

	Smaller independent body → Fully fledged	Contracted research management → Fully fledged	In-house Observatory within the competent Commission service(s) → Fully-fledged	Hybrid option → Consistent approach to data collection
<b>Proposed Action</b>	The Commission would support the development of a small independent structure, based on the example proposed as the 'fully-fledged option' indicated within this report. This option would require less than the budget proposed and would not have the same number of staff, resulting in less projects and data collection/analysis.	The Commission would initiate calls for tenders in order to gather data on the European music sector. Tenders could also be launched to develop long term data collection solutions to address gaps. The data and working methods developed during this phase could be used as providing the basis for any future independent structure.	The Commission would hire several experts and begin working on developing data collection methods, working with potential providers of data and analysis of the data. Eventually, more members can be added, and these members can also be moved into an independent Observatory structure if this is eventually developed.	The Commission will test a number of different actions to gather and improve data relating to the music sector. This will potentially involve a combination of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• calls for proposals/tender for projects that need to be carried out by third parties;</li> <li>• Projects carried out in-house by the competent Commission service(s), working in combination with the JRC or external experts on music sector related projects;</li> <li>• Strengthening cooperation with other relevant data collection bodies regarding music sector data;</li> <li>• Working with and providing support for stakeholders to improve existing data collection activities;</li> <li>• Working closely with sectoral and non-sectoral data collection experts to address innovative solutions to addressing data gaps.</li> </ul>
<b>Benefits</b>	Would make the process of scaling up easier; Can already establish working methods; Consistency in staff, premises and working methods already in place	Would be straightforward to implement from a legal view; Allows for time to develop and test ideas, as well as time to gain the necessary political and financial support.	Having consistent staff and working methods in place would allow for a smooth transfer in case an independent structure was eventually created; Working methods already in place allows for consistency.	Flexible approach; Allows to test a number of different possibilities in parallel; Allows the first data collection at European Level to take place; Can use as a basis to develop into a number of structural options.
<b>Challenges</b>	Challenges in establishing a legal basis and the necessary political support would be similar, if not the same as for a fully-fledged option. Limited budget would mean less work carried out, possible unrealised expectations.	Lack of consistency in data and information provided if multiple tenders addressed by different parties. Difficult to scale up as a following independent structure; would be a very different form to the existing structure. Need for additional members at a time when it is extremely difficult to recruit human resources	Potentially challenging to move from an internal Commission structure to an independent body; Strain on the financial resources in-house.	Lack of consistency in approach; Does not involve the development of a real structure with its own identity; Potentially does not meet the expectations of stakeholders.

Source: Panteia, 2019