

Feedback on briefing document – Advisory Board 5th October 2018

Role and tasks – Advisory board

- The board is presented as a support tool (for consultation, review,...) which represents a substantial load of (volunteer-)work. Live DMA expects a better involvement of the advisory board in the strategic decisions too.
- The consortium and the advisory board members share a lot of concerns but also different interests. Live DMA suggests to include The European Commission in the Advisory board to arbitrate how the different feedbacks are taken into account in the final report.

Data collection

The European music sector is not just made of trades and sales. We must observe more indicators related to « **music practices** » in general to have a full picture of the sector.

- The composition of the music sector (public bodies, private non-profit, private commercial)
- Sales and income along the music value chain (sources of incomes + sources of expenses)
- Activities
- Employment and volunteers (totals and « full-time-equivalent »). It would be interesting not to collect only totals but to get an overview by age/gender/ as well.
- Gross value added and the sector's contribution to European GDP
- Audience practices (playing music and listening to music are not limited to a consumer behaviour. Ex : play guitar in your garage or school studio, sing in a choir, attend a free concert in a bar)
- Circulation of the European repertoire
- Cultural diversity (any idea how ?)
- The flow of the various music rights across the EU

Focus

Live DMA wants to highlight a few very important points mentioned in the briefing document, but that need more attention :

- The questions of data ownership and data accessibility. What are the conditions for a free and transparent access to the data gathered by the Observatory ? How to guarantee that the data is owned by the source, and not the one who collects ? Ex : Live DMA collects data about activities, employment and finances in the music venues. Live DMA can share and communicate the totals, average and median numbers but we can't communicate the raw and individual data for each venue.
- The practical use to the music sector : what flexibility for the Observatory ? Thinking the Observatory as a top-down institution might lead to a big issue : the observatory will not be able to collect the data. How to think the Observatory in a bilateral relationship with the sector, serving its needs ?
- What continuity ? Will the Observatory work on « one-shot » data collection, or isn't it a goal to conduct yearly collection to be able to analyse the evolutions of the sector.
- The translation challenges

Qualitative data

I haven't seen it mentioned in the document at all. Universities and researchers produce a very large amount of qualitative and scientific studies. The Observatory is a chance to gather and organise all this work already available about the music sector and its evolutions (in terms of sociologist, economic, technical, and aesthetics innovations).

Organisation models and scenarios

Live DMA proposes to add a consultation phase to know how different music organisations imagine the future Observatory. Indeed, it is likely possible that the Music Observatory's needs do not fit with any already-existing Observatory.

Study on Music Moves Europe

Data Collection

Same general comment as for the Observatory :

- Number of **organisations (public, private non-profit, private commercial)**
- Jobs
- GVA
- Turnover
- Wherever possible, working hours (paid/unpaid), working conditions (e.g. short-term vs long-term contracts, mobility requirements)
- Music revenues per format (digital, physical, live) → **sources of incomes + sources of expenses**
- ~~Ideally some~~ data or qualitative information on repertoires, genres, and ancillary services (music education, instruments)
- Cross-border circulation of artists and repertoires (online and offline digital platforms, dependence on live revenues),