

Digitalisation and working life: lessons from the ‘Uber cases’ around Europe

There have been several discussions in 2015 around the evolution of work and the impact of digitalisation on work organisation and employment conditions. As one of the most successful examples of the ‘gig economy’, Uber, the smartphone-based car hiring service, has been at the centre of several discussions as Uber’s operating model challenges various regulations, from labour and social protection legislations to commercial regulations. The company has grown rapidly since it was set up in the USA in 2009, and has spread to many European [Member States](#). The expansion of this model of organisation questioned the usual regulation of work, from the fairness of competition for other businesses in the sector to the erosion of working conditions for drivers. It has brought together employers and trade union representatives, raising multiple concerns and questioning the sustainability of the model in social and economic terms.

This EurWORK topical update is a joint product of Eurofound’s correspondents and examines Uber’s operation in seven member states (Finland, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Spain, Sweden and the UK) as well as in the USA, and includes responses and reactions from employers’ and worker representatives and other interested parties, as reported by autumn 2015. The issues of what the ‘gig’ economy means for working conditions and notions of what constitutes a ‘good job’ are likely to be prominent in debate for some time to come.

Introduction: Uber’s operations and impacts

Smartphone-based car hiring service Uber was set up in the USA in 2009 and began expanding into overseas markets in 2012. As of autumn 2015, Uber operates in around 60 countries and in 300 cities. The company’s rise has been rapid and various media [reports](#) place the value of the company at 50 Billion USD as of May 2015. Uber relies on Smartphone technology to match drivers with fares. Various versions of the service are available including UberX, UberBlack UberPop and UberLUX, which essentially differ according to the type of vehicle and the fares (base and mileage). Drivers use their own vehicles to provide the service. Passengers (so-called ‘users’ according to the company), pay Uber for the journey, they may choose the route (which is relevant in terms of the similarity with the taxi service) and a fixed portion of the fee, usually a 20% commission, is paid to the driver.

The ‘app’ developed by UBER makes the platform specific vis à vis other taxis companies; it is presented as a platform matching ‘users’ with drivers and not as a taxi business. The Uber case implies various issues for industrial relations and working conditions, though it is evident that further research is required to fully understand the implications. The rise of technology-based services highlights the limitations of traditional forms of regulating the employment relationship. Technology is not necessarily implicated in the emergence of non-traditional employment relationships though, as here, it can be a major factor in promoting change. Digitalisation opens up new possibilities for how work can be configured, though as this case demonstrates there is a need for vigilance to ensure that working conditions are not eroded and that digitalisation does not foreshadow a race to the bottom.

The threat of Uber to the pre-existing model of regulation of the passenger transport sector is best illustrated by the alliances which its rise has prompted. Employers and trade unions have come

together to resist the changes and challenges to the sector which Uber has precipitated. The role and status of the driver is a key concern, and both trade unions and employers are concerned about the ability of Uber to undercut pre-existing providers, which would threaten existing jobs. Trade unions are more vocal than employers on the prospects for future employment in the sector in terms of job quality, security and remuneration.

Uber's operations expanding from the USA to EU member states

Uber's expansion to Europe began with the UK in London in 2012 and has been rolled out since then to other locations in England including Birmingham, Manchester and Leeds. Since 2013, Uber spread to other European countries. Uber began operating in *Italy* in 2013. As of Autumn 2015 it has offices in several major Italian cities. In *Sweden* Uber has operated in Stockholm since 2013 and in Gothenburg since 2014; four Uber services, UberBLACK, UberLUX, UberX, and UberPOP are offered. In *Germany*, Uber launched its UberBlack app in February 2013. In April 2014, UberPOP was introduced in Berlin, Hamburg and Frankfurt allowing to order a "ride from a private driver for less than the taxi fare". Uber began operating in Spain in Barcelona in April 2014. In September, Uber expanded to Madrid, and a few weeks later, to Valencia ([El Confidencial newspaper, 25th June 2015](#)). Uber has been available in *Hungary* since 2014. As of Autumn 2015, Budapest is the only city where Uber operates, though there are plans for expansion to other major cities. In *Finland*, Uber launched its UberPOP and UberBLACK services in November 2014 in Helsinki.

Legislative context surrounding Uber's operations in the Member States, key legal issues and challenges

The nature of the Uber platform (mixed and not straightforward in most countries) could explain why a great deal of attention has been paid to the challenges to fair competition with other related businesses, either organized along the more traditional lines of either self-employed or companies with employed workers.

One of the principal points of criticism of Uber relates to whether the services are deemed to be covered by current legislation regarding vehicle licensing and therefore whether they are bound by the same rules as their main competitors. In several countries it is unclear as to whether or not Uber can be considered as a taxi service, required therefore to adhere to the same rules and regulations as taxi services. If Uber is not subject to the same regulations there are concerns that this results in unfair competition between licensed and unlicensed services, leading to accusations of undercutting regulated taxi services. Uber's position, stated all around the world, is that it is not a taxi service but a technology service, an application used and paid by drivers (to offer services and get clients) and by customers (to buy services).

Several other issues linked to Uber's operations have impacts on and challenge current regulations, such as: questions of safety and insurance for passengers when travelling in unlicensed cars; and the tax positions of both the company and the individual Uber drivers have been questioned in a number of countries.

As the Uber platform very nature is far from straightforward in all countries, the issues of the employment status of the 'users' offering services and their working conditions, are still to be considered and studied; some claims start to address the consequences in terms of workers employment rights and obligations this work organization has precipitated.

Is Uber a “taxi service” or a “sharing service”? – Differences in regulation

Uber self-declares a “connecting service”, that is, its business is based on electronic intermediation via app between people who want to share a car. They reject being involved neither in the taxi service nor in the transport of passengers.

Soon after Uber’s launch, in March 2015, the *Finnish* Ministry of Transport and Communications [published a press release](#), stating that although the Uber service as such – connecting passengers with drivers – is legal, driving passengers for money without a taxi license and without the professional qualifications needed for taxi drivers is against the law. Since then, the police have instigated various investigations concerning the legality of services provided by Uber drivers, but as no case has yet come to court, the outcome remains unclear.

Similarly in *Sweden*, the UberPOP service has attracted the most attention, the main legal issue being whether it should be seen as a taxi service or a car-pooling service. While Swedish law supports car-pooling with reasonable remuneration for the driver, if drivers profit from car-pooling and if the service is offered with [the intention of making profits](#), it should be considered as a taxi service, making licensed drivers, registered cars, taxi meters, and paying income taxes obligatory. Representatives from both the Swedish Transport Agency and the Swedish Taxi Association have voiced the opinion that [UberPOP would most probably be categorised as a taxi service](#) if tried in court, which would make the services, as currently run, illegal. The Swedish police initiated several judicial investigations, and in September 2015 the first court decision interpreting the nature of the services provided by an UberPOP driver was given. The Court concluded that “*the driver had been engaged in taxi services, without a taxi license and the taxi driver legitimation needed*”. Accordingly, the driver was sentenced to 50 day-fines at 50 SEK (amounting to a total of about €265). [Uber commented on the court](#) ruling in media, stating that “*the company withholds its view that they operate within the limits of Swedish legislation and that the dialogue with Swedish authorities will be continued*”. In September 2015, the government appointed a comprehensive [inquiry in the taxi industry \(in Swedish\)](#), scheduled to be finalised in July 2016. The main aim is to once and for all, clarify the definitions related to taxi services, and also thoroughly review the legislation on car-pooling, which with high certainty, will impact the future of Uber in Sweden.

From the start of its operations in *Italy*, Uber became involved in disputes with the government and taxi companies, because of the alleged breach of the national legislation on transportation services (Law 15 January 1992, n. 21). The focus of the dispute is the UberPOP service, which has been considered “comparable to taxi services”, but not bound by the same rules as taxis. . After a court in Genoa had ruled that Uber operated essentially as a voluntary sharing of a private vehicle, more than 2,000 taxi drivers gathered in Turin to protest against the court’s decision. Hence these initial decisions in the Swedish and Italian cases illustrate the different perspectives taken on the same point.

In *Hungary*, authorities have sought to clarify the position and although some ambiguity exists, it is intended that the new legislation will regulate competition in the sector. Arguments over the interpretation and scope of the legal framework in place have eventually been settled by adopting a new national taxi regulation in July 2015 (Government decree 176/2015 (VII.7.)). The Decree covers not just the traditional taxi services but the so-called ‘car passenger services’ as well. In this way Uber has also become subject to the overall national regulation on taxi services, while the content of the former legislation has not changed much. Now taxis can compete on equal terms with Uber. Although the Government Decree came into force in early August 2015, Uber and the drivers using it have continued operating in the same way. So far there has been a sort of ‘grace period’: authorities

have not launched targeted inspections. In parallel, Uber have initiated discussions with the government to ask for reconsideration of the new legal framework in order to better respond to the specific features of 'sharing services'.

What is the nature of the relationship between Uber and the drivers using the platform?

Although the question of the employment relationship between Uber and the drivers using the platform has been raised, it has not been subject to the same level of legal attention as the issues of the legal status of Uber's operations. Legal challenges are emerging around the issue of whether "Uber's drivers" should be classed as employees and therefore be subject to labour regulations or if they enjoy another status (eg: self-employed). Some of these issues relating to working conditions may apply more generally across the 'gig' economy, though these issues require further exploration and research

In October 2014, the 'Professional Association Taxi Elite' of Barcelona pressed charges at the Trade Court of Barcelona (still the sentence not been passed at time of writing) ([El Confidencial newspaper, 25th June 2015](#)). The main points raised are: whether or not Uber drivers were employees of the company, and if the 'illegal activity' was carried out by the drivers or by the company ([El Pais newspaper, 28th May 2015](#)). In June 2015, the Labour Inspectorate of Catalonia concluded that Uber's drivers were employees, that is, that there was a labour relationship between Uber and its drivers ([El Pais newspaper, 13th June 2015](#)). Among others the following elements were pointed out: the company provided drivers with smartphones so that they could carry out their professional activity; presence of an 'incentives system' based on drivers' productivity; the company ensured drivers that it would intervene if drivers experienced any issues with courts or police. During this trial process, in July 2015, the Trade Court of Barcelona asked the European Court of Justice to rule on whether or not prohibiting Uber's activity was legal (As of autumn 2015, there has been no ruling). In turn, Uber presented an official complaint against Spain (as it did before against France and Germany) with the European Commission alleging that restrictions that have been imposed go against European laws and are addressed to "protect the traditional monopoly of taxis". Uber alleged five types of EU law violations, including those related to directives covering electronic commerce and services, the principle of technological neutrality, the freedom to offer services and even the fundamental rights of the EU ([El Pais, newspaper 31 March 2015](#)).

In the UK, the GMB union represents 'taxi drivers', including the ones who drive for Uber and the ones working for other companies. In July 2015 the GMB instructed its solicitors to take legal action on behalf of its members driving for Uber. The issue is the legal status of 'Uber's drivers'. Uber regards the drivers as 'partners' and as such, considers that labour laws do not apply. GMB is hoping to prove that Uber is in breach of a legal duty to provide its drivers with workers rights such as basic pay levels (the National Minimum Wage), holidays and other rights associated with health and safety and recourse to a proper system relating to discipline and grievance. For example the company do not ensure that drivers take the required breaks or work within the maximum number of hours. The solicitors' [note](#) that there have also been reports of Uber drivers being suspended ('deactivated') when they have raised some of these issues with the company individually. All these features make the Uber position much similar to the traditional employer role, putting the drivers using the platform in a 'subordinated' position vis à vis the Uber company.

How does Uber calculate fares?

The issue of how Uber calculates fares is another aspect of legal challenge, relating to whether the service requires licensing or otherwise. It also could have an impact on the autonomy of drivers to agree the price they will charge to their clients.

In the *UK* in March 2015, Transport for London (TfL) submitted papers to the High Court to ask for clarification on the issue of taximeters. In London, taximeters -the boxes fitted to the cars to calculate fares- can only be used by licensed taxis; hence if Uber were ruled to be using taximeters, then this would require the drivers to be licensed when they presently are not. This is a grey area in law as Uber's calculations of fares are based on smartphone technology, which works differently from taximeters. TfL have been under pressure from taxi drivers to seek clarification on the matter; though TfL has stated that it considers the way in which Uber fares are calculated using Smartphone technology not to be equivalent to taximeters, it has nevertheless referred the matter to the High Court for clarification.

In *Sweden* the issue is slightly different. The controversies around the regular taxi services UberBLACK, UberLUX, and UberX services, mainly concerns their lack of taximeters, which according to law is obligatory for cars used for taxi services. [The Swedish Taxi Association](#) accused Uber of [creating unfair competition](#) by not using taximeters. Exemptions from the taximeter requirements can be issued for extraordinary reasons – not clearly defined in the legislation – and Uber has in turn [accused the Swedish Transport Agency \(Transportstyrelsen\) of harassment](#), by not permitting such exemptions, claiming that the Agency protects the traditional taxi businesses.

Other issues - Tax

Tax is another area where Uber has attracted attention, both in terms of the tax arrangements of individual Uber drivers as well as for the company itself. Concerning the drivers using the platform, for example in *Hungary*, inspections revealed that Uber drivers were not compliant with tax laws. 'Mystery shopping' conducted in Spring 2015 found irregularity in every case. Uber drivers did not have a tax number, did not give receipt to passengers, did not have a special, so-called passenger-transport driving licence, etc, which are all requested in case of ordinary taxi drivers. Uber drivers could expect a fine up to HUF 200 thousands (approx. 630 Euros) as well as further inspections. In *Sweden* media also recently exposed that [3 out of 10 UberPOP drivers do not pay income taxes](#), making Uber an investigational target also for the Swedish Economic Crime Agency and the Swedish Tax Agency.

When turning to the company itself, in *Hungary*, it has also become a cause for concern that Uber Hungary Kft. as the subsidiary of Uber International Holding B. V. (registered in the Netherlands) carried out their activities without meaningful tax payments. In the *UK*, Uber was [referred](#) to the regulatory body, Her Majesty's Revenue and Customs, amid concerns that Uber was registered in the Netherlands and not paying tax on its UK operations.

Reactions to Uber's position and challenges

Position of the social partners

In all countries, including the USA, Uber has attracted criticism as it raised legal challenges. For the most part, Uber continues to operate, though there are examples of where bans have been imposed and the company's activity cannot continue. Bodies representing regulated taxi services have been vocal in their opposition to Uber. In some circumstances social partners (such as the GMB union in

the UK) represent taxi drivers in general, covering both Uber and non-Uber drivers. Consequently their position is to push for on the one hand, greater regulation of Uber's activities to ensure fair competition and, on the other hand for better rights for the Uber drivers. Wider concerns are expressed, stressing the risks and opportunities for non-well defined and regulated platforms, to promote the underground economy, and are associated with precariousness, insecurity and poor quality jobs.

Many of the legal challenges and requests for clarification have resulted directly or indirectly from the actions of social partners and other relevant actors.

The issue of unfair competition has been a focus in all countries studied here. For example in Sweden, the Swedish Taxi Association and the Swedish Transport Agency have applied further pressure on Uber, arguing that it should operate under the same legal framework as taxis. Other protests on this issue have been held in Germany and Spain, as well as the protests in Italy mentioned above.

The issue of protecting workers rights has also been a focus for attention. Some of this is linked to issues of the business model and concerns protecting the rights of drivers who work for traditional taxi companies. The Spanish case provides a useful illustration of this point. In September 2014 the Spanish UGT trade union argued all economic activities should allow free competition, and consumers and workers' rights should be protected. They stated that public administrations should fight against Uber, which is "an illegal activity and promotes underground economy, and whose responsibilities towards workers and users are not clear". UGT also argued that allowing the activity of Uber would destabilise the transport sector, putting at risk an economic activity which generates thousands of jobs in Spain. ([UGT Press Note, September 2014](#)).

More pertinently perhaps the case of Uber, and the gig economy more generally, raises questions about the company's responsibility for its workers in relation to their pay and conditions. The supplementary question of whether drivers can secure a living wage through this model of labour market attachment is something which demands further investigation.

Outcomes from legal challenges: Bans

In Germany in July and August 2015, the Hamburg and the Berlin authorities prohibited Uber to provide UberPOP services because of non-compliance with the Passenger Transport Act (Personenbeförderungsgesetz, PBefG. However, Uber continued to provide its services as the decisions were not backed by court rulings. Taxi Deutschland, a cooperative of taxi companies and BZP (the national association of taxi and car hire companies) member, filed a law suit with the Superior Administrative Court of Frankfurt to obtain a ruling on unfair competition. In late August 2014, the Frankfurt court took an 'urgent decision' and prohibited UberPOP (nationwide) for breach of the PBefG. However, the ruling was annulled two weeks later because the need for an 'urgent decision' could not be proofed. Some days later, the courts of Hamburg and Berlin endorsed the decisions of their local authorities and prohibited UberPOP services on the local markets. The Berlin court also prohibited UberBLACK saying that UberBLACK breached the PBefG on hire cars, because the drivers pick up clients on the streets and do not return to their home base after each ride. On 18 March 2015, the Superior Administrative Court of Frankfurt took a final decision on Uber and

prohibited Uber to provide any app services using drivers without passenger transport permit. The ruling came into force in April 2015.

Similarly in *Spain* the Association of taxi drivers of Madrid pressed charges against the company at the Trade Court of Madrid in October 2014. In December 2014, the Trade Court of Madrid passed sentence against Uber, saying that it had to cease operating across the whole of Spain. Thus, the company was obliged to interrupt its services indefinitely. The sentence said that Uber was causing 'immediate harm' to the taxi sector, and that taxi drivers were suffering from 'unfair competition' (General Council of the Judiciary, Press Note December 2014). Linked to this, the High Court of Justice of Madrid obliged phone companies to stop offering their services for the Uber platform.

In the *USA*, responses have been varied, with some cities banning Uber programs altogether, and in others restrictions imposed have forced the company to [suspend operations](#). Many city and state governments have sought to include Uber in their jurisdiction, but under some degree of regulation. The regulations set up in Nevada from May 2015 place an excise tax on Uber (and competitor Lyft) and put the [regulation of the ride-sharing services under the control of the Nevada Transport Authority](#). [Colorado passed similar legislation in June of 2014](#), the first state to do so, which requires background checks, vehicle inspections, and insurance for Uber drivers. Some cities, like Miami, FL, have been able to effectively keep Uber out by classifying them under the banner of 'town cars' which have a built in regulatory system that is meant to distinguish their service from the taxi service. Uber has responded by [reportedly](#) attempting to go over the heads of the city government and taxi union, by sending 20 lobbyists to the state legislature to push for new legislation allowing the company to operate in Miami.

In *Italy* with reference to the abovementioned case of the Uber driver, although the court in Genoa found that the driver was not operating as a taxi driver and therefore did not have to pay the fine, this ruling sparked further challenge and Uber was subsequently found to be engaging in unfair competition. The main trade unions of the sector filed a request with the Court of Milan in order to investigate the legality of Uber's activities. On 25 May 2015, the Court of Milan declared that the UberPOP service created 'unfair competition' and, consequently, set a deadline of 15 days for Uber to comply with its ruling and block the app. According to the ruling, UberPOP is a direct competitor of taxi drivers. In fact, even though it is a private transport service, it actually has the same features as a public transport service, such as taxis. In more detail, users contact drivers through a phone app and choose a destination. As a consequence, UberPOP should not be considered as car-sharing or ride-sharing (since car owners do not share the costs of the drive to reach their personal destination). Moreover, the Court of Milan stated that Uber's pricing system is not subject to the laws governing the public taxi service; Uber drivers do not have to bear the expenses incurred by the holders of a transport license (that is, costs for installing meters, insurance obligations, maintenance checks, etc.). As a consequence of this system, Uber's fares are lower than those applied by taxis. Lastly, the Court of Milan held that the lack of authorisation and the non-regulated behaviour of UberPOP drivers entail an unfair competitive advantage. On one hand, Uber responded to the court ruling, arguing that its business is different from taxi services, emphasising that it is a technology company whose customers are solely the users of the application. The company also appealed the ruling in order to protect Uber drivers' jobs. On the other hand, the main trade unions of the sector stated that the verdict is an important step to make sure the rules on transportation services are complied with in Italy. They also stressed the opportunity to extend the rules governing public transport to private hire car services. On 2 July 2015, the Court of Milan confirmed the *interim* injunction set out in the appealed decision, and banned UberPOP on grounds of unfair competition.

Future developments on the Uber business case and employment statuses across European Labour Markets

The main lessons of the Uber cases all around the world are clearly linked with the place and role of digitalisation in the economy, especially linked with the services sector.

First of all, the Uber company adopts very pragmatic responses to answer the variety of national regulations and positions. It adapts its business models while continuing to lobby for pushing reforms of regulations.

Germany provides a good example of where Uber have responded to legislative sanction by adapting the business model in order to keep operating. Uber first lowered the fares of UberPOP to 0.35 cent per kilometre to operate similar to a ridesharing company (which under PBefG charges 'contributions to costs'). In reaction to the Frankfurt court ruling, Uber then gave up on the UberPOP business model in Germany in spring 2015. Since fall 2014, the legal business model UberTaxi has been introduced in five cities (Berlin, Hamburg, Munich, Frankfurt, Düsseldorf): UberTaxi provides app services with licensed taxi drivers for a lower fare. Since spring 2015, UberX has been introduced in the five cities. UberX provides app services with licensed drivers of hire cars. In spring, Uber claimed that it will pay for the €200 in examination costs if drivers take examinations with the local Chambers of Commerce for gaining a passenger transport certificate (interview in XXX magazine).

When UberX was set up in Berlin, the new CEO of Uber Germany, Christian Freese, said in an interview with [Berliner Morgenpost](#) on 20 September 2015 that 'Uber has changed its strategy and that in Germany the company will be better off taking a cooperative approach'. Freese claims that Uber will exclusively cooperate with professional drivers of hire cars and with taxi drivers and that both groups will gain more clients and save waiting time by using Uber's apps. Some 1,000 out of 8,000 Berlin taxi drivers already cooperate with UberTaxi and the company aims at cooperating with all of them, Freese says. (Competition with given taxi operators is not mentioned.) UberTaxi and UberX shall also be introduced in other countries. In the start-up online newsletter Gründerszene Freese said on 21 September 2015 that Uber will establish itself as the main service platform for passenger mobility and that the company aims at cooperating with a leading German car manufacturer.

Alongside this more cooperative approach, Uber has also been engaged in lobbying for greater liberalisation of the taxi market. Uber has been calling for a reform of German passenger transport legislation. In November 2014 the online newsletter Gründerszene reported that Uber had launched a [position paper](#) on needed reforms. It proposes a liberalisation of the taxi licence scheme, an end to the restrictions in hire cars to not pick up clients on the streets, changes to the examination on the passenger transport certificate (no test on local knowledge) and an end to the strict regulations on the outer appearance of taxis. Furthermore, Uber suggests the introduction of a new legal category 'service provider for casual passenger transport'.

Also, it proposes a new employment status for persons providing small services to the digital/share economy (that is Uber, Airbnb, Ebay, Helpling, a.o.). These persons should be self-employed, but profit from a low tax lump sum as long as they do not earn more than €450 per month. (The concept reminds of the German mini-job status for marginal part-time workers.) The paper was [strongly opposed](#) by the taxi driver organisations, but did not stir a public debate. On 1 April 2015, Uber requested an investigation from the European Commission to see whether Germany's restrictions on its services are legal and do not violate the EU law. In July 2015, the European Court of Justice requested a response by the German government. (At the moment of writing the response is still due).

It will be interesting to see Uber's response in other countries where it is currently prevented from operating. In countries which have stopped short of banning Uber, there is no need for the company to change how it operates, but it will also be instructive to see what its approach is in these circumstances.

Concluding remarks

At this stage, the Uber cases underline all around Europe the real complexity for legislation to apply to workers, jobs and activities that are performed in different frames from the more traditional subordinated or self-employment relationships. Despite the unrest and amount of coverage relating to Uber it is yet to prompt a response such as collective bargaining or reregulation of the sector. Challenges thus far have tended to focus on how Uber does or does not comply with existing legislation, rather than attempts to redefine the legal positions. In many ways this type of response is probably a necessary first step and these other responses may follow in time. For the moment though this piece has raised certain key issues about how Uber operates.

First the business case has been raised, as the position of these digital platforms offers in different sectors challenges the business regulation.

Indeed, the Uber case has prompted legislators to address the issue of how to regulate the transport sector. The policy debate in different Member States is expected to take different forms, but the central questions will be around whether the sector requires de- or re-regulation. It is possible that these technology driven changes to the transport sector will be replicated in other sectors where services are provided. In this light, responses to Uber take on greater significance.

Secondly, the Uber situations reveal the opportunities, limits, challenges and ways forward for addressing the development of forms of contracting work and activities not directly fitting in the traditionally used categories of subordinated/independent work. Again, as many rights and obligations are based on these categories – from the social protection rights (e.g working time, minimum wage coverage) and contributions, to taxes and representativeness – it is of paramount importance to clarify how digitalised activities will align with the more established labour market models. Uber and others in the digital economy raise this challenge which all actors will have to address.

About this article

This article is a joint piece of several of Eurofound's network of European correspondents, coordinated by Duncan Adam, University of Warwick.

Further resources on individual and collective employment relations can be obtained from EurWORK.

For further information, contact Christine Aumayr-Pintar, cau@eurofound.europa.eu