexts of the living labs; and 3) a refinement of the framework based on the primary data collected during these studies.

This process enabled Music360 to integrate validated value dimensions into the platform, providing real evidence on how background music generates diverse forms of value for different stakeholders.

The progress achieved in WP1 resulted from continuous coordination across the project. Feedback obtained during the Valencia meeting in September 2023 played a key role in refining the conceptual model and clarifying the links between values, stakeholders and expected outputs. Subsequent consortium meetings further aligned WP1 with the design and implementation of the living labs, the definition of measurement strategies and the technical and analytical requirements of the Music360 dashboard.

Tasks

- T1.1a/b Modelling the value of music (Q1.1, Q1.3).

T1.1a/b focused on developing a conceptual model of the monetary and non-monetary value of music, addressing Q1.1 (identification of value components) and Q1.3 (relationships among value dimensions and implications for measurement). The work followed a structured and collaborative approach involving all WP1 partners.

The task began with an academic literature review covering the economic, emotional, social, cultural and health-related values of music. This review was jointly conducted by VU (economic and monetary perspectives) and UPV (non-economic value dimensions). The analysis revealed that prior literature is well developed for economic value—particularly indirect effects—and for individual/private values such as emotional responses and therapeutic benefits. In contrast, shared and public values (cultural, social and ethical) are significantly less studied, indicating the need for a broader integrative framework.

Based on this review, partners collaboratively developed a multi-perspective conceptual framework integrating the different forms of value and linking them to the contexts in which background music is used. VU, GTM and UPV contributed to identifying value mechanisms affecting customers, IMRO focused on employee-related value dimensions, and UPV provided input regarding patient-oriented and well-being dimensions. TVE contributed insights on venue typologies—retail, hospitality, festivities, health, and others—and how value creation varies across these environments.

This framework also incorporated the perspectives needed to prepare the living labs. BMAT contributed with expertise on music data, metadata structures and technical constraints relevant for subsequent measurement in WP2 and WP6, ensuring feasibility of operationalisation. GTM, IMRO, TVE, BMAT, UPV and VU jointly discussed and validated the proposed value dimensions and their interrelations during project workshops (WS2 and WS5), both held with physical attendance. These collaborative sessions enabled each partner to contribute domain-specific insights and refine the conceptual architecture.

Overall, T1.1a/b produced a validated conceptual model that defines: a) the key monetary and non-monetary value components of music (Q1.1), b) the stakeholders and venues in which these values emerge, and c) the hypothesised relationships among value drivers, emotional responses and measurable outcomes (Q1.3), forming the basis for subsequent field studies and experimental interventions.

This multi-stakeholder, multi-context model provides the conceptual foundation for measurement strategies in WP1, the ontology in WP2, and the experimental design of the living labs in WP6.

- T1.2a/b Measuring value of music (Q1.2).

In this task, carried out in close coordination with WP6 and the design of the living labs, the objective was to determine how the different value dimensions of music can be measured according to the type of stakeholder and the characteristics of the venue (VU, GTM, UPV, BMAT). To guide this work, we developed a matrix that distinguishes between indoor and outdoor venues, economic and non-economic value dimensions, and the specific use of background music (as opposed to foreground music). This matrix served as a foundational tool

for selecting appropriate measurement approaches and identifying priority areas for data collection.

In parallel, the music ecosystem was analysed (TVE, UPV) to map stakeholders, clarify how value is created and transferred, and identify relevant research questions for each living lab. Based on these questions, methodologies were adapted to the objectives and context of each lab. Quantitative methods were selected for economic value dimensions and for non-economic values with measurable economic spill-overs (VU, GTM, IMRO). For non-economic value dimensions (UPV)—far less studied and requiring deeper exploration—we adopted qualitative or quantitative methods depending on the objectives and venues.

Measuring non-economic values posed several specific challenges. For example, assessing the therapeutic value of music required identifying an appropriate scale to capture patients' benefits. In the living lab involving cancer patients, background music was found to improve anxiety, relaxation, pain, fatigue and other symptoms associated with cancer. To capture cultural and social value in popular festivities and community-based events, UPV adapted selected items from validated measurement models identified during the literature review. Ethical value was addressed primarily through qualitative approaches, focusing on the transmission of positive values through music and its broader social meaning within the event.

Workshops WS2 and WS5 provided an important space for aligning the preparation of the living labs. Partners shared methodological considerations, discussed how to collect data effectively (with technical support from BMAT), and adjusted measurement strategies according to stakeholder profiles and the specific value dimensions to be analysed.

- T1.3a/b Analysing value of music (Q1.4).

The previous tasks enabled us not only to analyse the data collected in the living labs but also to refine the conceptual framework itself, generating new insights—for example, regarding ethical value (UPV) or the impact of non-copyrighted music (GTM). The analysis of the living labs resulted in the identification of new playlist features (BMAT, UPV), evidence of stronger impacts on employees (IMRO, VU), and comparative findings on the effects of live versus recorded music in patient contexts (UPV). Results obtained from the two music-therapy tools demonstrated that different musical approaches yield distinct therapeutic benefits, providing evidence to support the personalisation of background music to enhance its therapeutic value.

Additional living lab results (Netherlands, Finland) contributed to understanding how background music can improve servicescapes, benefiting both employees and customers (Finland, Netherlands), or enhance the overall user experience (UPV). Findings from a study in Spain also highlighted the relationships among cultural, social and emotional value. In another study in Spain, ethical value was examined in depth, focusing on how music contributes to the transmission of positive social meanings and values.

The joint presentation and discussion of national studies during the workshops generated valuable synergies, supporting a broader assessment of the measures employed by different venues and the value dimensions perceived by various stakeholders. These exchanges also facilitated the integration of study data into both the dashboard and the CMO model, strengthening the alignment between empirical findings, conceptual reasoning and platform requirements.

Deliverables

- D1.1: A framework to quantify and qualify the value of music – version 1 (month 5).

D1.1, led by UPV with contributions from VU and TVE, established the initial framework for conceptualising the different dimensions of value associated with background music. The deliverable identified how these value dimensions vary across venues and stakeholders and provided a structured approach to distinguish and describe these differences.

Once the variability and multidimensional nature of value were recognised, the team examined how each value dimension could be operationalised—translating conceptual definitions into measurable variables and indicators. This first version of the framework therefore represented

an essential starting point, enabling the identification of key concepts to be measured as well as the methods and tools suitable for doing so.

D1.1 served as the foundation for the design and implementation of the first round of living labs (UPV, VU, GTM, IMRO). The insights generated in this deliverable also informed the initial specification of the data requirements for the Music360 dashboard (UPV, VU, BMAT), ensuring coherence between conceptual development, empirical testing and platform needs.

- D1.2: A framework to quantify and qualify the value of music – version 2 (UPV)(month 10) (R2/R3/R4)

D1.2, led by UPV, refined and expanded the initial framework based on the first results obtained from the living labs. This second version integrated the insights generated during the early implementation phase and identified additional information required for the second round of living labs (VU, UPV, GTM, IMRO, BMAT).

The evaluation of the framework enabled the inclusion of new value dimensions—such as ethical value—and supported a more systematic comparison of stakeholder groups (e.g., customers vs. employees). These comparisons helped identify patterns of congruence and shared values across different users of background music, improving the robustness and applicability of the model.

Overall, D1.2 strengthened the conceptual foundations of the project by ensuring that the framework evolved in response to empirical evidence, thereby improving its relevance for subsequent measurement activities and for the integration of data into the Music360 dashboard.

1.2.2 Work Package 2 - Standardized, trusted and unified collection of music metadata

** You must not replicate all the information you have in your deliverables, or copy/paste such information.)*

** I have copied the text for information and convenience. Text highlighted in yellow will be deleted.*

Lead: [UPV]
Input: [VU, UPV,BMAT]

WP2 - Standardized, trusted and unified collection of music metadata:

Overall, WP2 has been carried out through a collaborative and iterative process to obtain the first and second version of the different deliverables. The work carried out in WP2 has been distributed among the project partners according to their specific expertise, resulting in a complementary and coordinated effort towards the development of a standardized, trusted, and unified music metadata ecosystem

UPV together with the close collaboration of BMAT and VU has led the conceptual formulation and technical implementation of WP2, particularly the design and development of the distributed architecture of the Music360 platform. During the first deliverables version (V1) UPV has been responsible for defining the Music360 Ontology and the supporting Architecture together with VU (Deliverables D2.1 and D2.2). Thus, implementing the core backend components such as APIs, data ingestion pipelines, and integration services. In the second iteration (v2). UPV and BMAT further refined the architecture by introducing a more modular and efficient technology stack, improving data processing capabilities, and supporting large-scale distributed data management.

VU has played a central role in the conceptual and security-related aspects of WP2. This includes the development and alignment of the ontology and data model with the project's conceptual framework, as well as the design and implementation of the security framework (Deliverables D2.3 and D2.6). VU has defined authentication and authorization mechanisms, access control models, and data governance principles. In the second version, VU has also led the exploration and validation of privacy-preserving computation techniques, enabling secure data analysis across multiple stakeholders without disclosing sensitive information

BMAT has contributed mainly to data-related aspects and technical implementation support. Its work includes the provision and handling of real-world music data, the development of data ingestion and transformation processes, and support for metadata harmonization across heterogeneous sources. BMAT has also contributed to the implementation and testing of architectural components, ensuring that the system is capable of integrating and processing real industry data effectively.

The different Music360 partners, including CMOs, have supported WP2 by aligning the technical developments with value modelling requirements. Their contribution focuses on ensuring that the architecture and data structures adequately support the measurement of both economic and non-economic value of music, as defined in the project. They have also contributed to requirements analysis and validation of the system design from a value network perspective. In particular, partners responsible for living labs execution have contributed by providing requirements, domain knowledge, and real datasets. They have participated in empirical validation activities, helping to refine the architecture and ensuring that the developed solutions are aligned with real-world needs and constraints.

Description of work progress

The work carried out in WP2 has followed a structured and iterative process, progressing from conceptual design to implementation and validation, and is reflected across both the defined tasks and their corresponding deliverables.

Tasks

- T2.1a/b Designing an ontology for the value of music (Q2.2) (Lead: UPV; Stichting VU, BMAT). This leads to D2.1 and D2.4. The tasks require workshops with physical presence (WS2, WS5).

T2.1a/b focused on developing a common ontology for music metadata, defining the key entities, relationships and value dimensions relevant to the music ecosystem. The ontology specification was iteratively improved through different workshops and working meetings, in which Music360 partners participated in order to collect and analyse the complexity of the music value chain. Particular attention was given to the experience of the participating CMOs regarding royalty distribution and the use of standards such as DDEx, as well as the role of TVE in aligning different perspectives within a common organisational model.

The outcome of this task was initially captured in D2.1, which introduced the first version of the ontology mainly focused on the monetary value of music. It was later refined in D2.4, where the model was extended and aligned with the needs of stakeholders and the integration of new requirements about non-monetary values and more complex music analysis.

- T2.2a/b Designing and implementing a platform for data collection and representation (Q2.1, Q2.5) (Lead: UPV; participants: Stichting VU, BMAT). This refers to M2 (M10) and M6 (M25), and D2.2 and D2.5.

T2.2 addressed the design and implementation of the data collection and representation architecture used as the backbone of the Music360 platform. The initial results of this work were documented in deliverable D2.2, which defined a baseline architecture incorporating core components such as APIs, data ingestion pipelines and aggregation services. TVE, VU and UPV mainly supported this initial version.

As the project progressed, this architecture was further refined and expanded in D2.5, which introduced version 2 of the architecture. Refinement of the Music360 architecture also involved BMAT, which provided a practical perspective on music usage and facilitated the process of enriching information about music to visualising music analysis.

This updated architecture supports decentralised data collection, enabling multiple data providers to contribute to the dataset while retaining control over their own data. It also ensures interoperability through shared schemas and open standards. Improvements in scalability, performance and extensibility have also been incorporated, reflecting feedback from implementation and validation activities. Implementing the Music360 platform brought the concepts and designs proposed for the Music360 Ontology and Architecture, which has been validated by the CMOs involved in the project during different working sessions and demo days.

- T2.3a/b Designing and implementing security mechanisms for controlled data access (Q2.3/Q2.4) (Lead: Stichting VU; participants: UPV, BMAT). This leads to D2.3 and D2.6.

The focus of T2.3 was to ensure secure and trusted data sharing within this distributed environment. The initial security framework, which included core mechanisms such as authentication, authorisation and access control, was defined in. In this task, the focus shifted towards enabling secure collaboration in multi-party and partially untrusted

environments. Consequently, privacy-preserving computation techniques, such as secure multi-party computation, were explored.

Deliverables

- D2.1: An ontology of the value of music – version 1. This a machine processable version of the conceptualization in D1.1. (UPV)(month 8) (R5).

The main focus of Deliverable D2.1 was on representing the monetary value of music, as well as the concepts and relationships involved in music creation and royalty payments. To achieve this, initial ontology workshops were performed in Amsterdam and Valencia in order to capture the complexity of the music value chain in the different countries involved. This also involved analysing the various data models currently used by CMOs to represent their music management information for royalty payments.

- D2.2: A distributed architecture and implementation for music data collection, representation, and distribution -version 1. First version of a system to store and obtain data concerning the value of music in a distributed way, e.g. without using centralized information sources. Challenge is to include information sources from IPR societies, additional information collected by BMAT, and information from customer surveys (UPV) (month 10) (R6)

D2.2 provided the initial architecture that was primarily designed for VU and TVE, and was implemented alongside UPV and BMAT. This set of components captures data from various providers and loads it into a common data model based on the first version of the Music360 Ontology. Implementing specific APIs enabled users to control the loading and access of data according to their roles. This deliverable demonstrated the possibility of exchanging and analysing data from CMOs in different countries and the possibility of enriching the music information (using BMAT technology) to obtain an overview of the monetary value of music in different venues.

- D2.3: Secure and trusted sharing of music data – version 1. First version of a security architecture. The focus will be on authorization and access control of information stored at various sources (Stichting VU) (month 12) (R7)

D2.3. Included the use of standard protocols and the implementation of fine-grained access restrictions. It was relevant to make proper characterization of music stakeholders and the roles supported in the Music360 platform. For this purpose different workshops were performed with CMOs and other industry actors.

- D2.4. An ontology of the value of music – version2

D2.4 improved the initial ontology definition (D2.1), taking into account the results of the living labs and the feedback received from the Music360 partners during the workshops held in Barcelona, Dublin and Valencia. The Music360 Ontology v2 supports enriched analysis for further research and the empirical evaluation of the impact of music, as well as improving the characterisation of the value of music from monetary and non-monetary perspectives. This evolution ensured that the ontology could support interoperability across heterogeneous data sources and the representation of complex value-related concepts.

- D2.5 Deliverable D2.5 corresponds to the working prototype of the Music360 that demonstrates the feasibility of integrating multiple data sources, managing distributed data, and providing unified access and visualization capabilities. The implementation also incorporates the security mechanisms defined in T2.3 (D2.3 and D2.6), ensuring that the system is both functional and trustworthy.

D2.5 involved reengineering the initial architecture with technological components to support more demanding data loading scenarios, thereby improving the performance and response time of the original version when managing large volumes of music data. The second version of the Music360 architecture was mainly led by UPV in collaboration with BMAT. VU played a significant role in the validation process, aligning the requirements of the various stakeholders with the capabilities of the architecture by conducting demonstrations and validation activities with real users.

- D2.6

This work was significantly expanded upon in D2.6, representing the second version of the security framework.

D2.6 was validated through concrete scenarios led by VU and TVE and performed by different CMOs and Living Lab owners. These developments allow stakeholders to carry out joint analyses of sensitive data without revealing the underlying information, thus strengthening the 'trusted' element of WP2.

1.2.3 Work Package 3 - Stakeholder-level reporting and analysis of the value of music

** You must not replicate all the information you have in your deliverables, or copy/paste such information.)*

** I have copied the text for your information, structure and convenience. Text highlighted in yellow will be deleted.*

Lead: [BMAT]
Input: [VU,BMAT]

WP3 - Stakeholder-level reporting and analysis of the value of music

Description of work progress

Tasks

- T3.1a/b Designing an implementing stakeholder data presentation tools (Q3.1/Q3.2) (Lead: BMAT; participants: Stichting VU). This results to M43(M15) and M8 (M31), D3.1 and D3.2. These tasks will have a physical workshop meeting (WS3, WS5)

- T3.2a/b Music360 platform value analysis and reporting tools (Q3.1/Q3.2) (Lead: BMAT; participants: Stichting VU). These tasks require a physical workshop, which will be co-located with WS3 and WS5.

Deliverables

- D3.1 Reusable dashboard to present and analyze the value of music - version 1. Web frontend for stakeholder-oriented modelling and value analysis. (BMAT)(month 15) (R8)

- D3.2 Reusable dashboards to present and analyze the value of music – version 2. A revisited version of the dashboard, including the lessons learned by the Living Labs. (BMAT)(month 31) (R8)

1.2.4 Work Package 4 - Ecosystem-level reporting and analysis of music value creation, distribution and consumption

** You must not replicate all the information you have in your deliverables, or copy/paste such information.)*

** I have copied the text for your information, structure and convenience. Text highlighted in yellow will be deleted.*

Lead: [TVE]
Input: [TVE, VU,BMAT]

WP4 - Ecosystem-level reporting and analysis of music value creation, distribution and consumption

Description of work progress

While individual stakeholders are interested in transparency of value creation, distribution and consumption of music in which they are involved, policy makers and strategic planners are interested in collecting information about the entire ecosystem. For example, policy makers are interested in the royalty cash flow across national borders is, or in the international distribution of locally produced music. This ecosystem-level information is aggregated and anonymous.

In Music360 we reengineered the e3web software tool for ecosystem modeling with the e3value notation into the ecosphere toolset that can be securely fed with data from the Music360 platform. Development was done at the VU (for security mechanisms), TVE (for the development of the Ecosphere tool) and BMAT (for the relation with the stakeholder-level dashboard). In addition to the physical project meetings where we coordinated work, there were weekly online meetings with all developers to ensure coordinated progress.

Our work on Excosphere breaks down into the following tasks.

Tasks

- T4.1 Designing and implementing graphical ecosystem modeler tool (Q4.1) (Lead: TVE; participants: Stichting VU, BMAT) .

We tested the ecosystem modeling language e3value on the music ecosystem by producing an e3value model of the music ecosystem of each of the countries participating in Music360. We generalized this into a generic EU model and extended this with an ecosystem model for the Music360 platform. These exercises showed that e3value is powerful enough to represent the EU music ecosystem.

We also overhauled the existing e3value toolset (e3web) into a more user-friendly web-enabled system, Ecosphere, with a plug-in architecture that can facilitate data feeds from data that the various CMOs in the project make available to the Music360 platform.

T4.2 Extending ecosystem modeler tool for full support of the e3value language (Q4.1) (Lead: TVE; participants: Stichting VU, BMAT) .

To create full support for e3value we reengineered the e3value metamodel and implemented it in Ecosphere. This includes the addition of a transaction editor, and a reporting pane where warnings and errors are shown during ecosystem modeling and analysis. We also adapted the numerical execution engine of e3web for Ecosphere, so that we can generate ecosystem-level value flow analysis, which includes cash-flow analysis for the entire ecosystem.

We revised the backend structure of e3web, now Ecosphere, completely, to comply with the chosen security architecture. First of all, this means that we introduced OAuth2/OpenIDConnect authentication in the platform, in the way proposed in deliverables D.2.3 and D2.6. This also resulted in a completely new implementation of the backend platform using resource sources (according to the OAuth 2.0 terminology).

T4.3 Ecosystem tooling extended with secure access to live music value data feeds (Q4.2/Q4.3) (Lead: TVE; participants: Stichting VU, BMAT).

We have demonstrated with the RAAP/PPI case study (see also D6.6) that the Ecosphere toolset can do calculations that are interesting for policy makers. An example of this is the amount money that shifts from Rome Treaty performers to non Rome-treaty performers as a result of the RAAP/PPI verdict. The analysis, based on the Music360 data, needs a manual step, as the data coming from the Music360 platform is not directly suited to ecosystem level calculations, and the translation from the Music360 usage to data that is usable in the Ecosphere toolset is highly domain dependent.

Deliverables:

- D4.1: Dashboard for ecosystem modelling – version 1. Software tooling to model music ecosystems including valuation assessment on the ecosystem level. Focus on graphical modelling of monetary and non-monetary value flows in an ecosystem.

Deliverable D4.1 concerns the revised graphical editor as a component that runs in the web browser and hence does not require software installation by the end user anymore. Furthermore, the deliverable is about an implementation of the net value flow calculation for each actor in the business ecosystem. This allows us to do financial sustainability assessments on the actor level. Finally, we changed the backend of the platform such that it fits the Music360 architecture.

We documented the Ecophere system in D4.1.

- D4.2: Dashboard for ecosystem level value analysis -version 2. Focus on inclusion of data feeds on the value of music.

A browser component was developed to offer created e3value models to users in a structured way. This concerns frontend development in Angular. Similar, a new workspace for users was developed.

We migrated the platform to a microservice architecture (which is the foundation for the overall Music360 architecture). The microservice architecture implements a plugin system, where functionality can be added or removed to/from the platform.

We further developed automated financial assessment of the business ecosystem on a per actor basis. Access control is fully executed by the database management using Row Level Security. Again, this follows the guidelines as specified by the Music360 architecture, and it ensures that security as close as possible to the data to be protected. This fits the requirements by the stakeholders if the platform provider is a trusted party.

A case was developed about the RAAP/PPI case, which is a court verdict concerning the eligibility of non-Rome treaty productions about neighbouring rights. It serves as an interesting example to policymakers how the effects of laws and court verdicts can be analysed at the business ecosystem level. To do so, we took data about the number of plays of recordings collected by the Dutch living lab, and used that data to feed into the business model of the music ecosystem. The connection is semi-automated; the data is extracted from the database following the Music360 database model. Then it is converted into a format that Ecosphere, and the e3value model, can understand. This conversion is semi-automatical: the data provided is a very different format than required by the e3value model. Nevertheless, we have demonstrated that it is possible to use collected data by the living lab in ecosystem-level analysis using Ecosphere.

All this is documented in D4.2.

1.2.5 Work Package 5 - Sustainable business model of Music360 solution

** You must not replicate all the information you have in your deliverables, or copy/paste such information.)*

** I have copied the text for your information, structure and convenience. Text highlighted in yellow will be deleted.*

Lead: [SENA]
Input: [TVE, VU,BMAT, BUMA, GDA, IMRO]

WP5 - Sustainable business model of Music360 solution

Description of work progress

Tasks

- T5.1a Designing and validating Music360 platform business model v1. Focus on sustainable business model. (Q5.1/Q5.2) (Lead: SENA; participants: TVE BUMA, BMAT, GDA, IMRO) . This results in D5.1. This task requires a physical workshop (WS2).

- T5.1b Designing and validating Music360 platform business model v2. Focus on scaling up. (Q5.3) (Lead: SENA; participants: TVE, BUMA, BMAT, GDA, IMRO). This leads to D5.2. This task requires a physical workshop (WS5).

Deliverables:

- D5.1 Sustainable business model of Music360 dashboard – version 1. A sustainable ecosystem business model of the Dashboard and data collection mechanisms of the four participating countries, tested in simulations. (SENA)(Month 16) (R10)

- D5.2 Sustainable business model of Music360 dashboard – version 2. A revised and scalable, validated business model for the Dashboard, based on experiences and interviews in WP6. (SENA)(Month 32) (R10)

1.2.6 Work Package 6 - A field validated Music360 solution

** You must not replicate all the information you have in your deliverables, or copy/paste such information.)*

** I have copied the text for your information, structure and convenience. Text highlighted in yellow will be deleted.*

Lead: [GDA]
Input: [VU, TVE,SENA, BUMA, UPV,BMAT,GDA, IMRO, Aepo-Art]

WP6 - A field validated Music360 solution

Description of work progress

Tasks

- T6.1a/b Eliciting stakeholder needs for the understanding of music (Q6.1) (Lead: IMRO/GDA; participants: TVE, SENA, BUMA, GTM, IMRO, Aepo-Artis). This refers to D6.1, and D6.2. Task 6.1a requires a workshop with physical presence and will be co-located with the kick off event (WS1). Additionally, task 6.1b requires a workshop too, collated with other events (WS5).
- T6.2 Modeling national ecosystems (Q6.2) (Lead: TVE; participants: SENA, BUMA, GDA, GTM, IMRO). This leads to D6.3. This task involves one workshop with physical attendance (WS2).
- T6.3 Expressing national ecosystems in ecosystem modeler (Q6.2) (Lead: TVE)
- T6.4 Defining national field validators. This also includes recruitment of music right users and owners who participate. (Q6.2) (Lead: GDA; participants: SENA, BUMA, GTM, IMRO). This task requires a workshop with physical presence (WS2).
- T6.5 Designing and implementing national data feeds (Q6.2) (Lead: GDA; participants: SENA, BUMA, GTM, BMAT, UPV, Stichting VU, IMRO)
- T6.6 Designing and implementing national Dashboards (Q6.2) (Lead: BMAT; participants: Stichting VU, UPV). This task requires a physical workshop (WS3).
- T6.7 Validating the Music360 solution in the national fields (Q6.2) (Lead: GDA; participants: SENA, BUMA, GTM, BMAT, UPV, Stichting VU, IMRO). Tasks T6.4, T6.5, T6.6, and T6.7 result in demonstrator D 6.5
- T6.8 Modeling international ecosystem (Q6.3) (Lead: TVE; participants: SENA, BUMA, GDA, GTM, IMRO). This leads to D6.4 and requires one workshop with physical attendance (WS5).
- T6.9 Expressing international ecosystem in ecosystem modeler (Q6.3) (Lead: TVE)
- T6.10 Defining international field validator. This also includes recruitment of music right users and owners who participate. (Q6.3) (Lead: GDA; participants: SENA, BUMA, GTM, IMRO). This task requires a workshop with physical presence (WS6).
- T6.11 Unifying national data feeds(Q6.3). In this task, the resulting demonstratrors (D 6.5) will be changed to be useful in an international context (Lead: GDA; participants: SENA, BUMA, GTM, BMAT, UPV, Stichting VU, IMRO)
- T6.12 Designing and implementing international Dashboard (Q6.3) (Lead: BMAT; participants: Stichting VU, UPV). This task requires a physical workshop (WS5).
- T6.13 Validating the Music360 solution in the international field (Q6.3) (Lead: IMRO; participants: SENA, BUMA, GTM, BMAT, UPV, Stichting VU, GDA). This task requires a physical integration workshop (WS6). Tasks T6.10, T 6.11, T6.12 and T6.13 lead to demonstrator D6.6.
- T6.14 Public OpenAPI access to living lab data. (Lead: BMAT; participants: Stichting VU, TVE, SENA, BUMA, UPV, GDA, GTM, IMRO). This leads to D6.7.

Deliverables:

- D6.1 Stakeholder needs for understanding the value of music – version 1. This deliverable comprises the requirements of stakeholder needs with respect to understanding of the value of music. Focus is on the national living labs. (IMRO)(month 2) (R1)
- D6.2 Stakeholder needs for understanding the value of music – version 2. Focus is on the international living lab. (GDA) (month 18) (R1)
- D6.3 National music ecosystem models (month 8). Understanding of the national ecosystems by means of *e*^{3}*value* ecosystem models. (TVE)(R11)

- D6.4 International music ecosystem models. Understanding of the international ecosystem by means of e3value ecosystem models. (TVE) (month 24) (R11)
- D6.5 National living labs. Implementation of the dashboards and associated data collection mechanisms, and validation in national contexts. (GDA)(month 16) (R12)
- D6.6 International living lab. Implementation of the dashboards and associated data collection mechanisms, and validation in an international context. (IMRO) (month 36) (R12)
- D6.7 Open data access living labs. Public API-controlled access to data found in the living labs. (BMAT)(month 36) (R12

1.2.7 Work Package 7 - Dissemination, communication and exploitation

** You must not replicate all the information you have in your deliverables, or copy/paste such information.)*

** I have copied the text for your information, structure and convenience. Text highlighted in yellow will be deleted.*

Lead: [VU]
Input: [All partners]

WP7 - Ecosystem-level reporting and analysis of music value creation, distribution and consumption

Work Package 7 (WP7) ensured the effective communication, dissemination, and exploitation of Music360 project results, targeting stakeholders across the European music ecosystem.

From an excellence perspective, WP7 implemented a structured and adaptive dissemination strategy aligned with Horizon Europe requirements and stakeholder needs.

From an implementation perspective, dissemination activities were coordinated across partners through defined roles, workflows, and tracking mechanisms, ensuring consistency and efficiency.

From an impact perspective, WP7 significantly enhanced the visibility and uptake of project results through stakeholder engagement, participation in events, and scientific dissemination.

During implementation, the communication strategy was refined following discussions with the European Commission to better align with industry practices and evolving digital communication channels.

Minor delays in some dissemination-related deliverables did not affect the overall communication objectives or impact. Detailed dissemination results and outputs can be found in the relevant WP7 deliverables

Description of work progress

Within our project framework, significant progress has been achieved through the establishment of a dedicated task force, convening biweekly to strategize upcoming deliverables and ongoing dissemination efforts. The coordination of these meetings is led by VU Amsterdam, leveraging a collaborative approach where responsibilities are distributed among participating partners.

BMAT has taken the lead in managing website content and updates, ensuring a cohesive online presence reflective of project objectives. Furthermore, collaborative efforts between SENA and BUMA are instrumental in drafting PR materials tailored for events showcasing Music360, maximising outreach and engagement opportunities. Finally, it is a shared responsibility among all partners to showcase Music360 during events. To ensure alignment across work

packages and facilitate collaboration, key highlights and relevant requests are shared during monthly project meetings, fostering synergies across the project landscape.
To maximize the legacy of Music360, we propose maintaining the project website as an active knowledge hub for at least three years post-completion. Given the strong interest from several partners, this platform will remain a vital resource for stakeholders to access our research outputs and collaborative findings. We will implement a "light-touch" maintenance strategy to ensure the site remains current and secure. By sharing oversight among interested partners and committing to periodic content updates, we can preserve the project's visibility and foster ongoing industry engagement. This continued investment ensures that the Music360 digital infrastructure remains a reliable, accessible asset for the community well beyond the project's formal conclusion. It is worth noting that the Music360 consortium has made a conscious, deliberate effort to ensure our project reflects the diversity of the modern world. Through our website imagery and the curated Spotify playlist, we have intentionally highlighted a broad spectrum of representation, encompassing gender, regional origins, age, cultural backgrounds, and disability. This commitment to inclusivity was a strategic choice to ensure our public-facing assets remain authentic and accessible. By integrating these diverse perspectives, we have fostered a project identity that truly resonates with the multifaceted global community we aimed to serve..

Tasks

- T7.1 Plan for the dissemination and exploitation of results (Lead: BUMA). This leads to D.7.1

  The task force formulated a comprehensive communication and dissemination strategy to streamline outreach and engagement efforts. This involved delineating clear communication objectives, pinpointing stakeholders, and strategically choosing communication channels to effectively engage them. Moreover, the strategy incorporates considerations for maintaining a consistent tone of voice and fostering inclusivity. For a deeper insight into these strategies, please consult the relevant Deliverable document.

  UPV in Spain is promoting the Music360 results as enabling technology and technological expertise to support Tech for Good initiatives. In particular, it is exploring the use of Music360 ontology and data analysis mechanisms with the NGO Musicians for Health (Músicos por la Salud) to measure the effect of musical interventions on societal well-being and mental health, with a focus on groups such as the elderly or Alzheimer's patients.

- T7.2 Project website (Lead: BMAT). This leads to D 7.2

The project website has successfully launched, marking the beginning of a continuous endeavor to maintain regular updates. While facing initial challenges, we have overcome hurdles and are now consistently updating the website. Additionally, we are enhancing its appeal by regularly publishing blog posts, adding a personal touch to the platform.

- T7.3 Communication, e.g. press releases, presence on social media.

  Music360 has selected LinkedIn, Facebook, and Instagram as its primary social media channels. Moreover, the task force is dedicated to leveraging local media and issuing press releases to enhance local outreach efforts.

- T7.4 Dissemination at music industry events (e.g. EuroSonic Noorderslag and Westway lab) (Lead: SENA; participants: BUMA, GDA, GTM, TVE, BMAT, IMRO). This refers to M9 (M12), M10 (M24), and M11 (M32).

- T7.5 Dissemination at other organizations (e.g. branch organizations like SCPAR, CISAC, WIPO, and IFPI, and government, creators and users of music) (Lead: BUMA; participants: SENA, GDA, GTM, IMRO, Aepo-Artis) . This refers to M12 (M12), M13 (M24), and M14 (M32).

- T7.6 Scientific dissemination (Lead: Stichting VU, participants: UPV)

- T7.7 Roundtables European Commission (Lead Stichting VU, participants SENA, BUMA, GDA, GTO, IMRO, Aepo-Artis). This refers to M15 (M18) and M16 (M36)

Deliverables:

- D7.1 Dissemination, communication, and exploitation plan version 1 (Stichting VU) (month 6)(R13)
- D7.2 Dissemination, communication, and exploitation plan version 2 (Stichting VU) (month 18)(R13)
- D7.3 Intermediate Policy Brief (BUMA)(month 15)(R13)
- D7.4 Final Policy Brief (SENA)(month 36)(R13)
- D7.5 Dissemination, communication, and exploitation plan version 2 (Stichting VU) (month 34)(R13)
- D7.6 Final report on communication, dissemination, and exploitation (month 36)(R13

The initial version of the Communication, Dissemination, and Exploitation Strategy (D 7.1) has been finalized, and the task force is presently engaged in developing the second iteration (D7.2). The objective is to enhance the strategy by incorporating lessons learned from the first version and refining its components for improved effectiveness

1.2.8 Work Package 8 - Project management and data management

** You must not replicate all the information you have in your deliverables, or copy/paste such information.)*

** I have copied the text for your information, structure and convenience. Text highlighted in yellow will be deleted.*

Lead: [VU]
Input: [All partners]

WP8 - Project management and data management

Work Package 8 (WP8) ensured the effective coordination, governance, and administrative implementation of the Music360 project in full compliance with the Grant Agreement and the Description of Action.

From an implementation perspective, WP8 established and maintained a robust governance structure, including the General Assembly, Executive Board, and coordination mechanisms. Regular meetings and reporting ensured alignment across work packages and timely progress monitoring.

From an excellence perspective, WP8 ensured high-quality execution through structured coordination, adherence to agreed procedures, and alignment with project objectives.

From an impact perspective, effective management enabled the successful delivery of project results across all work packages.While minor delays occurred in the submission of a limited number of deliverables, these were managed effectively and did not affect the overall results or impact of the project.

Overall, WP8 provided a stable and efficient framework for project execution. Detailed results of technical work can be found in the respective work package deliverables,

Description of work progress
WP Highlights

Tasks

- T8.1 Organise an efficient project structure. This task details the organizational structure of the project in D8.1. (Lead: Stichting VU). This leads to D8.1.
- T8.2 Project management. Management and overall coordination by Stichting VU will enable Music360 activities in all work packages to be performed timely, coherently and efficiently. This entails at least the

following activities: (1) Planning and organization of consortium meetings (General Assembly, Executive Board, Advisory Board; (2) Maintenance of the Grant Agreement and Consortium Agreement; (3) Active progress monitoring of the project's objectives and alignment between WPs; (4) Efficient internal communication within the consortium; (5) Overall legal, financial, and administrative management of the project. (Lead: Stichting VU; participants: TVE, SENA, BUMA, UPV, BMAT, GDA, GTM)

- T8.3 Report to the European Commission. Stichting VU will act as liaison between the project consortium and the Commission representatives. Activities include: (1) Collecting and processing data from the other partners on the activities in their WPs; (2) Processing all technical, financial and administrative information into project periodic and final reports compliant with Commission criteria; (3) Ensuring quality of the project activities and its deliverables, checking the consortium performance, avoiding any performance risks at project level.

- T8.4 Data management. This task comprises the creation of a data management plan conform the requirements of the European Commission as well as securing the implementation of the plan. (Lead: Stichting VU). This lreads to D8.2, D8.3 and D8.4.

Deliverables:

- D8.1 Management handbook (Stichting VU) (month 3)8

- D8.2 Data management plan beginning of project (Stichting VU)(month 6/18/36)

1.2.9 Work Package 9 - Ethics requirements

** You must not replicate all the information you have in your deliverables, or copy/paste such information.)*

** I have copied the text for your information, structure and convenience. Text highlighted in yellow will be deleted.*

Lead: [VU]
Input: [All partners]

WP9 - Ethics requirementsDescription of work progress

Objectives

The objective is to ensure compliance with the 'ethics requirements' set out in this work package

Deliverables:

- D9.1 H - Requirement No. 1 (Stichting VU) (month 2)

Participants
The procedures and criteria that will be used to identify/recruit research participants must be submitted as a deliverable before the start of the relevant activities.

The informed consent procedures that will be implemented for the research participants must be clarified and submitted as a deliverable before the start of the relevant activities.

Templates of the informed consent/assent forms and information sheets (in language and terms intelligible to the participants) must be submitted as a deliverable before the start of the relevant activities.

For children and/or adults unable to give informed consent involved, details on how the consent of the legal representatives (and assent of the research participant, when applicable) will be obtained must be submitted as a deliverable before the start of the relevant activities.

Since vulnerable individuals/groups will be involved, adequate measures to protect them, prevent coercion and undue inducement, exacerbation of their vulnerability, and minimise the risk of harm and/or stigmatisation must be submitted as a deliverable before the start of the relevant activities.

Detailed information on the incidental/unexpected findings policy (including the disclosure policy in case of unexpected findings) must be submitted as a deliverable before the start of the relevant activities.

Copies of opinions/approvals by ethics committees and/or competent authorities for the research with humans must be obtained before the start of the relevant activities, and submitted as a deliverable before the start of the relevant activities.

- D9.2 POPD - Requirement No. 3 (Stichting VU)(month 2)

Personal data deliverable

-

Clarification how all of the personal data that will be processed are relevant and limited to the purposes of the research project (in accordance with the 'data minimisation 'principle) participants must be submitted as a deliverable before the start of the relevant activities.

A description of the technical and organisational measures that will be implemented to safeguard the rights and freedoms of the data subjects/research participants must be submitted as a deliverable before the start of the relevant activities.

A description of the security measures that will be implemented to prevent unauthorised access to personal data or the equipment used for processing must be submitted as a deliverable before the start of the relevant activities.

Description of the anonymisation/pseudonymisation techniques that will be implemented must be submitted as a deliverable before the start of the relevant activities.

Templates of the informed consent forms and information sheets with regard to data processing (in language and terms intelligible to the participants, including DPO contact details for host institutions required to appoint a DPO under the General Data Protection Regulation 2016/679) must be submitted as a deliverable before the start of the relevant activities.

For the further processing of previously collected personal data, an explicit confirmation that the beneficiary has lawful basis for the data processing and that the appropriate technical and organisational measures are in place to safeguard the rights of the data subjects must be submitted as a deliverable before the start of the relevant activities.

- D9.3 AI - Requirement No. 4 (Stichting VU)(month 2)

Ethics Handbook deliverable

-

The Ethics Handbook is developed and submitted as a stand-alone deliverable, under the supervision of the Ethics Board.

This deliverable must include:

- a detailed explanation on the measures taken to prevent, avoid and mitigate potential bias, discrimination and stigmatisation in input data and algorithm design and outcomes
- detailed explanation on how the research participants and/or end-users will be informed about: (1) their interaction with an AI system/technology (if relevant); (2) the abilities, limitations, risks and benefits of the AI system/technique; (3) the manner in which decisions are taken and the logic behind them (if relevant) must be submitted as part of the Ethics Handbook deliverable.
- an assessment/evaluation report of the ethics risks related to the AI.
- a risk mitigation plan with a description of the measures set in place to prevent/mitigate any potential negative personal/social/environmental impacts during the research, deployment and post-deployment phase.

- D9. OEI - Requirement No. 5 (Stichting VU)(month 1)

Creation of the project Ethics Board

-

The complexity and seriousness of the raised ethics issues require independent supervision and monitoring from the start of the project (M1) by an external Ethics Board comprising appropriate expertise in research ethics specialising in handling of human involvement, medical ethics, AI ethics, and personal data protection.

Reports by the Ethics Board are due in M6, M14, and M36.

- D9.5 OEI - Requirement No. 6 (Stichting VU)(month 6)

Ethics Board report - 1
- D9.6 OEI - Requirement No. 7 (Stichting VU)(month 13)

Ethics Board report - 2
- D9.7 OEI - Requirement No. 8 (Stichting VU)(month 36)

Ethics Board report - final

#§WRK-PLA-WP§# #@IMP-ACT-IA@#

1.3 Impact – [Jaap]

Please describe the progress of the project so far towards delivering scientific impact, based on its objectives and towards delivering impact in any of the following fields (if applicable): scientific, economic, societal or industrial production or processes. Report on changes to the expected impacts presented in your DoA (if any) and the effects on the project/need for adaptations.

Where necessary, provide further details of your monitoring and evaluation strategy, including: references to baselines, benchmarks, assumptions used (with justification) as well as calculations performed to quantify the impacts. If necessary, provide this information in a separate deliverable / a dedicated section of a deliverable.

[OPTION for EIT:

Please describe the progress made towards the impacts (both economic and societal) included in the EIT Impact Framework and the KIC impact targets as stated in the KIC Strategic Agenda Annex 1. *]*

[OPTION for JU's and EIT:

Please describe the ongoing project activities as well as the ones proposed or foreseen that enable synergies to be created with national/regional or other EU-level R&I.*]*

[OPTION for MSCA:

Green Charter: Include in this section any relevant information to illustrate how your project implemented the measures mentioned in the MSCA Green Charter.

Supervision: Describe in this section how the supervision of the researchers has been implemented, including the frequency of the meetings between supervisor and researcher and the related outcomes. *]*

**As the instruction also states, here it's important to narrate and explain how your project has progressed towards achieving the impacts promised before, highlighting your impact related KPIs, that were also defined in the proposal before.*

Summary:

- Universities:
- Collective Management Organizations (CMOs):
- Creators:
- Users of music:
- Monitoring companies:
- Policy makers:
- society at large:

Scientific impact: related to supporting the creation and diffusion of high-quality new knowledge, skills, technologies and solutions to global challenges.

Societal impact: related to strengthening the impact of research and innovation in developing, supporting and implementing.

Economic impact: related to fostering all forms of innovation, including break- through innovation, and strengthening market deployment of innovative solutions.

1.4 Update of the plan for exploitation and dissemination of results (if applicable)

Include in this section any updates to the plan for exploitation and dissemination of results and give details.

#§IMP-ACT-IA§#

[OPTION for projects providing access to research infrastructure:

1.X Access to research infrastructure

If access to research infrastructure has been provided under the grant, please include access provision activities.

Trans-national access (TA) activities

Provide for the set of TA activities, the integrated information described below.

Description of the publicity concerning the new opportunities for access

In the first periodic report, describe the measures taken to publicise to researchers throughout Europe the opportunities for access open to them under the Grant Agreement. In the following periodic reports, indicate only additional measures and changes.

Description of the selection procedure

In the first periodic report, describe the procedure used to select user groups[1]: organisation of the selection panel(s), any additional selection criteria[2] employed by the selection panel(s), measures to promote equal opportunities, etc. Specify if feedback is given to rejected applicants and in which form. In the following periodic reports, indicate only changes to the existing procedure.

The list of the selection panel members should be maintained and updated when necessary in order to prove that the panel is composed following the conditions indicated in Annex 5 to the GA[3]. The granting authority reserves the right to request this list at any time.

Indicate number, date and venue (if not carried out remotely) of the meetings of the selection panel during the reporting period.

Provide integrated information on the selection of user groups and on the scientific output of supported users. In particular, indicate the number of eligible applications submitted in the

1 Teams of one or more researchers (users).
2 See Annex 5 to the Grant Agreement.
3 The selection panel must be composed of international experts in the field, at least half of them independent from the beneficiaries, unless otherwise specified in Annex 1.

reporting period and the number of the selected ones (taking into account only calls for which the selection has been completed in the reporting period). Indicate also the number of user groups, whose support started in the reporting period, which have a majority of users not working in an EU Member State or HE associated country.

Description of the trans-national access activity

Give an overview of the applications and users supported in the reporting period, indicating their number, their scientific fields and other relevant information you may want to highlight.

You should maintain the list of selected applications/user groups for which costs have been incurred in the reporting period. The provision of access/service to a user group can run over more than one reporting period. In this case, the user group should be inserted in the list of each concerned reporting period. The list of applications must include, for each application, an identifier, the objectives, as well as the amount of granted access on each installation used by the user group in the reporting period. When the access provision to the user group is completed in the reporting period, the list should also include a short description of the work carried out. The granting authority reserves the right to request this list at any time.

In addition you must fill the following tables (in Part A to be filled in the IT tool):

- *Transnational/virtual access to research infrastructure*: indicate for each installation providing trans-national access under the project, the quantity of access actually provided in the reporting period (expressed in the unit of access defined in Annex 1 for that specific installation).

- *List of users (transnational access)*: Researchers who have access to research infrastructure/installations (one or more) through EU support under the grant either in person (through visit) or through remote access.

Scientific output of the users at the facilities

Give highlights of important research results from the user groups supported under the grant agreement. Indicate the number and the type of publications derived by the work of user groups supported under the grant, taking into account only publications that acknowledge the support of this EU grant.

You should maintain a list of articles that have been published in journals (or conference proceedings) during the reporting period and which are resulting from work carried out under the trans-national access activity. List only publications that acknowledge the EU support. For each publication, indicate the identifier of the application/user group that have led to the publication itself, the authors, the title, the year of publication, the type of publication (article in journal, publication in conference proceeding/workshop, book/monograph, chapters in book, thesis/dissertation, whether it has been peer-reviewed or not, the DoI (digital object identifier), the publication references, and whether the publication is available under Open Access or not. The granting authority reserves the right to request this list at any time.

Virtual access (VA) activities

Provide for the set of VA activities, the integrated information described below.

In the first periodic report, describe the measures taken to publicise to researchers throughout Europe the opportunities for access open to them under the Grant Agreement. In the following periodic reports, indicate only additional measures and changes.

Provide statistics on the virtual access in the period by each installation, including quantity, geographical distribution of users and, whenever possible, information/statistics on scientific outcomes (publications, patents, etc.) acknowledging the use of the infrastructure. Where the call conditions impose additional traceability obligations, information on the traceability of the users and the nature of access must be provided too.

In addition you must fill the following tables (in Part A to be filled in the IT tool):

- *Transnational/virtual access to research infrastructure*: indicate for each installation providing virtual access under the project, the quantity of access actually provided in the reporting period (expressed in the unit of access defined in Annex 1 for that specific installation).

- When virtual access users are traced, also the table *List of users (virtual access)*

As indicated in Annex 5 to the GA, the access providers must have the virtual access services assessed periodically by a board composed of international experts in the field, at least half of whom must be independent from the consortium. In the first periodic report, describe how the virtual access providers will comply with this obligation. In the following periodic reports, indicate only changes to the existing procedure.

When an assessment is scheduled under the reporting period, the assessment report must be submitted as deliverable.

1.X Resources used to provide access to research infrastructure

For virtual or trans-national access costs reported as actual costs, include for each access provider information on how many of the person-months (PM) reported in the use of resources have been used to provide access and explain for which task *(e.g. scientific support to users, …)*.

Access Provider Short Name	Installation(s)	Number of person-months	Explanations of tasks

Information on individual subcontracts must be reported in the use of resources linked to the financial statements in the IT tool. Please mention in the comments field of each subcontract whether it is related to virtual or trans-national access. In addition, all other direct costs items related to virtual or trans-national access must be detailed there, even if they do not exceed 15% of personnel costs. *]*

[OPTION for Co-funded Partnerships:

1.X Co-funded partnerships

Please provide updated information and figures for indicators included in the monitoring and evaluation framework provided in the initial proposal.

European Partnership			Monitoring and evaluation framework date		
	Objectives	**What is a measure of success?** (Please use quantitative (Key Performance) and qualitative indicators and link them to a point in time)	**Which is the data source and methodology used** (project data, study, ….)	**Who is responsible for monitoring and providing the data / information** **When will it be collected?**	**Baseline and target**
General objectives (linked to	GO1				
	GO2				

impact indicators)	GO3				
Specific objectives* (linked to outcome/result indicators)	SO1				
	SO2				
	SO3				
	SO4				
Operational objectives* (linked to output indicators)	OO1				
	OO2				
	OO3				
	OO4				

*add more lines, as needed.

Please use this section to provide explanations, in particular regarding the obtained results (e.g. achievements, targets that are "off track") and the process of monitoring (e.g. changes in the indicators or baselines). Please provide also hyperlinks to publicly available reports that provide more detailed information on the partnership performance.]

#§PRO-GRE-PG§# #@FOL-UP-FU@#

2. Follow-up of recommendations and comments from previous review(s) (if applicable)

Link to review folder : https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/12jubhtUDHYilZXtglId1VM17cXd89nW7

NETHERLANDS

Subject: Horizon Europe (HORIZON)
Project: 101094872 — Music360
Project review (Article 25)
Project review report

Dear Madam/Sir,

I am writing in connection with the above-mentioned review procedure for your grant.

Please find enclosed the draft review report. As you know it was drafted with the help of outside experts.

In our view, the project implementation is satisfactory.

To improve the implementation, we would recommend the following changes:

The project management should be strengthened to ensure the successful implementation of the project and minimise the deviations. There have been several delays in the submission of reports, which cause concern.

The consortium should make sure that the delays of the Irish and Spanish Living Labs will not affect the rest of the project implementation. The consortium is requested to mitigate these delays and acquire the ethics approvals that are pending.

The risks to implementation and exploitation should be appropriately mitigated.
The project's KPIs on communication and dissemination are only partially achieved and the consortium is encouraged to strengthen their outreach.

Following the deliverable assessment, please submit the revised version of D2.2, D7.1, D8.1 by 19 July 2024.

The project is still very relevant and timely, and the consortium has relevant expertise to deliver the objectives.

⚠ Please also note that a positive assessment of the technical work does NOT automatically guarantee that the costs will be accepted. This will depend on a number of other factors (such as compliance with cost eligibility rules, etc) which will be assessed separately, based on the financial reporting assessment that will take place later on.

1

Please include a table explaining if and how each recommendation from previous reviews and/or Project Officer assessment has been addressed.

#§FOL-UP-FU§# #@IMP-ACT-IA@#

3. Exploitation primarily in non-associated third countries (if applicable)

Please provide a justification how this exploitation is still in the interest of the EU.

#§IMP-ACT-IA§# #@CON-MET-CM@#

4. Open science

Describe the Open Science practices related to early and open sharing of research (e.g. through pre-registration, registered reports, pre-prints or crowd-sourcing of solutions to a specific problem).

Describe the concrete measures that ensure the reproducibility of the results obtained during the action i.e., measures to ensure that the *same results* can be obtained by using the *same data and/or methods*, etc..

#§CON-MET-CM§# #@WRK-PLA-WP@#

5. Deviations from Annex 1 and Annex 2 (if applicable)

Explain the reasons for deviations from the DoA, the consequences and the proposed corrective actions.

5.1 Tasks/objectives

Include explanations for tasks not fully implemented, critical objectives not fully achieved and/or not being on schedule. Explain also the impact on other tasks on the available resources and the planning. Explain also the impact on other tasks and provide and provide details to allow assessing whether the project is on track.

5.2 Use of resources *(n/a for MSCA and Lump Sums)*

Include explanations on deviations of the use of resources between actual and planned use of resources in Annex 1, especially related to person-months per work package.

Include explanations on transfer of costs categories (if applicable).

Include explanations on adjustments to previous financial statements (if applicable).

5.2.1 Unforeseen subcontracting (if applicable) *(n/a for MSCA)*

Specify in this section:

- the work (the tasks) performed by a subcontractor which may cover only a limited part of the project
- explanation of the circumstances which caused the need for a subcontract, taking into account the specific characteristics of the project
- the confirmation that the subcontractor has been selected ensuring the best value for money or, if appropriate, the lowest price and avoiding any conflict of interests
- include also the name of subcontractor and amount.

5.2.2 Unforeseen use of in kind contributions *(n/a for MSCA and Lump Sums)*

Specify in this section:

- the identity of the third party
- the resources made available by the third party respectively against payment or free of charges
- explanation of the circumstances which caused the need for using these resources for carrying out the work.

#§WRK-PLA-WP§#

HISTORY OF CHANGES

VERSION	PUBLICATION DATE	CHANGE
1.0	15.12.2021	Initial version (new MFF).
1.1	01.05.2023	Minor updates in Part A. Added section 1.4 on updates to the plan for exploitation and dissemination of results.