

Arbetsmarknadsdepartementet

Yttrande angående ILO:s rapport V (3) om anständigt arbete i plattformsekonomin

Genom remiss den 25 augusti 2025 har Svenska ILO-kommittén ombetts att yttra sig över ILO:s rapport *Decent work in the platform economy, ILC.114/ Report V(3)*.

Rapporten har tagits fram inför den andra standardsättande diskussionen om anständigt arbete i plattformsekonomin som ska äga rum vid Internationella arbetskonferensens hundra fjortonde möte i juni 2026.

Rapporten innehåller ett antal förslag och frågor, syftande till att inhämta medlemsstaternas ändringsförslag/synpunkter på utkast till konvention och rekommendation till Internationella arbetsbyrån. Staterna kan även lämna kommentarer avseende annat. Kommentarererna kommer att ingå i den fjärde och sista rapporten som byrån förbereder som underlag inför konferensen 2026.

ILO-kommittén har ombetts att besvara ILO:s rapporteringsformulär på engelska.

ILO-kommittén har valt att besvara de frågor som ställs av ILO, och i vissa fall kommentarer även avseende annat, direkt i detta yttrande och använder således inte rapporteringsformuläret.

Rapporten återfinns som [bilaga 1](#).

Kommittén brukar vid besvarande av denna typ av remisser i sin tur remittera ärendet till ett antal myndigheter och organisationer. ILO:s snäva tidsramar för Sveriges svar gör dock att det inte har funnits tid för en sådan underremittering inför detta yttrande.

ILO-kommittén yttrade sig 2024 över ILO:s rapport Realizing decent work in the platform economy och ett tillhörande frågeformulär inför ILO:s första standardsättande diskussion om anständigt arbete i plattformsekonomin vid arbetskonferensens 113:e session 2025 (kommitténs yttrande nr 15/2024). ILO-kommittén hade då remitterat ärendet till en rad myndigheter och organisationer.

Svenska ILO-kommitténs allmänna kommentarer

General comments

A new ILO instrument

We welcome the ILO initiative of an instrument regarding decent work in the platform economy. In our response to the first questionnaire, we indicated our preference for the instrument to take the form of a recommendation. During the International Labour Conference in June 2025 there was expressed a preference for a Convention that is “principles-based”. We can agree with the idea that the instrument should be a “principles-based” Convention, supplemented by a recommendation and thus not so detailed. However, such a Convention must provide space for national systems and adaptations. We appreciate the latest efforts made by the Office in this regard.

As communicated in our response to the first questionnaire, the Swedish ILO-committee does not consider that everyone who performs work through digital platforms, regardless of if there is an employment relationship or another kind of contractual relationship, should be included in the definition of a digital platform worker. It is our firm belief that a new instrument should only regulate workers in an employment relationship. An ILO-instrument covering all platform-workers, even those who are not employees, is problematic. The creation of “a third category of employees” should be avoided. Nonetheless, we note the outcome of the June 2025 negotiations on the definitions and on the scope.

Should this outcome persist, and these provisions remain unopened, we would like to note that we find it profoundly important to maintain the division between employees and others who carry out work for a digital labour platform. The Convention must be drafted in a way that allows for national systems where genuine self-employed and platform workers in an employment relationship are subject to different legislation. It is central that labour law regulations are applicable only where there is an employment relationship.

In our view the current texts are not formulated in a way that it is possible to maintain the division between platform workers in an employment relationship and for instance self-employed. The

provisions must be analysed from this perspective and amended so they open up for different implementations on national level. The time to reflect and analyse the texts from this point of view has been too short. As our principal view is that the instrument only shall cover employees our answers to the questionnaire are based on that standpoint.

Digital labour platforms

Should the definition on digital labour platform be reopened we are of the view that it would be important to clarify that the instruments should not encompass digital platforms which are not labour platforms. It is not desirable that the new instruments regulate for example social media, search engines and the like.

The concept of employee

A central issue in labour law is who is to be regarded as an employee. It is important that the concept of employee and the assessment of employment status continues to be determined nationally. Furthermore, it is important to maintain the difference between employees and others who carry out work. It is therefore important that a new ILO instrument does not create an intermediate concept between employees and non-employees by, for example, extending the rights that normally are due to employees to self-employed workers as well.

Innovation and self-employment

It is important that a new instrument does not hinder member states to promote innovation and self-employment or making it possible to be engaged for work without being an employee.

The social partners and the Swedish labour market model

In Sweden, working conditions are mainly determined by collective agreements. It is therefore important that any new ILO instrument on decent work in the platform economy takes into account national labour market models and allows for working conditions to be regulated by collective agreements.

Furthermore, since wage formation is a matter for the social partners in Sweden, it is also important that a new instrument does not contain any mandatory provisions on statutory minimum wages.

Consultation, negotiation and agreements with the social partners

Regarding consultation, negotiation and agreements with the social partners, we consider it important to preserve the tripartite model that forms the basis of the ILO. The model involves the governments of the Member States as well as the national workers and employers' organizations. We therefore consider that a new instrument should not grant rights to organizations/representatives other than workers' and

employers' organizations. References to other 'organisations representing digital labour platforms and digital platform workers' should therefore not be included in the instrument.

The EU Platform Work Directive

The European union has adopted directive (EU) 2024/2831 on improved working conditions for platform workers. It is important that the ILO instruments will be compatible with the EU directive.

Svenska ILO-kommitténs svar och kommentarer till frågeformuläret

The convention

Ingress

-

Article 1 Definitions

Article 1 (a) (i) – digital labour platform

We note the outcome of the June 2025 negotiations.

We support the Office's proposal to change the wording to "organizing and facilitating" (Office p 29).

The wording "and/or" is, as the Office points out, ambiguous. We do not support the widening of the scope that the wording implies. We would like to stress that the instrument should not cover a wide range of digital platforms, such as social media and online advertising and search engines. The instruments should regulate digital labour platforms. We therefore favour using the term "and".

Article 1 (b) – digital platform worker

A digital platform worker is currently defined as a person employed **or** engaged to work. We note the outcome of the June 2025 negotiations. However, we are of the view that the words "or engaged to work" should be deleted.

As regards **Article 1 (b) (i)**, we are of the same opinion, for the same reasons, as above regarding Article 1 (a). We favour using the term “and” (Office p 29).

Article 1 (d) – remuneration, payment

If the Convention shall cover both workers in an employment relationship and persons engaged to work, we can support the proposal to add the word “or payment” in the second sentence of the definition (Office p 35). However, it needs to be clarified in the text that the terms are not interchangeable, but rather apply to different situations, i.e. employees receive remuneration and non-employees (a person engaged to work) receive payment.

We support the proposal to add the word “and” in “national law and regulations” (Office p 36).

It is crucial that there is flexibility in this part of the convention, given the many different national systems.

Article 2 Scope

Please refer to our comments in the general text above and to the comments to the definitions (Office p 40).

Article 3 Fundamental principles and rights at work

We support a more principles-based Convention. In order to reach an agreement, we could be flexible regarding the deletion of Article 3(2). The article is not necessary as the rights are already covered in Article 3.1 (a) (Office p 42).

Concerning Article 3.1, we would like the first sentence to be reworded in a way that it is in consistence with the wording of the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work and its Follow-up (p 2), where the words to respect, to promote and to realize are used.

Articles 4–7 Occupational safety and health

Article 4

We are flexible. We can support the present text, but we can also support the new proposals from Office regarding article 4.1 and 4.2 and moving the present 4.2 to the recommendations (Office p 48 and 50).

Article 5

We support the proposal of the Office to remove Article 5, as we support a more principles-based Convention (Office p 53).

Article 7

We don't support the proposal to remove Article 7 (Office p 56).

Article 8 Violence and harassment

We note the information given by the Office in their commentary on the draft texts, p 20.

We propose that the text in Article 8 is deleted from “consistent with” and forwards.

Article 9 Employment promotion

Member States' responsibilities regarding employment promotion should apply to the whole labour market. Specific provisions on this for platform work is not necessary. In our view Article 9 therefore could be deleted.

Article 10 Employment relationship

Article 10.1 should be kept but rephrased, see below.

In our view Article 10.1 should be rephrased to “each Member shall take measures to ensure the correct classification of digital platform workers in relation to the existence of an employment relationship “in accordance with national law and practice, taking into account the Employment relationship Recommendation, 2006 (no 198) if

applicable.” The changes of the proposed provision aim to ensure that the conditions for determination of employment status is decided on national level.

We prefer to keep Article 10.2 (Office p 61).

Article 11–13 Remuneration

Article 11

As has been stated in the general comments, we do not consider that everyone who performs work through digital labour platforms should have been included in the definition of a labour platform worker. Nonetheless, we note the outcome of the June 2025 negotiations.

As such, if the text is to be amended to “remuneration or payment”, it is our view that it would also be logical to make the corresponding changes in the title (Office p 62).

We can also support the proposal to remove “including when calculated on a piece-rate basis” (Office p 65 (a)).

We support the wording “national law and regulations” (Office 65 (b)).

As regards Article 11 (a) we can accept the wording “adequate”, only if national labour market models without statutory minimum wage, and where the social partners are responsible for negotiating wages fit within this framework (Office p 67).

We welcome the effort to provide flexibility for the member states on how to ensure adequate remuneration. Instead of the proposed new wording after “adequate”, it could be considered to use the wording “in accordance with national law and practice”.

Article 12

We support the proposal to move the more detailed requirements of Article 12 to the Recommendation (Office p 70).

Please also note the previous comment regarding adding the word payment.

Article 13

We support the proposal to move the content of Article 13 to Article 21.

Please also note the previous comment regarding adding the word payment.

Article 15 – 17 Impact of the use of automated systems

Article 16

Please note the previous comments regarding adding the word payment (Office p 79).

Article 17

We can support the proposal to use the wording “a review conducted by a human being” (Office p 83).

Please also note the previous comments regarding adding the word payment.

Our opinion is that the scope of the obligations in Article 17 (a) is too wide as it refers to “any decision”.

Article 19

We can support the amended Article 19 and to move the detailed wording to the Recommendation (Office p 87).

Article 21 – 22 Terms and conditions of employment or engagement

Article 21

We support the proposal to merge Article 21 and 13, however with the important change that information should be in writing, if possible, but with no requirement of a written contract (Office p 90 and 91). We also propose to delete “in an appropriate, verifiable and easily understandable manner” in order to make the provision less detailed.

In Sweden it is possible to conclude contracts – both employment contracts and others – orally.

Please also note the previous comment regarding adding the word payment (Office p 92).

Article 23 Protecting migrants and refugees

We support adding the wording “or engagement” (Office p 94).

Article 25 Compliance and enforcement

We support adding the word “and” (Office p 96).

Article 29

We propose to delete the reference to “organisations representing digital labour platforms and digital platform workers”.

It is crucial that the tripartite system of the ILO is reflected in the instrument. The right to be consulted shall therefore not be given to other organizations than the acknowledged social partners in the tripartite system, namely employers and workers organizations.

Article 30

We support the meaning of Article 30. However, it should be ensured that a corresponding wording is used as in other ILO-instruments.

The Draft Recommendation

Paragraph 1 – 5 Freedom of association, social dialogue and the role of employers and workers organizations

Paragraph 1

We are flexible but prefer the original wording “considered” instead of the suggested “applied”.

Paragraph 2 – 5

General

Paragraph 2–5 should not be included in the recommendation regarding persons who are not employees and their counterparts.

The proposed wording of paragraph 2–5 seems to be modelled on the rights and obligations between employers and employees and their organizations as regards freedom of association, social dialogue and the role of employers and workers organizations, which is also the headline of the section.

Within the ILO-system freedom of association and the effective recognition of the right to collective bargaining are fundamental principles and rights. There is presently no equivalent regulation within the ILO system regarding persons who are not employees and their counterparts.

Paragraph 2

See above under general.

(no question from Office)

Paragraph 3

See above under general. In addition:

We can accept the paragraph if it's narrowed to employers and employees. The fundamental principles and rights in the area are only aimed for them. The reference to organizations representing digital

labour platforms and digital platform workers should therefore be deleted.

It is crucial that the tripartite system of the ILO is reflected in the instrument. The rights shall therefore not be awarded other organizations than the acknowledged social partners within the tripartite system, namely employers and workers organizations.

Paragraph 4

This paragraph should be deleted. The internal life of the social partners should not be regulated. Free, democratic and independent workers and employers' organizations are crucial.

Neither the present nor the suggested wording is acceptable. The state should not have an influence on internal matters of the organizations, such as which group of workers or employers they shall organize. Conventions are ratified by member states and a recommendation is to be read in conjunction with the Convention. Thus, also the recommendation is aimed to the member states. The recommendation should therefore not recommend the member states to encourage the social partners or be directed to the social partners. (Office p 106).

Paragraph 5

We can accept the paragraph in its present wording, except the reference to organizations representing digital labour platforms and digital platform workers, which should be deleted.

(no question from Office)

Paragraph 6 Occupational safety and health

We can accept the change, and we welcome the flexibility (Office p 109 and 102).

Paragraph 7 – 8 Employment promotion

Paragraph 7 and 8

Reference is made to our answer under Article 9 of the convention. Responsibilities for member states regarding employment promotion should apply for the whole labour market on equal terms and not specifically regarding the platform economy.

The paragraphs 7 and 8 should therefore be deleted.

(no question from Office)

Paragraph 10 – 16 Remuneration and working time

The title

If the title should include “payment” ultimately depends on what the convention will be encompassing (Office p 116).

Paragraph 10

If the paragraph should include “payment” ultimately depends on what the convention will be encompassing (Office p 118).

We would like to repeat our comments above regarding payment and remuneration under Article 11 in the convention.

Paragraph 11

We would like to repeat our comments regarding payment and remuneration.

We are in favour of making the recommendation less detailed regarding payment and remuneration. Thus, the paragraph can be deleted (Office p 120).

Paragraph 13

We support the suggested changes to create more flexibility (Office p 123).

Paragraph 14 and 15

Our view is that the proposed paragraphs 14 and 15 are too detailed and should therefore be deleted.

If regulated in the Recommendation we can support the proposal to make Paragraph 14 to clause d) in Paragraph 15 and to add a new paragraph

(Office p 126, 129 and 130)

Paragraph 16

The provision is too detailed, and this should instead be regulated at national level.

If the text remains, we can support the proposed amendment (Office p 132).

Paragraph 17 – 20 Social security

Paragraph 17

We do not think that the method of financing the social security system should be regulated in the recommendation.

If the text remains, instead of the proposed amendment we propose a new wording as follows. Members should take measures to ensure appropriate financing of sustainable social security systems (Office p 134).

Paragraph 19 and 20

We support the proposal to delete those paragraphs (Office p 140).

Paragraph 25 – 26 Protection of digital platform workers' personal data and privacy

Paragraph 25

We support the proposal to delete paragraph 25 (Office 143).

Paragraph 27 Terms and conditions of employment or engagement

We suggest that the paragraph is deleted. The proposed provision is too detailed and should instead be regulated at national level.

If regulated it is important that the wording is changed so that the information should be in writing but with no requirement of a written contract.

(no question from Office)

Paragraph 28 Protection of migrants and refugees

We support the proposal to delete paragraph 28 (Office 147).

If not deleted we can accept the addition of "or engagement" if the convention will be covering both employees and others. (Office p 148)

Paragraphs 31 – 33 Compliance and enforcement

Paragraph 31

We can support deleting this paragraph. (Office p 152)

Paragraph 32

We can support deleting this paragraph. (Office p 154)

Paragraphs 34 – 35 Implementation

Paragraph 34

We suggest that the paragraph is deleted. The proposed provision is too detailed. We can accept clause b).

I beslutet i detta ärende har deltagit undertecknad Cathrine Lilja Hansson och ledamöterna Emelie Barbou des Places, Cecilia Mobach,

Anna Bergsten, Ola Brinnen, Marie Nordström, Cyrene Martinsson Waern, Lise Donovan och Sophie Silverryd.

Arbetsgivarrepresentanterna från Svenskt Näringsliv har reserverat sig mot beslutet i enlighet med bilaga 2. Arbetstagarrepresentanterna har gemensamt reserverat sig mot beslutet i enlighet med bilaga 3.

Ärendet har handlagts av undertecknad sekreterare.

För Svenska ILO-kommittén

Cathrine Lilja Hansson
Ordförande

Helle Ellehöj
Sekreterare

Bilaga 2

Reservation från Svenskt Näringsliv

The Confederation of Swedish Enterprise hereby submits the following reservations to the Swedish ILO Committee's (the Committee) comments regarding the ILO Office's questionnaire in the Brown Report "*Decent Work in the Platform Economy*".

Reservations have been entered with respect to Articles 1, 2, 11(a), 12, 16, 18 and 19, as well as paragraphs 2, 5, 8, 13, 15 and 16. Furthermore, proposals have been made for new Articles 19bis, 19ter and 30bis, and for a new paragraph 26bis. An alternative wording and proposals for new points have also been submitted under the Preamble.

To the extent that the Committee has not provided observations on the operative provisions proposed by the ILO Office, the Confederation of Swedish Enterprise has likewise refrained from commenting on these provisions. This should not be interpreted as implying that the Confederation of Swedish Enterprise otherwise endorses the ILO Office's proposals in other respects.

General Comments

The Confederation of Swedish Enterprise aligns itself with the Committee's general comments. However, it wishes to emphasize that the EU Platform Work Directive should not be regarded as a baseline or minimum standard in the course of the ongoing negotiations. Furthermore, it is of great importance that the proposed ILO standards reflect a greater balance among the various interests, through a clearer recognition of the positive aspects of platform work and the protection of the rights and needs of digital labour platform companies.

Reservations concerning the Draft Convention **Preamble**

In the first paragraph, we propose that the phrase "significantly transforming the way work is organized and performed" be replaced with "*has increased opportunities for job creation, earnings and market access.*"

The platform economy has not fundamentally changed the way work is performed. As noted by the ILC Platform Committee during the negotiations, most digital labour platforms do not organize work. Moreover, in certain jurisdictions, the term “organize” is closely associated with an employment relationship.

The fifth paragraph of the preamble should be deleted. As the ILO Office clarified during the 2025 ILC, not all platform companies use automated systems; those that do use them in different ways, and automated systems are also widely used outside the platform economy.

We further propose that the following paragraph be added to the preamble:

Recognizing the role of the platform economy in creating earning and job opportunities, particularly among populations that face structural barriers to entry into the traditional job market,
Recognizing the need to support digital labour platforms with an enabling environment for sustainable enterprises,
Acknowledging the diversity of reasons why workers choose to work on or through digital labour platforms, such as flexibility, autonomy, and better work-life balance.

Articles 1–2

Each of these definitions was discussed in detail during the 2025 International Labour Conference and should not be reopened for negotiation. The texts represent the outcome of a hard-won tripartite consensus and should therefore be respected. Reopening provisions that have already been negotiated would undermine the prospects of achieving a broad, consensus-based agreement at the 2026 ILC.

The Confederation of Swedish Enterprise particularly opposes replacing “and/or” with “and” in Article 1(a). The term “organize” implies, in many jurisdictions, the existence of an employment relationship. The vast majority of platform companies merely facilitate contact between customers and service providers. As a rule, service providers are not employees; moreover, they are generally free to decide if, when, where, and how they wish to work.

The Confederation of Swedish Enterprise also objects to adding the expression “or payment” after “remuneration” in the second part of Article 1(d). Self-employed persons are typically responsible for the costs incurred in connection with their work. In many member States, they may also deduct such costs for tax purposes. Such an addition

could furthermore affect existing business models, in which prices are set directly between the service provider and the client, and where the platform company often has no insight into the pricing process.

Articles 11 (a) and 12

The Confederation of Swedish Enterprise is of the view that paragraph 11(a) and Article 12 should be deleted

Article 16

The Confederation of Swedish Enterprise considers that the concept of indirect discrimination in Article 16 is too broad. There may be legitimate reasons to treat workers differently, for example based on experience or skills. This part should either be deleted or redrafted to allow exceptions from the provisions for legitimate reasons.

Artikel 18-19

Article 18-19 should be deleted.

Data privacy is a very important topic across the economy. As there will be a dedicated expert meeting on data protection in 2027, we should avoid creating new regulations just for the platform economy, which would lead to confusion and incoherence. We should not create a hierarchy of privacy protection between platform and non-platform workers.

Additionally, these provisions do not recognize the legitimate purposes for which data is collected. It also neglects to acknowledge that regulations should be consistent with not only international instruments, but also national law and practice.

New section: *Protection of the rights of digital labour platforms*

The Confederation of Swedish Enterprise considers it essential that the forthcoming ILO standard be guided by the principles of balance and a holistic approach. The Confederation therefore proposes that the following text be included under Article 19:

New 19bis: Each Member should ensure that the measures in this instrument protect and do not interfere with or compromise commercially

sensitive information, intellectual property or trade secrets of digital labour platforms.

New 19ter: Each Member should ensure that the measures in this instrument do not put digital labour platforms at a competitive disadvantage compared to other enterprises.

New section: 30 bis

The Confederation of Swedish Enterprise proposes that a new article be introduced with the aim of ensuring that the provisions of the Convention complement the existing regulations of the member States.

“Measures taken by a Member to implement this instrument should not be used as a criterion, basis or evidence for reclassification or to establish a presumption of employment”.

Reservations concerning the Draft Recommendation

Paragraph 2

Notwithstanding, the Confederation of Swedish Enterprise considers that the phrase in paragraph 2, “including, where appropriate, at the cross-border level”, should be replaced with “where applicable.” ILO instruments are intended to operate at the national level, and the ILO should not be seen as encouraging member States to intervene in the regulatory frameworks of other member States with regard to labour relations. In light of the substantial differences in national legislation and practice, the use of “where applicable” would provide member States with the necessary flexibility.

Paragraph 5

The Confederation of Swedish Enterprise aligns itself with the Committee’s proposed modifications to Article 5 but considers that Article 5 should be deleted in its entirety. The requirement to provide “*all information relevant and necessary*” conflicts with companies’ intellectual property rights and other regulations protecting sensitive information. A general obligation to share sensitive information with a wide range of organizations would also infringe upon companies’ fundamental freedom to conduct business.

Paragraph 8

The Confederation of Swedish Enterprise welcomes the ILO Office's proposal in paragraph 8.

Paragraph 13

The Confederation of Swedish Enterprise considers that the paragraph should be deleted if it applies to self-employed persons. We wish to emphasize at the outset that employers should of course not charge fees to their employees. Platform workers operating as self-employed, however, use platforms as a tool to reach a broad customer base and offer their services. The operation of platforms relies on the possibility of charging fees to those who use the platform to find assignments or clients. Limiting this possibility could risk hindering the development of the platform economy.

Paragraph 14

The Confederation of Swedish Enterprise considers that the paragraph should be deleted and opposes its transfer to paragraph 15 should it not be removed.

Paragraph 15

The Confederation of Swedish Enterprise is firmly opposed to the Office's proposal to introduce a new paragraph (15bis), which would require independent contractors to be reimbursed for their expenses. Self-employed workers are responsible for their own expenses, including platform workers. In many Member States, self-employed platform workers are permitted to deduct business expenses for tax purposes. These well-established practices, which are essential to the functioning of the broader economy, should not be overridden in this manner.

Digital platforms generally do not have visibility into the expenses incurred by self-employed workers, and achieving such visibility would require significantly restricting the flexibility that platform workers currently enjoy. Many workers operate across multiple platforms simultaneously and may use platforms to secure only a portion of their clients, while obtaining others through alternative means. In such cases, it would be impossible for a given platform to determine its obligations

under the proposed paragraph. For these reasons, this paragraph should be deleted from future drafts.

Paragraph 16

The Confederation of Swedish Enterprise emphasizes that the possibility to refuse a task when a worker does not wish to work applies only to self-employed persons.

Regarding the ILO Office's question, we oppose the formulation "*considering the nature of their work arrangements and the classification of their status in employment.*" The phrase "*the classification of their status in employment*" is more concise and precise. We propose the following wording:

"Members should take measures so that digital platform workers who are self-employed can, as appropriate, decline a task or disconnect from a digital labour platform when they do not wish to work."

New section: Protection of the rights of digital labour platforms

The Confederation of Swedish Enterprise recommends that the following paragraph be inserted, consistent with our proposals under Article 19.

New paragraph 26Bis Protection of the rights of digital labour platforms

Each Member should ensure that the measures in this instrument protect and do not interfere with or compromise commercially sensitive information, intellectual property or trade secrets of digital labour platforms.

Paragraph 29

The Confederation of Swedish Enterprise considers that paragraph 29, in its current formulation, falls outside the scope of the mandate of this ILO Committee. The legal framework governing international disputes is already well-established. We therefore propose the following rewording

“Members should take measures to promote digital platform workers’ access to dispute resolution mechanisms and remedies”.

Bilaga 3

Reservation från LO, TCO och Saco

Från arbetstagarsidan görs följande tillägg till yttrandet till ILO:s rapport om anständigt arbete i plattformsekonomin och avstyrker därmed föreslagna texter till yttrandet rörande dessa artiklar, med hänvisning till nedanstående förslag:

LO, TCO and Saco would like to keep Article 3, 4, 5 and 7 in the Convention and therefore do not agree on the deletion of Article 3.2, even though 3.1 establishes the fundamental principles and rights at work. In this instrument it is important to reflect those fundamentals in a clear manner and guide member states on their way to fully implement the five FPRW.

In this same manner, LO, TCO and Saco do not support the ambition to simplify the provisions on OSH under Article 4, nor the removal to the recommendation. References to OSH provisions should be clear and detailed to facilitate compliance and implementation on a national level. The protection of workers is a fundamental principle and should remain in the convention.

Concerning Article 5: LO, TCO and Saco would like to keep the text with the following supplement:

Each Member shall require digital labour platforms to ensure that:

(a) digital platform workers receive information on and, where appropriate, training in occupational safety and health;

(b) any equipment used to perform work via digital labour platforms, so far as is reasonably

practicable, does not entail dangers for the safety and health of digital platform workers;

(c) digital platform workers have adequate personal protective clothing and equipment, where necessary and so far as is reasonably practicable, to prevent occupational accidents, occupational diseases and any other injuries to health.

(d) access to rest facilities

In accordance to the proposed text to Article 10 on Employment relationship LO, TCO and Saco propose to remove this article directly after Article 2 (scope).

To Article 24: LO, TCO and Saco would like to keep the wording of “fair” and propose the following wording as a clarification of the text: Digital platform workers should have the right to be accompanied, supported and represented by their representatives in such dispute resolution mechanism, as appropriate, in accordance with relevant national laws, regulations and collective agreements.

Article 27: LO, TCO and Saco suggest to keep the paragraph, but agree to the wording that the information should be in writing with no requirement of a written contract.