



Intercontinental network for the promotion of the social and solidarity economy
Intercontinental network for the promotion of the social and solidarity economy
Intercontinental Network for the Promotion of Social and Solidarity Economy

www.riposs.org
info@riposs.org

RIPESS Political Statement on ILO Convention No. 193

The adoption of ILO Convention No. 193 on 12 June 2026 is a historic victory for workers in the platform economy and for the many organisations that have fought to end the false claim that digital innovation must come at the expense of labour rights. As the first global treaty to set binding labour standards for platform work, it confirms that workers managed through apps, ratings systems, and opaque algorithms are **workers entitled to rights, protections, and dignity**.

For RIPESS, this moment deserves both celebration and clarity. Convention 193 establishes an essential floor of rights for millions of workers, inside an extractive business model that dominates the platform economy. The Convention was not adopted unanimously. Within the ILO's tripartite structure, two governments voted against (United States and New Zealand) and 11 governments abstained (namely Germany, United Kingdom, Argentina, Chile, Costa Rica, Panama, Paraguay, Bangladesh, India, Russian Federation and Libya) – see full tripartite vote count [here](#). The task now is to defend this gain, push for rapid ratification and implementation (as well as campaign in countries that voted against or abstained, especially in tech-dominant countries like the US), and open the next political horizon: a digital economy organised around democracy, care, fairness, and collective ownership, recognising social and solidarity economy models as a strategic alternative.

Why this Convention matters

Convention 193 closes a major gap in international labour governance by addressing working conditions in a sector that has grown rapidly while escaping clear legal obligations. Human Rights Watch notes that the treaty covers pay, safety and health, social security, algorithmic management, and correct classification, all issues at the centre of rights violations experienced by platform workers worldwide.

This matters because platform companies have long relied on contractual misclassification and technological opacity to shift costs and risks onto workers while retaining real power over labour processes. The convention directly responds to this model by requiring governments to take measures to ensure workers are correctly classified based on the reality of the work performed, rather than on the labels chosen by platforms.

Its scope is also politically important. The convention applies to workers in both the formal and informal economy and includes work carried out in person, such as transport and delivery, and online, such as data labelling, content moderation, and other digital tasks. This broad coverage reflects the real diversity of platform labour and helps prevent employers from escaping regulation by shifting between sectors, geographies, or legal categories.

What workers gain

Convention 193 establishes a meaningful baseline of rights that platform workers have often been denied. These include freedom of association and collective bargaining, non-discrimination, the elimination of forced labour and child labour, and the right to a safe and healthy working environment, with some protections applying regardless of employment classification.

The convention also addresses concrete material conditions of work. It requires timely payment, clear information on pay and deductions, minimum wage protection for workers in an employment relationship, compensation for work-related expenses in line with national law and practice, and access to social security on terms no less favourable than those of others with the same employment status.

One of its most important advances is the recognition that algorithmic management is a labour issue, not merely a technical one. The treaty requires workers to be informed about automated systems used to monitor, evaluate, and make decisions about their work, and it gives workers the right to request written explanations and human review of significant automated decisions such as non-payment, suspension, or deactivation.

For migrants and refugee workers, the convention also creates an important foothold. It requires governments to prevent abuses and ensure protection during recruitment, engagement, and work, which is crucial in sectors where migrant workers face debt, precarious legal status, unsafe conditions, and little recourse against abuse.

The limits of the treaty

Convention 193 is binding on ratifying states, but it is not self-executing for transnational platform corporations. Its impact will depend on how governments transpose it into national law, how labour inspectorates and courts enforce it, and how workers and their organisations use it in collective bargaining, litigation, and public pressure campaigns. There will be a continued need to push back against the power of tech corporations through collective SSE-style organizing of self-employed gig workers. For example, the US Council for International Business (defending the tech industry's operations in the US and abroad in these negotiations) stated about the new treaty: "It is a great achievement that respect for existing national classification laws and the rightful distinction between the self-employed and employees can remain." In response, one recent example is the collective organizing of 70,000 rideshare "self-employed" drivers in the US State of Massachusetts that won union recognition to exercise their collective bargaining voice in shaping their wages, benefits and working conditions, as well as transparency around algorithms, setting a precedent for the rest of the country,

For these reasons, the Convention is best understood as a powerful normative and legal instrument, but not a complete answer. Yet, we can use it in order to dismantle the concentration of ownership, investor control, data extraction, and market dominance that shape the current platform economy.

The absence of a final Recommendation is another important limitation. Human Rights Watch notes that the ILO process had been expected to produce a complementary Recommendation alongside the Convention to provide more detailed implementation guidance, but that text was not finalised because of time constraints. This leaves a strategic opening for future advocacy but also means that the next stage of interpretation and implementation will be politically contested.

The absence of a Recommendation is not only a procedural gap — it is the central site of the next advocacy battle. The ILO's active role within the UN Inter-Agency Task Force on Social and Solidarity Economy (UNTFSSSE), and the two UN General Assembly resolutions on SSE adopted in [2023](#) and

[2024](#), provide a clear institutional basis for what that Recommendation should contain. Future standard-setting work should draw on these commitments to produce supplementary guidance that explicitly recognizes worker-owned, cooperative, and other solidarity platform economy models and calls on Member States to support them. This is consistent with the direction of the UN system as a whole, not a departure from it.

A political message for allies and media

Convention 193 is a necessary, but not sufficient, victory: it secures the legal tools to claim and implement basic rights for platform workers but leaves intact the extractive business models of dominant platforms. Our task now is to use this new floor of rights to build and scale democratic, feminist and solidarity-based digital platforms.

Convention 193's probably strongest message is the that it brings to an end the fiction that digital labour exists outside labour rights. This is the first time the international community has clearly stated that technological intermediation cannot be used as a loophole to deny workers fair pay, social protection, safety, due process, and collective voice.

For all of us, movements working in labour, feminist, migrant justice, digital rights, (and also food sovereignty, and climate justice as detailed below), the convention creates common ground. It links the struggle against labour precarity to the struggle against opaque algorithms, extractive data governance, and business models that privatise value while socialising risk.

Convention 193 is a major advance for workers, but it must become a stepping stone toward democratic alternatives. The central debate is no longer whether platform work should be regulated, but whether the future digital economy will remain extractive and corporate-controlled or become accountable to workers, communities, and the public good.

The next horizon: digital solidarity economy

Convention 193 carries the language of decent work in its very title. Convention 193 does not stand alone in the ILO's own record. In 2022, the International Labour Conference adopted the [Resolution on Decent Work and the Social and Solidarity Economy](#) that established the first internationally agreed definition of the SSE and set guiding principles for governments, employers and workers. That instrument created a political and institutional commitment that Convention 193 must now be read alongside it. The platform economy is precisely the terrain where both instruments should be applied together, since now universally agreed SSE principles that underline democratic and participatory forms of governance are increasingly decried as lacking in global tech giants, threatening in very dangerous ways national and popular digital sovereignty.

This is where RIPESS and allied networks have a distinctive role to play. The next step is not only to demand ratification, but to show that another model is possible: digital platforms governed through cooperation, social ownership, democratic decision-making, and a commitment to decent work by design.

A digital solidarity economy means moving beyond mitigation of harm toward transformation of power. It means supporting worker-owned and community-based platforms, cooperative data governance, public policies that favour socially useful digital infrastructures, and regulatory frameworks that embed participation, transparency, and accountability into the design of technology itself.

This agenda is especially important in sectors already central to RIPESS work, including care, food systems, local services, and territorial economies. In these sectors, platformisation is reshaping

livelihoods, logistics, and access to markets, yet there is still space to build alternatives rooted in feminist economics, food and digital sovereignty, community resilience, and territorial justice.

Priorities for action

The immediate priority is a broad ratification and implementation push. Governments should be pressed to ratify Convention 193 without delay, align domestic law with its provisions, and ensure that workers and their organisations are meaningfully involved in enforcement and oversight. This should be complemented with campaigns in countries listed in the introduction whose governments have refused to adopt the Convention.

A second priority is to shape national implementation so that it reaches beyond formal compliance. Labour ministries, courts, regulators, and social partners should be pushed to adopt strong rules on classification, social protection, algorithmic transparency, human review of automated decisions, and remedies for wrongful suspension and deactivation.

A third priority is to connect labour rights with digital system change. Public procurement, local economic development policy, social finance, and innovation funding should support platform cooperatives and other social and solidarity economy initiatives that can meet social needs without reproducing the extractive model of dominant transnational platforms.

A fourth priority is to advocate for a Supplementary Recommendation to C193. The absence of a finalized Recommendation from ILC 114 leaves implementation guidance contested and incomplete. RIPESS and allied networks should push for future ILO standard-setting work to produce a Recommendation that explicitly names platform cooperatives and SSE enterprises as legitimate actors in the platform economy, and calls on Member States to support them through public procurement, digital infrastructure, and dedicated financing mechanisms. The 2022 ILC [Resolution](#) on Decent Work and the SSE, the two UNGA resolutions of [2023](#) and [2024](#), and the ILO's active role within the UNTFSSSE together provide the institutional foundation for this ask. The goal is to ensure that C193 becomes not only a floor of worker protections, but a gateway to a genuinely different model of platform ownership.

Finally, we should use this moment to build a shared narrative. Convention 193 is a workers' victory, a democratic response to algorithmic power, and a foundation for advancing a just digital transition rooted in solidarity rather than speculation and extraction. Using C193 as a lever for a digital solidarity economy agenda will bring our scopes to national ratification campaigns with an SSE angle, regulatory co-design on algorithmic management, link C193 to UN SSE resolutions and climate/food agendas, increase a feminist and intersectional framing as well as a global narrative and coalition work.

Convention 193 is therefore both an achievement and an invitation. It gives labour and social movements a stronger legal and political basis to defend platform workers today, while sharpening the case for a digital solidarity economy tomorrow. The challenge now is to ensure that this historic treaty becomes not the ceiling of ambition, but the floor from which deeper transformation begins.

What Convention 193 actually does

- Substantive pillars include:
 - Correct classification of workers, based on the reality of the work relationship, not contractual labels.
 - Minimum guarantees on pay (including timely payment, transparent deductions, and minimum wages for those in an employment relationship) and compensation of work-related expenses.
 - Access to social security on terms no less favourable than for other workers with the same status.
 - Fundamental rights: freedom of association and collective bargaining, non-discrimination, elimination of forced and child labour, safe and healthy working conditions.
 - Regulation of algorithmic management: information on automated systems used to allocate work, evaluate performance or deactivate accounts; the right to explanations of significant automated decisions and to human review; privacy and data-protection **safeguards**.

How binding is it for transnational platforms?

- **Binding nature is mediated through states.** ILO conventions are only legally binding on member states that ratify them, not directly on companies; governments then must align national law and enforcement with the convention.
- Once ratified, the state has an obligation to:
 - Reform classification rules so that platform workers who function as employees are recognised as such, closing loopholes platforms use to outsource responsibility.
 - Extend social protection, OSH rules, and minimum wage regimes to platform workers as required by the convention and national status categories.
 - Regulate algorithmic management, including transparency, data rights and appeal mechanisms – this is particularly relevant for transnationals operating across borders with unified tech stacks.

For transnational platforms like Uber, Deliveroo, Glovo, etc., this means that in each ratifying country:

- Their business models based on misclassification and shifting costs to workers are legally weakened, and litigation or inspection strategies can anchor claims directly in Convention 193 language.
- They face statutory obligations to disclose information about algorithms, data use, ratings, and deactivations, creating levers for unions and worker collectives to demand co-governance.
- They will operate in increasingly fragmented regulatory environments, as some states ratify and others do not, which tends to push large firms either towards “levelling up” globally or towards forum-shopping; the convention gives movements arguments against the latter in global fora and OECD/UN processes.

From our movement lens, this is a structural victory on the terrain of minimum standards, even if not on transformative economic models:

- It recognises platform workers as workers with labour rights, not as “users” of apps, undermining a core ideological pillar of gig-capitalism.
- It inserts algorithmic management and data exploitation into the heart of labour law debates, which is crucial for any digital solidarity economy narrative.
- It has strong language on migrants and refugees, obliging states to prevent abusive recruitment, debt bondage and unsafe conditions for migrant delivery and care workers.

RIPSS has contributed to

- A multi-year process that already placed SSE across key areas of the ILO agenda: in [2023](#), by ensuring the recognition of SSE’s contribution to the **Just Transition**; in [2024](#), by placing SSE at the centre of debates on **Care Economies**; and in [2025](#), by advancing the call to democratize digital labour through the launch of its position paper [Reclaiming the Platform Economy through Social Solidarity](#). This trajectory now converges in the discussions on **platform work**, where these three strands of advocacy meet.
- During the [2026](#) ILC, RIPSS continued this work by calling for explicit **recognition of worker-owned and cooperative platform models**, and by urging Member States to support them through public procurement, digital infrastructure, and dedicated financing. This intervention reinforced the argument that platform regulation must not only protect workers, but also open space for democratic, solidarity-based alternatives.
- The convention itself creates a **regulatory baseline** that makes SSE digital platforms more viable socially and economically when they respect rights by design.