FuturePulse

D5.2 Record Label pilot report v1

October 2nd, 2019

Author/s: Saki Markovic (PGM), Anders Engström (PGM)

Contributor/s: Sophie Andersson, Magnus Martinsson (PGM)

Deliverable Lead Beneficiary: Playground Music (PGM)

This project has been co-funded by the HORIZON 2020 Programme of the European Union. This publication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use, which may be made of the information contained therein.

Deliverable number or supporting document title	D5.2 Record Label pilot report v1
Type	Report
Dissemination level	Public
Publication date	02/10/2019
Author(s)	Saki Markovic (PGM), Anders Engström (PGM)
Contributor(s)	Sophie Andersson, Magnus Martinsson (PGM)
Reviewer(s)	Daniel Johansson (SYB), Goncal Calvo (BMAT)
Keywords	Pilots, Report
Website	www.futurepulse.eu

CHANGELOG

Version	Date	Description of change	Responsible
V1.0	29/09/2019	First shared version	Saki Markovic / Anders Engström
V1.1	1/10/2019	Amendments after first review	Saki Markovic / Anders Engström

Funded by the European Commission

Table of Contents

Funded by the European Commission

1 Executive Summary

To serve the increasingly complex needs of the music ecosystem, FuturePulse will develop and pilot test a novel close-to-market music platform in three high-impact Use Cases. This is the first pilot report, which focuses on reporting on the testing of the initial system targeting mostly the end users within the consortium. This report focuses only on the first phase small scale pilot and not on the later stages (medium and large) as these will be addressed in future reports.

The pilot testing has been conducted by the Record Label use case partner, Playground Music. The results from the first pilot shows both strengths and weaknesses of the FuturePulse platform, as expected at the time frame of when the first pilot was conducted.

2 Introduction and Relation to other WPs/Tasks

The FuturePulse project is divided into seven (7) work packages that are simultaneously and will result in the end product. Over the course of the project the different work packages relate to one another in several ways and depend on each other to move forward. This Pilot report is part of work package 5 (WP5 Pilots & Evaluation) which have the objective to serve as a testing ground for the platform and to deliver a set of concrete user findings for the FuturePulse consortium. Following are descriptions of the other work packages and how they relate to D5.2 Record Label pilot report v1.

WP2 - Music Data Collection, Analysis and Indexing

The main objective of Work Package 2 (WP2) is to ensure that all consortium partners have timely access to music data necessary for developing and testing the FuturePulse capabilities. Moreover, WP2 will make sure that such data access complies with pertinent regulations and fully respects the interests of all data owners.

D5.2 Record Label pilot report v1 is related to WP2 when it comes to testing what data sources has been implemented and that the crucial data retrieval necessary for the FuturePulse platform is working as desired. Based on the reports and findings in this deliverable the consortium can learn which data that is missing and act on this to make sure to collect the data necessary for the end result.

WP3 - Predictive Analytics and Recommendations

The main objective of Work Package 3 (WP3) is to develop methods to leverage the large variety of collected music data (derived from WP2) for supporting decision making by various stakeholders (e.g., artists, labels, and brands).

D5.2 Record Label pilot report v1 is related to WP3 in that it reports back on how the predictive functions for analysis of the market in FuturePulse is delivering.

WP4 - Platform Integration and Application Development

The main objective of Work Package 4 (WP4) is to thoroughly define the integrated FuturePulse architecture, to develop all necessary applications and APIs towards the integrated FuturePulse complete platform, and to assess and validate its efficiency.

D5.2 Record Label pilot report v1 is related to WP4 in testing that the FuturePulse platform is designed in such a way that it has competitive advantage over other available services on the market. This deliverable provides the core background business knowledge for WP4 to succeed.

WP6 - Innovation Management, Dissemination and Exploitation
The main objective of Work Package 6 (WP6) is two folded:

- to generate awareness about the project, its achievements in the general public and in communities of interest.
- to pave a clear path for exploitation and sustainability for the project.

D5.2 Record Label pilot report v1 (and the following reports for medium and big scale pilots) is closely related to WP6 as the feedback provided about the music industry and markets needs for the specific use cases will be essential for how dissemination and exploitation will commence.

WP7 - Project Management
The main objective of Work Package 7 (WP7) is to support the project in succeeding its goals through strong coordination and continuous monitoring, assessment and reporting.

This includes:
a) overall management and coordination of the work conducted in the project; b) monitoring of the delivered work quality; c) internal collaboration; d) financial management; e) conflict resolution; and f) risk management.
D5.2 Record Label pilot report v1 is related to WP7 in that the report is important for how the project will succeed in creating a new and novel solution on the market. Project Management has to be constantly updated about how users finds the platform both from the technical and user experience aspects.

3 Methodology

The aim of the pilots is to make sure the platform is working, find out what features the pilot users find useful and if anything should be amended to better suit their needs. The end user in this pilot is defined under 5.1.

FuturePulse pilot test is designed according to the market knowledge of each use case owner. Use case owners will identify the most relevant features of the FuturePulse platform and have them tested either directly by themselves or through external pilot users (depending on the pilot) during the different evaluation (pilot) phases as indicated in the previous section.

In the first pilot phase, we have tested the initial features of the platform; the technical aspects such as data collection and validity as well as given feedback on the overall design and functionality. PGM has been using persons within their organization and

Funded by the European Commission

closely related labels as first pilot users for first rounds of testing and collected the feedback. The close relationship with the first pilot users will help enhance the platform and get straightforward feedback about the features tested.

Test activities

1. Using the platform, the pilot users will test the data collection of thirty five (35) artists. All artists will be subject to the same testing. The goal of this test is to identify if all data is collected correctly and from the right sources.
2. Technical feedback. Each pilot will provide significant feedback to technical partners, which will be collected and evaluated by the pilot operators throughout the implementation of each pilot phase. In this test the pilot users will feedback on bugs and technical issues that often happen in this stage of development. The goal is to make sure that the functions of the platform run smoothly.
3. In depth tests on five different artist cases. With the help of a questionnaire an in depth test will be conducted on four different artist cases. The goal is to attain qualitative and useful findings for the continuation of the projects.

3.1 Pilot users

For the first phase small pilot PGM engaged members of their own staff and people from closely related labels as pilot users. Each person has been given a face to face demonstration of the platform and has been given dedicated areas of testing concentrated to confirm that all data is being collected from correct sources/accounts and at the PGM Requirements #2 (see below 4.2).
NDA's has not been necessary since the close relation to the pilot users.
Staff involved has been PGM's Head of Social Media Marketing, PGM's Marketing & Communication Manager, PGM's Information Manager, PGM's Head of Digital Operations and PGM's Digital Operations / Digital Content Manager.

3.2 Requirements tested

RL_REQ#2 : A combined visual timeline for streaming statistics of an artist

Description:

Statistics from social media, Youtube and DSPs visualised in a combined interactive graph. Events that can be added automatically should be in the timeline, such as "release date". The solution should also include the possibility to manually enter "events", as simple marks in the timeline, that could influence streaming quantities, such as the start of an ad campaign, an addition of a song to a playlist, or other events. Stats represented should be both number of listeners and number of streams, on a daily basis.

Sub-requirements:

RL_REQ#2.1 – ability to see Spotify popularity index at artist/track level

RL_REQ#2.2 – ability to see Spotify streaming numbers of an artist/track

Funded by the European Commission

RL_REQ#2.3 – ability to get deeper knowledge on charts (ie top 100.000). We often focus on when a track reaches top 100, top 50 etc. But longtail is very important for back catalogue and it would be interesting to know when/if a track reaches top 1000, top 10.000 etc.

RL_REQ#2.4 – ability to get up to date facts from streaming and social media platforms

RL_REQ#2.5 – ability to analyze instagram followers to locate fans

RL_REQ#2.6 – ability to see monthly listeners to followers conversion rate for artists

RL_REQ#2.7 – ability to get more in depth apple music information

RL_REQ#2.8 – ability to compare streaming with extensive airplay data

RL_REQ#2.9 – ability to see demographics on all data sources

RL_REQ#2.10 – ability to see device use on all data sources

RL_REQ#2.11 – ability to see free/subscription on all data sources - per track and artist

RL_REQ#5: Genres trending for each market

Description:

Predict trending genres in different territories and investigate recurrent patterns. Do genre trends that are big in Europe always follow North America? Where do trends start and how do they expand - are there common denominators? Present movements on timeline to visualize the trends on a global level. They need to be manually categorised in clusters such as "Europe" or "English speaking countries".

3.3 Data sources for evaluation

The data sources used for evaluation were mainly data retrieved from the platform since the goal of the pilot is to evaluate the platform in its current state. The platform data was then compared to corresponding data on DSPs, social media, Spotify for Artists Playgrounds' own digital media base etc. in order to validate the accuracy of the data on the platform.

A valuable source has been being able to get feedback from colleagues who are all working with artists and repertoire on a daily basis. They have been useful not only when it comes to the technical assessment of the platform but also giving their feedback on the overall functionality of it; giving us insights to whether the platform has been of use to them in their daily work.

A third source has been a questionnaire formed to help the pilot testers methodically test and evaluate the platform in relation to the actual requirements of the first phase pilot test.

4 Use case scenario

4.1 Use case #1 (RL_REQ#2: A combined visual timeline for streaming statistics of an artist)

Users Stories: Pilot tester from marketing perspective.

1. The ability to see all available graphs in one dashboard so that I get a good overview of comparison possibilities.
2. The ability to choose which graphs to compare so that a comparison between relevant data is possible based on the need for a specific artist/project such as:
    a) choose different statistics from different platforms to the same graph so that correlations become easier to detect visually;
    b) compare streams on Spotify with number of likes/followers on Facebook so that I can understand the correlation, if there is one;
    c) compare followers on Spotify with number of likes/followers on Facebook so that I can understand the correlation, if there is one;
    d) compare streams on Spotify with streams on Youtube or other streaming platforms so that I can see what platforms are relevant for what artists;
    e) compare streams on other DSP's with streams on Youtube or other streaming platforms so that I can see what platforms are relevant for what artists.
3. The ability to add promotional activities as "events" in the streaming timeline so that correlations become easier to detect as well as:
    a) save effects of such events as statistics so that I can use it in planning future promotional activities and choose the most beneficial timing.
    b) add (or have added automatically) blog posts or big reviews as "events" in the streaming timeline so that correlations become easier to detect.
    c) add (or have added automatically) live events/concerts as "events" in the streaming timeline so that correlations become easier to detect.
4. Knowledge of what age group in a certain territory uses what streaming platform so that I can spend marketing budgets on the platform where the assumed target group will most likely see it.

4.2 Use case #2 (RL_REQ#5: Genres trending for each market)

User Story: As a Record label, I want to know how music trends move across the markets so that I can predict how trends are changing and developing.

1. The ability to see data for a specific genre in one country.
2. The ability to see data for various genres in one country and present them in the same graph so that correlations become easier to detect visually.
3. The ability to see trends of a specific genre in various countries.
4. The ability to see trends of various genres in various countries and present them in the same graph so that correlations become easier to detect visually.

Funded by the European Commission

5 Questionnaire

A questionnaire was developed to evaluate the requirements and sub-requirements of RL_REQ#2 and RL_REQ#5. The goal with the questionnaire was to see if internal colleagues of Playground Music were able to find and use said requirements as well as get their evaluation of the functions of the platform and whether it is useful to them in their daily work. The questionnaire was combined of direct questions as well as open questions to get as much information out of it as possible.

We asked them to apply the questions on five different artists profiles. Before the questionnaire was given to pilot testers, a brief face to face demonstration of the platform was given.[1]

6 Analysis

It has been taken under consideration that this is a small scale pilot test: on a newly developed platform, which is why expectations have been set accordingly. The focus has been on identifying the different requirements and testing the functionality of them. With that in mind, the pilot testers are satisfied with the outcome and can validate the success of the initial requirements.

As of the time for the first pilot testing, the platform still needed further development to truly make an impact on a record labels day to day work. The common feedback from all pilot users was that while it was good to have so much information collected in one place - the platform was at the time still missing enough predictive analytical skill set to make an impact on the testers daily work. Analysing requirement #5 is a good example: while the information regarding genre trends is there and you can compare it to other genres and add different markets, the platform can still not alert us to movements and change in trends or pick up on common denominators. The analysis has to be done manually. Of course, manual analysis will always be necessary but the pilot testers believe that machine learning and analytical alerts will make all the difference and actually be a key factor giving FuturePulse a competitive advantage to similar services on the market.

Another major key factor is design and user experience. While the pilot testers agreed on the fact that the functions of the requirements were integrated into the platform, they also mentioned that the design and user experience could be better. Some mentioned that the navigation around the platform was hard and the experience was not flawless, others experienced the platforms as ‘buggy’ with some coding issues. Also, using the platform did not always make sense and it was sometimes hard to know how to access some data or how to use it correctly.

6.1 User Perception

In many ways, the functional requirements for the first phase of the project have been completed; meaning the functions are there and working or at least displayed on the platform. For instance, if we look at requirement RL_REQ#2; there is a visually combined

[1] See appendix 1 for questionnaire

Funded by the European Commission

timeline of comparable functions such as streaming numbers and popularity index. The sub-requirements that are missing are RL_REQ#23, RL_REQ#25, RL_REQ#2.8. Reasonable explanations have been given by the tech partners of why they are missing; whether it's accessing the correct data or needing more time to develop the functionality.

However, in the absence of a dedicated pilots coordinator (since Bass Nation was not taking on this role as planned) we have had some problems understanding what platform functions had information from accurate valid sources or if they were mock-ups.

For the medium scale pilot test, we suggest that the pilots coordinator communicates closely with the tech working group and sends clear instructions to the user case leaders of what functions on the platform are ready to be tested to have more clear knowledge of what is in production and what is not.

Seeing that many of the methods of analysing and presenting data on the platform are completely novel, the pilot testers have in some cases have a hard time understanding what exactly they are looking at. For instance, when looking at the genre trending graphs, the popularity is presented with numbers but what those numbers stand for and represent is somewhat unclear. A couple of the pilot testers have given their feedback that it is hard to trust some of the data presented since it is not very clear what sources have concluded the outcome of the data.

The pilot test included a quantitative test of thirty five artists to evaluate mainly two things:

1) If the links on the artists pages were correct, and
2) If the stats/information presented were accurate as well.

The testing resulted in the knowledge that most data and information on the platform is accurate. It is being collected from the right places as well as updated timely and continuously. However, there are still some wrongly linked sources and some wrongly sourced data. These errors have been detected by going through a large amount of artist data on the platform and compare them to sources outside of the platform (publicly available information). In other words, the process of finding the errors has been manual. The more artists added to the platform, the harder these errors will beto detect. It has, therefore, been in our interest to make sure that as many bugs as possible have been reported. It has also been in the interest of the technical partners to solve the bugs and make sure the problems are not recurring (more information under 7.4).

In addition, qualitative tests of five artists have been done to deliver more in depth knowledge and feedback.

6.2 User Acceptance

The pilot testers were expecting three main things of the platform:

1) a platform that presented features aligned with current business practices
2) a somewhat close-to-market product, and
3) a user interface which is easy to navigate.

In early July, a major update was done to the platform adding features that had not been available during the early testing. The pilot testers found that the second iteration of the platform was necessary in order to actually carry out the tests. Before the updated and added features there was little to nothing to actually test, especially considering the fact

that the testers were expecting a product that would add value to current business practices as well as being close to the market. The update delivered features of the platform that align with current needs of someone working with artists and artists development. The testers expressed that although not all features were fully ready to use, at least the potential of the continuous development of the platform was clear.

The new design and user interface made it possible to better navigate the platform. The amount of improvement that has been done on the platform during the course of the pilot left the testers with an increased trust in accomplishing the objectives. However, the biggest feedback was that a lot of work has to be put into improving the design and user interface as well as making the knowledge transfer more relatable.

6.3 Impact Assessment

RL_REQ#2

As mentioned above, the pilot testers found the platforms useful in regards to having all the information collected in one place which has been time saving. Also, being able to compare the different statistics from different platforms in the same graph has been aligned with current business practices. Usually this is done manually by accessing the different platforms which often make the results arbitrary.

To be able to fully exploit the platform, some explanations of novel features have to be clearer. For instance, the popularity index has to be given a context as it is hard to understand at the moment. Also, the testers expressed that some deeper insights and analytical knowledge is necessary to compete with similar platforms on the market. They expressed an interest in having the platform present solutions to *why* the changes in stats or figures is of importance - or at least the possibility to easily navigate to where in depth insights can be given.

RL_REQ#5

The testers also expressed their delight of being able to track and follow genre trends and how they move. However, they also found them hard to understand and hard to apply. Questions raised were: what does the number stand for? What is a trend? Is it a rise in streams, Facebook mentions or something else? The information provided now presents little to no context, which makes the information hard to understand.

Overall, the testers were happy with the initial features but are expecting further developments of the functions and design of the platform.

6.4 Technical feedback

The technical feedback has been collected and presented to the technical partners through a Google sheet. This sheet has listed miscellaneous bugs and errors that have been detected during the pilot. This feedback has been presented to the platform developers. The feedback has been received and most issues reported have been fixed.

Furthermore, the same sheet also contains the result of the first part of the pilot; testing if all the data from 35 sources is tracked correctly. This test has been carried out twice

Funded by the European Commission

within the pilot test period with 4 months apart. After the first test, many errors were found; stats and links were not tracked correctly and the information presented on the platform did not align with information from the sources. Early july a major update to the platform was made. Since the second iteration of the platform the same test has been conducted and only minor errors were detected.

6.5 Indicators and KPIs

For the first phase small scale pilot, these were the KPI:s and indicators for a successful test.

- **Test activity 1: Thirty five (35) tests carried out.**

Success factor: All data tracked from correct sources and presented as planned.

- **Test activity 2: Technical feedback**

Success factor: Technical feedback collected and given to pilot operators

- **Test activity 3: Four (4) in depth tests carried out.**

Success factor: Qualitative and useful findings for the continuation of the projects.

7 Design and setup of the medium scale pilot

7.1 Requirements to be tested and evaluated in medium scale pilot

RL_REQ#1: Predict success of tracks based on initial response
Description:
Based on initial data gain the ability to predict the success of a track. This initial data would be based on a set of parameters that would be tracked across all digital service providers.

Parameters currently available for all tracks:
- airplay numbers
- number of playlist adds + numbers of followers on these playlists
- adds to Spotify viral lists

Parameters currently available for PGM tracks only:
- saves to library or playlist
- number of streams (per day)
- organic vs curated streams
- average playing time
- listeners per month
- demographics, gender, age

RL_REQ#10:Playlist related streaming
Description:

Funded by the European Commission

If a song is featured in a specific curated playlist– how many streams will that playlist generate? We can see that certain playlists are very important when growing streams – what's the common denominator?

Sub requirements:RL_REQ#10.1 – ability to see playlist evolution and new playlist additions on Spotify
RL_REQ#10.2 – ability to divide Spotify playlists by followers
RL_REQ#10.3 – ability to sort playlists by editorial (playlists that a DSP creates manually) / all
RL_REQ#10.4 – ability to click on playlist name for further details
RL_REQ#10.5 – ability to click on playlist name and get list of similar playlists
RL_REQ#10.6 – ability to sort playlists by territories
RL_REQ#10.7 – ability to see playlist evolution and new playlist adds on all DSPs
RL_REQ#10.8 – ability to see statistics on specific playlist
RL_REQ#10.8.1 – company share - labels associated with the artists in the playlists (i.e. UMG 50%, WMG 30%, Sony 10%...)
RL_REQ#10.8.2 – genre share
RL_REQ#10.8.3 – country of artist
RL_REQ#10.9 – ability to filter playlists by "average monthly listeners"
RL_REQ#10.10 – ability to see playlist follower statistics: number of followers and demographics
RL_REQ#10.11 – ability to see Spotify popularity index of a playlist

The medium scale pilot (M25-M30) will provide feedback to technical partners and be a test of the more advanced sets of requirements and the visualisation and design and serve as a setup prior to the large scale pilot.

7.2 Post-pilot questionnaires

The post-pilot questionnaire will be based on the GQM measurement model which defined as a model on three levels:

Conceptual level (Goal)

A goal is defined for an object, for a variety of reasons, with respect to various models of quality, from various points of view and relative to a particular environment.

Operational level (Question)

A set of questions is used to define models of the object of study and then focuses on that object to characterise the assessment or achievement of a specific goal.

Quantitative level (Metric)

A set of metrics, based on the models, is associated with every question in order to answer it in a measurable way, practices and (mainly technical) mechanisms. For each evaluation dimension, a set of questions will be used to reflect the associated quality metrics and collect appropriate qualitative values for them. The questionnaires will be instantiated for each group from the evaluation audience.

Each FuturePulse use case has defined its own pilot evaluation roadmap according to the needs and requirements that each specific case has and possible stakeholders to be engaged throughout the implementation of each pilot. For the use case #1 (RL) the Goals, Questions and Metrics are based on the descriptions of the requirements and the sets of details therein but also on the findings from the first phase small pilot which will be reflected in the questionnaire.

7.3 Focus groups

The recruitment and engagement of focus group members and pilot users will be organised by each pilot leader among its business relations, clients and partners. Each pilot leader will create a list of potential users among its business relations, clients and partners in order to set up relevant pilot users focus groups.
Once the pilot user accepts to take part in the FuturePulse pilots, the pilot user will receive a formal engagement letter and be invited to sign a pilot user NDA.

The pilot users will then get access to the testing methodology and given a face to face or online first demonstration of the platform and the specific features that concern its area of business.

Focus groups will supply the test leader with written descriptions of outcome. Focused questionnaire based on the results from small scale pilot will be distributed to all the users involved in the medium scale pilot. The test leader will set up meetings with the focus groups to discuss results from said written descriptions and questionnaire results.

7.4 The evaluation methodology

For each of the project objectives, the evaluation methodology defines the following evaluation dimensions:

- Capture the user perception on effectiveness
- Monitor the user acceptance
- Investigate on the impact assessment
- User Perception
- Completeness of the evaluation assets against the functional requirements
- Effectiveness of the evaluation assets to address the accountability attributes
- Capability of the evaluation assets to implement the accountability support services
- Accuracy of the evaluation assets to deliver the expected artefacts
- User acceptance
- Usefulness of the evaluation assets
- Alignment of the evaluation assets to current business practices
- Overhead of the evaluation assets for knowledge transfer
- Increased trust in accomplishing the objectives
- Impact assessment
- Benefits brought by the evaluation assets to current business practices
- Barriers raised by the evaluation assets further wider adoption of the solution framework

Funded by the European Commission

- Coverage of the data protection requirements in current cloud markets
- Willingness to leverage the use of the FuturePulse platform and applications
- Overall satisfaction

Although concrete steps have been defined, deviations and adjustments may occur according to the technical implementation of the actual solution and available functionalities. As some technical issues can be considered as slightly unpredictable, short deviations may happen and pilot plans may need to be adjusted according to the available functionalities. For this reason, all pilot plans will be revised and adjusted as the project moves along and in the medium scale pilot there will be a special focus on the evaluation and testing of the user experience (UX).

7.5 Medium scale (M25-M30) summary

- Engage with end users through focus groups
- Conduct medium scale pilots
- Define testing scenarios
- Update the evaluation questionnaire for the pilots

8 Summary of results and conclusions

To conclude, this small scale pilot test have been carried out according to plan. All three KPIs have been met with successful results.

The quantitative tests have shown that information sources tracked are correct and accurately presented. Technical feedback has been given to the technical partners and since this is a dynamic project this KPI will be ongoing. However, the communication of technical improvements and updates can be improved to give a clearer understanding of the state of the platform and which features are ready to test. This is something to consider especially for the medium scale pilot.

As for the qualitative aspect, in depth tests the pilot has resulted in many learnings. The biggest one being the importance of design and user interface; being able to present all the data and features in a comprehensive way so that someone who is not deeply involved in the project can make use of it. The testers are certain that the back end developments and features are or will be beneficial to their work, however if they are not presented in a user friendly way and explained it will be hard to further use the platform.

Furthermore, it has been taken under consideration that this is a small scale pilot test: on a newly developed platform, which is why expectations have been set accordingly. The focus has been on identifying the different requirements and testing the functionality of them. With that in mind, the pilot testers are satisfied with the outcome and can validate the success of the initial requirements.

Going forward, a couple of challenges have been identified. To be able to really stand out on the market amongst competitors, the platform needs to have some more

predictive analytic functionality. This is taken under consideration in future requirements but nonetheless of importance to stress.

Another challenge is the design and user interface. This has to be improved. In order to attain and retain potential users, the design and user interface is of utmost importance. Even though the technical team has developed amazing and novel features, they do not add value unless presented in a way where the user can understand them and apply them to their daily work.

A third challenge is the pace of the development of the platform for the medium scale pilot. During the first phase pilot, we have realised that all the requirements under test have to be fully integrated in order to get a comprehensive feel of the platform. Adding features sporadically has been a challenge when carrying out the test and trying to give a holistic assessment of the platform and its added value.

Funded by the European Commission

APPENDIX

Appendix 1 - Questionnaire

RL_REQ#2 - A combined visual timeline for streaming statistics of an artist

1. (REQ#2.1, 2.2, 2.4,) On the artists profile, is it possible to see a combined timeline for the following metrics:

   a) popularity index (Spotify),
   b) streaming numbers (all DSPs),
   c) YouTube subscribers and views and
   d) Social media statistics and facts?

1.2 Was it easy to navigate to above information?

1.3 Did you find the above information comprehensive and useful in your daily work?

2. With help from the visual timeline/graph, is it possible to understand:

   a) The correlation between Spotify streams and Spotify followers?
   b) How YouTube views translate to Spotify Streams?
   c) If social media mentions correlates with streaming and how?

3. (REQ#2.9) Is the demographic data displayed in a comprehensive and extensive way?

4. Does the demographic data help you understand and define:

   a) Possible target groups for an artist?
   b) Markets where the artists is dominant?
   c) Emerging markets and locations where the artist has potential to grow?

5. (REQ#2.7) Does the platform display Apple Music data?

6. (REQ#2.8) Is it possible to compare streaming data with airplay data?

7. (REQ#2.10) Is device data displayed in a comprehensive and extensive way?

8. (REQ#2.11) Is free users vs premium users displayed in a comprehensive and extensive way?

9. (REQ#2.6) Is there a function to see monthly listener to follower ratio?

10. (REQ#2.3) Is it possible to get chart information on everything from top 50 to top 1000?

Funded by the European Commission

11. Can you manually enter events (live, marketing, media coverage) into the platform to be analyzed?

12. Does the navigation of the platform make sense?

13. In relation to the above questions and functions, we would like to get other comments on the functionality of the platform. Does it contain the information expected and needed? Does it add value to your daily work? Is some information excessive? Would you like to add or amend anything to better suit your needs?

RL_REQ#5 - Genres trending for each market

14. Can you find data for genres in various countries?

15. Can you find trends in genres for various markets?

16. Can you follow trends on timelines in various markets?

17. In relation to the above questions and functions, we would like to get other comments on the functionality of the genres functions. Does it contain the information expected and needed?

Appendix 2 – Post-pilot questionnaire for the medium scale pilot

RL_REQ#10 - Playlist related streaming

1. (REQ#10.1 and 10.2) On the artists profile, is it possible to see playlist evolution and new playlist additions on Spotify for:

    a. a specific track,
    b. and divide the playlist by followers?

i. Was it easy to navigate the above information?

ii. Did you find the above information comprehensive and useful in your daily work?

2. (REQ#10.3, 10.4, 10.5, 10.7 and 10.8) When navigating within playlists do you have the following abilities:

    a. ability to sort playlists by editorial (playlists that a DSP creates manually) / all,
    b. ability to click on playlist name for further details,
    c. ability to click on playlist name and get list of similar playlists,
    d. ability to see playlist evolution and new playlist adds on all DSPs,
    e. ability to see statistics on specific playlist?

i. Was it easy to navigate the above information?

ii. Did you find the above information comprehensive and useful in your daily work?

3. (REQ#10.8.1) When looking at a specific playlist can you do the following:

    a. See the company share - Labels associated with the artists in the playlists (i.e. UMG 50%, WMG 30%, Sony 10%...)

i. Was it easy to navigate the above information?

ii. Did you find the above information comprehensive and useful in your daily work?

4. (REQ#10.8.2) When looking at a specific playlist can you do the following:

    a. See the shares of genres within the playlist?

i. Was it easy to navigate the above information?

ii. Did you find the above information comprehensive and useful in your daily work?

5. (REQ#10.8.3) When looking at a specific playlist can you do the following:

    a. See country of origin for the artists in the playlist?

Funded by the European Commission

i. Was it easy to navigate the above information?

ii. Did you find the above information comprehensive and useful in your daily work?

6. (REQ#10.9, 10.10 and 10.11) Within a playlist, can you do the following:

   a. Filter playlists by ”average monthly listeners”,

   b. See playlist follower statistics: number of followers and demographics,

   c. See the Spotify popularity index of a playlist?

i. Was it easy to navigate the above information?

ii. Did you find the above information comprehensive and useful in your daily work?

RL_REQ#1 - Predict success based on initial response

1. Can you find data for the following parameters on track level?

   a. - listeners per month?
   b. - saves?
   c. - average playing time?
   d. - number of streams?
   e. - organic vs curated streams?
   f. - number of playlist adds + numbers of followers on these playlists?
   g. - airplay numbers?
   h. - demographics (gender, age)?
   i. - adds to spotify viral lists?

Funded by the European Commission