Designing positive platforms: a guide for a governance-based approach
As the labor market shifts towards an on-demand model, professionals are generating new sources of immediate income. Driven by realtime, highly customized expectations by clients and service providers, this technology-fueled phenomenon is known as the gig economy. The gig economy runs entirely on online social platforms that connect people, knowledge, and opportunities for meaningful collaborative work.

However, many of these platforms "have been accused of marginalizing workers, negatively impacting cities and nations by stressing existing regulations, behaving just like new middlemen, displacing the old ones." 1

Despite these challenges, studies suggest that by 2025 up to 540 million people will participate in the platform economy2. This presents both opportunities and challenges towards establishing more flexible and fair working models: "Platform work is neither inherently good nor bad. It has both potential for upsides to be amplified and downsides."3 Some of the downsides of platforms include unstable work schedules, job instability, and reduced access to benefits4.

Regulation is one possible solution to these downsides, but it's also important to bake-in positive aspects of platforms at every phase of their design and implementation.

Moreover, the long-term sustainability of a platform depends on the individuals who contribute to it. This is why professionals will often be referred to as "contributors" in this document.

What is a positive platform in this context?

"Positive" is related to a platform design based on two pillars that address the major problems with the gig economy:

**SHARED DECISION-MAKING WITH THE PLATFORMS’ CONTRIBUTORS**

In classical organizations, business-owners and entrepreneurs carry the risk. However, in the gig economy, contributors carry part of that risk by assuming a degree of liability for the services they offer through the platform. Although the contributors are the ones actually creating the value in the platform through their offer, they are seldom given the right to make decisions about the platform related to their products and services.

To tackle this issue, a positive platform should offer its contributors the authority to make decisions about their working conditions and the right to organize themselves collectively.

**LABOR BENEFITS PROVIDED BY THE PLATFORM**

In the gig economy, the definition of "worker" has become a legal debate (which will not be covered here). In any case, the fact remains that these professionals need benefits that go beyond basic financial compensation in exchange for the value they create.
These two pillars are essential to the design of the governance model for positive platforms, and this is why we are advocating for a governance-based approach.

**What is governance?**

An organization’s governance "determines who can participate (in the decision-making), what roles they might play, how they might interact and how disputes get resolved [...] and a set of protocols or standards [...] to facilitate connection, coordination, and collaboration," it is through these governance processes that the principles, vision, and mission of an organization are defined.

The focus of this framework will be set on the formal aspects of governance:

- **Ownership** (property of capital and its entailed rights / accountability instead of ownership in the case of networks)
- **Value** (value generation and value distribution processes within the organization)
- **Power** (rights, processes and structures for decision-making).

There are other very relevant dimensions to governance as well, such as culture and information, but for the scope of this guide the focus has been set on the combinations among the first three:

![Graph 1: Inclusive decision making and welfare as a result of the combinations between ownership, value and power.](image-url)

This framework aims to support entrepreneurs and organizations that want to establish a positive work platform.

**How to use this framework**

This guide presents the key positive design principles to build caring and inclusive organizations. These principles are the result of the study of 15 organizations (which can be found at the end of this document) and the underlying principles and best practices they have in common.

Each of the five main design principles described below include four insights and implications:

- **Challenges** faced when applying the design principle
- **Positive Mechanisms** to help implement it
- **Positive Practices** learned from the organizations analyzed
- **Key-questions** to foster reflection

---

2. Grandjean, Marguerite et al. (2017), Gouvernances: partager le pouvoir, la valeur. Comment les plateformes dessinent de nouveaux liens avec les communautés?
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**POSITIVE PRINCIPLE 1. INCLUSION**

*Inclusion of the maximum number of stakeholders in decision-making, ensuring that contributors have decision-making power that's proportionate to their level of activity and engagement.*

The design of an inclusive multi-stakeholder governance model takes into account the interests of all the stakeholders in the ecosystem. The continuous feedback from stakeholders adds resilience to the platform and presents new opportunities for innovation.

The most active contributors in the platform should be given the most power to make decisions that affect the way the platform operates. Otherwise, stakeholders—such as investors and majority owners who do not contribute—could make decisions that go against the interests of the most productive contributors.

**CHALLENGE 1**

Defining roles and power for stakeholders with diverse levels of participation. A shared-power system doesn't mean that everyone makes decisions on every issue that arises, nor that everyone has the same decision-making power. How are roles defined and power granted? The final design depends on the purpose of the organization and the values it is based on.

**POSITIVE MECHANISMS**

**Distributed-power approaches:**

A) **Binary power system**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>POWER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Owner</td>
<td>NO POWER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Graph 2: Binary power system. Source: own, together with Jose Ospina.*

Power is defined by ownership. This approach is binary because there are only two options: owners have power through ownership (an equal amount for each owner) and non-owners have no power, other than that of advisors.

B) **Smooth power system**

*Graph 3: Smooth power system. Source: own together with Jose Ospina.*

Power is defined by the level of contribution and commitment. In the smooth system, contributors have power in proportion to their value contribution and commitment.

Combinations of these two role variables (contribution, commitment) can lead to different power mixes.

**POSITIVE PRACTICE**

**Fairmondo**

Fairmondo launched two crowd-investing campaigns to raise funds and increase membership. It offered co-ownership shares with a maximum value of €25,000.

Each member has the same level of power (1 member = 1 vote) and can participate in the General Assembly (and other year-round processes), which makes decisions on the strategic structure of the organization.

**OuiShare**

OuiShare’s governance is based on a smooth power system. People in the organization may fall into four different roles according to their commitment and their contribution: support member, active member, connector, and alumni connector.

The connector group has the most power since its members contribute the most and with the highest commitment. They are the only ones who can make decisions on brand and budget.

*Graph 4: Ouishare shared-power system. Source: Ouishare.*

\*Alumni connectors are former connector who decide stop their activity and therefore the level of contribution.

---

1 Ospina, Jose (2017), The future of organizations --> no “organizations” at all?, article: https://medium.com/@pepoospina/the-future-of-organizations-no-organizations-at-all-a5eb900b358b.
**CHALLENGE 2**

Making sure that the most involved contributors retain more power than contributors whose participation is purely investment based. This challenge is faced daily by start-ups: how to attract investors, but at the same time avoid conceding the strategic decision-making power to them? While financial investors make important monetary contributions, they are not involved in the daily activity of the organization, and the decisions they make could have a negative effect on the welfare of the most involved contributors.

**POSITIVE MECHANISMS**

Design and implementation of systems to ensure a power balance in the organization.

**POSITIVE PRACTICE**

Enspiral

Enspiral’s Loomio ventures raised US$450,000 through a system named “redeemable preference shares (RPS).”

“Redeemable” means the shares can be purchased back only by the organization’s investors; they can’t be traded on the stock market. This class of shares is separate from the ones worker-members hold. Unlike conventional venture capital, RPS shares do not carry decision-making control, leaving the governance of Loomio unchanged.

**KEY-QUESTIONS**

- What is the vision of the organization and what are its goals for the ecosystem it operates in? Which stakeholders are affected the most by the organization's decisions and activities? What insights does the organization need from stakeholders?

- What is value contribution for the organization and how does it get measured? What is commitment for the organization and how does it get measured?

- How could investors give ownership back to the main contributors once the platform is successful and conduct the handover in a pre-agreed upon way that satisfies all stakeholders?

---

¹Loomio article: https://blog.loomio.org/2016/04/28/how-loomio-raised-ethical-investment-and-made-our-social-mission-even-stronger/
POSITIVE PRINCIPLE 2. PARTICIPATION

Fostering participation by embedding the principles of fairness, simplicity, transparency, and trust into all decision-making processes of the platform.

Low participation is a common problem. It’s often related to lack of clarity in procedures, unnecessary complexity, or lack of transparency. Low quality, overly complex, or hard-to-access information acts as a barrier to effective decision-making. A positive platform establishes a solid base for participation by implementing power-balance processes and structures based on the above-mentioned principles.

POSITIVE MECHANISMS AND PRACTICES

**Offline / online participation in the decision-making:** Introduction of online participation tools to enable all members to take part independently of their geographical location. Communication channels and tools should be designed according to the scale of the platform and the contributors shaping it. The introduction of asynchronous tools is a key element to foster online participation because it allows contributors to participate in decision-making when they have the time.

A further step would be to develop a specific decision-making system that combines online and offline procedures that include both deep conversations and clear decision-making mechanisms for everyone to participate in.

Loomio is a collaborative decision-making app. Users initiate discussions and put up proposals. As discussions progress, group members can refer to a continuously updated pie chart that shows how all the members have voted on the proposal (they can change their vote at any time). Loomio promotes its collaborative tool not as a replacement for in-person meetings, but as an adjunct. It allows everyone to contribute on their own time as well as facilitate sensitive conversations that don’t work online9.

**Participatory mechanisms for decision-making:** There is a very wide range of mechanisms to reach a decision (consensus, majority, holocracy, consent, etc). Nevertheless, in this context, decision-making should not be seen as a voting moment, but as a process. Voting should only be the last option, because it leaves participants divided into a winning and a losing side. Therefore, these mechanisms should be focused on an inclusive debate and discussion (eg: advice processes).

OuiShare embraces an "only vote when necessary" principle for decision-making, which means that chosen topics are discussed collectively (in person and online), but they are only put up to a vote as a last resort. When a vote is needed, it is conducted by what’s called "lazy consent," which means that there is no need for a specific percentage of people to vote on a matter for the result to be valid.

Silence indicates support for a decision. A "no" means that you don’t necessarily agree with the decision, but can live with it and have no valid objection (aka, veto)10.

**Internal education programmes:** Stress the importance of collaborative decision-making on the topics under discussion.

Coopaname internal “educational” programs help its members understand the importance of having a say in the decision-making processes and, moreover, of discussing the decisions to be made and providing members with all the necessary information before the actual decision-making takes place.

---


10 OuiShare online article: [https://medium.com/ouishare-connecting-the-collaborative-economy/how-are-decisions-made-in-a-distributed-organization-7dfcdbd673e3](https://medium.com/ouishare-connecting-the-collaborative-economy/how-are-decisions-made-in-a-distributed-organization-7dfcdbd673e3)
**Set of rules to foster participation:** Members must fulfill certain participation criteria to keep their status.

To maintain a high participation rate and a sense of responsibility, members of the MakeSense board sign a contract specifying the collective rules, as well as their role, duties, and exit process as a board member. If a member does not fulfill his/her commitment (e.g., breach of confidentiality, non-participation in meetings or on Loomio three months in a row), he/she risks expulsion from the board.

**Diversity in user-knowledge of online tools/internet accessibility.** Whatever system is chosen to facilitate discussions and make decisions, it has to be taken into account that not all contributors are tech-literate or have access to the Internet or needed software. It might be necessary to include offline decision-making mechanisms to ensure inclusion.

In addition to providing online tools for decision-making, providing opportunities for offline participation can increase participation in decision-making.

SMART began as an offline project. One of its principles is reinvesting its community benefits by consolidating services already provided and developing new ones. SMART answers the needs of the community in a number of ways. For example, by opening a new office where there is already a community of users without office space.

SMART has an online tool, which is the key element for scaling, but is aware that some of its users have difficulty using online tools. Moreover, to keep up the community engaged and have their needs adequately served, there are many options to join offline activities and talks:

- In-person consulting in any of the 12 offices in Belgium
- Regular meet-ups to discuss various topics that affect the community members (i.e., "how-tos")
- Provide free internet cafe for invoicing (basic computer skills are a requirement)
- Cover train fare to attend the general assembly (in Belgium)

**KEY-QUESTIONS**

- How could decision-making processes be designed to ensure fairness, simplicity, transparency and trust?
- What online and offline mechanisms could enable and foster participation for a diverse group of contributors?
POSITIVE MECHANISMS

Reduce the number of people in the decision-making, but ensure that everyone affected by decisions can participate in some way (with decisional or consultative power, for instance). Applying this principle will not only make decisions more representative, but also reduce resistance in the implementation of the decisions made.

CHALLENGE 1

Maintaining agility as the number of contributors increases.

For decision-making to be autonomous, it’s necessary to clearly define the decision-making roles of various group members and to design mechanisms that facilitate decision-making.

POSITIVE PRACTICE

Fairmondo: It plans to scale up to a multinational cooperative by organizing local coops in the countries where Fairmondo is active. The local stakeholders will own each coop. These local coops are co-owners of the global cooperative, which owns the trademark, supervises adherence to common standards, and supports new local coops.

A “Supervisory Assembly” consisting of members from local coops will ensure that representative levels don’t loose touch with the ground.

CHALLENGE 2

Introducing mechanisms to ensure decisions meet the values and vision of the organization as it scales. Control mechanisms maintain alignment with the vision and values made by the above-mentioned subgroups.

POSITIVE PRACTICE

Fairmondo: In order retain structural agility, Fairmondo has several different types of decision-making groups:

- The “Managing board” is elected by its employees to be responsible for everyday decisions. That means that the employees hold managers accountable for their work.
- The “Supervisory board” (representative body for the whole general assembly) controls the managing board, ensuring the implementation of collectively agreed upon strategic decisions.
- “Working groups” are open for any member to join and propose ideas and solutions in pre-determined areas.

KEY-QUESTIONS

- What strategic and the operational aspects of an organization are most affected by decision-making? How can contributor profiles be designed to make decisions effectively and fairly?
- What mechanisms does the organization have to route decision-making votes to accountable groups of contributors?
- What elements shape the identity of the organization? How does the organization implement them and how does it keep them while scaling?
PRINCIPLE 4. RECOGNITION OF THE GENERATED VALUE

Ensure a fair remuneration / reward system for all value contributors on the platform.

All organizations have tasks not directly linked to activities that affect its market value and are therefore difficult to measure and compensate. Nevertheless, these tasks (administration, organizational tasks, etc.) are crucial processes. Tasks directly linked to market value — such as client projects — are usually rewarded with financial benefits.

This tends to create a strong motivation to focus on contributions that produce direct financial benefits, leaving non-market activities undervalued and neglected. A positive platform must ensure that all contributors are fairly compensated, not just contributors whose activities are directly connected to revenue.

CHALLENGE

Measuring value and making a clear reward system to compensate the value created.

Value cannot really be measured since it is a subjective individual experience. What can be measured are contributions and these have some associated benefits. There has to be a contribution definition process to decide what contributions are associated with value creation and how they will be traced and distributed as benefits to its members. The organization should make the effort to allocate financial benefits to non-market value contributions as well.

POSITIVE MECHANISMS

Putting into place a fully transparent value accounting system that measures and accounts for contributions with well-defined rules. There are different approaches to develop a value accounting system. They can be based on algorithms, peer feedback, etc.

POSITIVE PRACTICES

Different approaches to value accounting:

A) Pre contribution agreement criteria

Previous agreement on what type of contributions are going to be considered for the value accounting system.

Sensorica: The Sensorica network builds a ledger of economic activity by recording contributions to collaborative processes. Benefits generated through the collaborative process are distributed to participants based on their past contributions. This tool is called value equation: before a project starts it specifies how benefits (including revenue) are distributed to all contributors, taking into consideration different forms of contributions, and perhaps taking into consideration different cultures of constituent communities formed by contributors.

Sensorica wanted to increase participation in activities that maintained and developed an organization. In order to do that, it made a list of benefits related to different kinds of contributions. Members had access to the list as part of a collaborative process undertaken collectively with all members.

Fairmondo: Fairmondo developed a "Fair Founding Point" system to adequately compensate participant contributions. For every unpaid hour contributed to Fairmondo, members receive 200 points. These points entitle members to an extra share of any surplus the cooperative successfully generates.

Graph 6: The benefits challenge of non market value contributions.

12 Sensorica
13 The value Equation: http://valuenetwork.referata.com/wiki/The_Value_Equation
14 http://www.sensorica.co/home/working-space/agreements/better-definition-of-a-sensorica-affiliate
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**KEY-QUESTIONS**

- What are the contributions that represent a value for the platform?
- What resources are available in the organization?
- What financial and non-financial benefits are associated with the contributions?
- How does an organization design a mechanism that takes into account all contributions that generate value while avoiding the feel of a control mechanism?

---

**PRINCIPLE 5. WELFARE**

*Inclusion of protection and security for contributors at the core of the governance model.*

Welfare has classically been understood as “workers’ rights”: medical coverage, maximum working-hours, regular payment, personal and professional development, technical support, etc. As seen above, in a gig economy, professionals are unprotected because the legal role of the traditional employer is not well defined. In this context it is unclear how professionals contributing to platforms can access medical care, unemployment coverage, organizational support, etc. This depends on the legislation of the country in which a platform is based.

Professionals contributing to platforms should be able to have access to minimal labor benefits. A way of achieving this is through mutualization among the members of an organization. **Mutualism** is a broad term that means finding joint solutions to problems faced by a group of individuals. This may happen by sharing time, support, a co-working space, ideas, projects, customers, or any type of resource. It’s possible to mutualize medical care, wages, etc.

**CHALLENGE**

Adjusting the type of mutualism to the needs and scale of the platform, taking into account the potential limitations to scale trust.

The type of mutualism depends on the level of trust which limits the scale a platform could reach: a relatively small group of a few dozen mutually trusting people might be able to mutualize wages and medical care to provide income and medical coverage year round; but larger groups might not be able to sustain such an arrangement.

For large scale projects, mutualism might come in the form of a joint service-offer to help contributors find new clients on a platform or getting advice and support on legal and tax issues concerning their work.

They types of mutualism mechanisms at a group’s disposal are as varied as the needs of that group.

---

**Graph 7: Mutualization possibilities for platforms. Source: own**

---


---
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POSITIVE MECHANISMS AND POSITIVE PRACTICES

Livelihood pods - Enspiral:
A group of individuals who decide to pool (mutualize) their income. This provides buffer against the precarity of the gig economy because members receive a basic income even if they are not working at a given moment. Livelihood pods also enable a high level of learning and development and trust between members.

"Standard labor welfare mutualization" and "occasional labor welfare mutualization"
- Coopaname and SMart. Contributors these organizations have access to:
  · Liability and work insurance.
  · Unemployment and pension funds during the time of their mission, that is, the time the organization is their legal employer.
  · Additional benefits resulting from mutualization: career advice, working spaces, connecting members for possible synergies, workshops on specific topics like invoicing, crowdfunding, social media, getting grants, etc.
  · Advanced payment by the platform within 7 days after the end of the mission (in the case of SMart instead of having to wait for the (usually longer) due payment date. Non-payments from their members’ customers are also paid by the platform.

Contributors receive these benefits as a percentage of the income invoiced through these cooperatives; how exactly the mutualization takes place depends on each countries’ legislation and the vision of the platform itself.

These two factors will also determine whether or not contributors are continuously eligible for medical and unemployment coverage, as well as pension benefits, or coverage only the period during which contributors are actively working on a platform. A positive platform should try to provide benefits coverage for as long possible.

Finally, what is especially interesting is the possibility of adding these benefits to platforms that merge with existing cooperatives. For example, when 90% of Deliveroo’s bikers joined the SMart, this organization negotiated better working conditions for these contributors in alignment with existing legislation. As a result, the bikers that worked through SMart finally got a protection layer (worker insurance) to cover them in case of accident.

Service-discounts and community support - Loconomics
Loconomics’ mission is to use technology, shared ownership, and community to strengthen local economies, by offering access to a wide range of local service professionals (service providers) on one easy-to-book platform.

Their approach to mutualization contains the following elements:
  · Bargain on member-owners’ behalf to negotiate discounted services and benefits (insurance, etc.).
  · Additional benefits of mutualization:
    · Empower member-owners to propose and carry out initiatives within the company
    · Provide networking opportunities for member-owners to build referral relationships
    · Market the platform to ensure predictable work for each member-owner
    · Distribute dividends to member-owners based on the fees they’ve paid
    · Offer workshops to bolster member-owners business skills
    · Provide a collaborative design process where member-owner feedback generates new features and benefits

KEY-QUESTIONS
✓ Are the platform contributors fully aware of the platform’s welfare system?
✓ How are internal differences among stakeholders handled regarding wages and organizational culture?
✓ How strong are the ties of trust among contributors in the organization?
  · What are the mechanisms to strengthen them?
✓ Are there other organizations in the ecosystem that can participate in mutualizing welfare elements?
Organizations analyzed for the development of this guide:

We interviewed the following organizations because their goals and actions around governance and decision-making closely matched our definition of a positive platform:

**Cocoon Projects** is the first European open enterprise providing end-to-end services for the evolution of large and small value-driven organizations.

- **Year founded:** 2011
- **Country of origin:** Italy
- **Number of employees/contributors:** 40 regular contributors
- **Revenue:** 300,000 €
- **Property model:** limited liability company

**Coopaname** is a business and employment cooperative, which is affiliated to a network of similar cooperatives in France and Belgium. The company offers services to unemployed people, many of whom are women. Specifically, it provides participants with opportunities to test and realize business projects in any sector while at the same time retaining their employee status. The initiative therefore allows people to engage in business creation endeavors while still maintaining their social security entitlements.

- **Year founded:** 2004
- **Country of origin:** France
- **Number of employees/contributors:** 850 contributors
- **Revenue:** 9.5M €
- **Property model:** cooperative

**Enspiral** is a virtual and physical network of companies and professionals brought together by a set of shared values and a passion for positive social impact. It's sort of a "DIY" social enterprise support network. At its heart, it's a group of people who want to co-create an encouraging, diverse community of people trying to make a difference.

- **Year founded:** 2011
- **Country of origin:** New Zealand
- **Number of employees/contributors:** 43 employees, 250/300 contributors
- **Revenue:** -
- **Property model:** Limited Liability Company (Ltd) with a charitable constitution, mandating its nonprofit purpose and the reinvestment of all income for its social mission.

**FairCoop** is an open global cooperative that organizes itself through the Internet outside the boundaries and controls of nation-states. FairCoop aims to issue an alternative global economic system based on cooperation, ethics, solidarity, and north-south redistribution and justice in economic relations.

- **Year founded:** 2014
- **Country of origin:** internet
- **Number of employees/contributors:** 15 contributors "full-time", hundreds of collaborators
- **Revenue:** alternative system
- **Property model:** informal, CBPP commons-based peer production

**Fairmondo** is a German cooperatively owned marketplace that promotes fair goods and services and “responsible consumption.” It is owned and run democratically by its members.

- **Year founded:** 2012
- **Country of origin:** Germany
- **Number of employees/contributors:** 8 employer member/over 2,000 members (coops-owners)
- **Revenue:Alternative:** $150,000 (aprox. 2016)
- **Property model:** cooperative
**Loconomics** is a California Cooperative Corporation that provides an app for booking services that is 100% owned by local professionals.

- **Year founded:** 2014
- **Country of origin:** US
- **Number of employees/contributors:** activity to be started, 2.5 employees
- **Revenue:** Alternative: activity to be started
- **Property model:** cooperative

**MakeSense** is an international community that rallies citizens across the world to help social entrepreneurs solve their challenges. By combining their skills and ideas, anyone can help social entrepreneurs create and develop their businesses and solve the most pressing issues faced by society in such arenas as: education, health, environment, food, etc. Since 2010, MakeSense has mobilized 30,000 volunteers in more than 100 cities worldwide to help 2,000 social entrepreneurs during problem-solving workshops.

- **Year founded:** 2010
- **Country of origin:** France
- **Number of employees/contributors:** 70 employees including affiliated structures (ecosystem), 20,000 contributors
- **Revenue:** 500,000 € MakeSense, 1.8M € the whole ecosystem
- **Property model:** non-for-profit association

**OuiShare** is a global community, a collective of freelancers and, at heart, an incubator of people driven by a set of core values. Founded in January 2012 in Paris, OuiShare rapidly evolved from a dozen enthusiasts to a global community spread across Europe, Latin America and the Middle East, and is an international leader in the field of collaborative economies, the future of cities, and the future of work.

- **Year founded:** 2012
- **Country of origin:** France
- **Number of employees/contributors:** 80 connectors, 5,000 members
- **Revenue:** 2M €
- **Property model:** non-profit organization (associations & foundations)

**Sensorica** is the first commons-based peer production network committed to the design and deployment of sensors and sense-making systems, utilizing open source software and hardware solutions. It developed an IT infrastructure and governance to support complex economic activity of open networks.

- **Year founded:** 2011
- **Country of origin:** Canada
- **Number of employees/contributors:** in December 2015 there were 121 contributors, but this number varies in time.
- **Revenue:**
- **Property model:** nondominium (from a legal perspective, it is a non-registered association)

**SMart** is a non-profit organization created in Belgium in 1998 and is currently expanding into 9 European countries. Its aim is to simplify and support the professional paths of all project workers and freelancers looking for an alternative to self-employment. All workers are employees of SMart during the time of their mission. They offer multiple services such as information, trainings, legal advice, van rentals, subsidies, a social professional network, etc. SMart became a a coop in January 2017.

- **Year founded:** 1998
- **Country of origin:** Belgium
- **Number of employees/contributors:** 160 employees, 2,500 cooperativists, 20,000 members using the services yearly, 85,000 members (overall), 150,000 stakeholders
- **Revenue:** a turnover of 125M € in 2015
- **Property model:** cooperative
Other organizations we have learned from:

**Calidoscoop** is a tool and channel to boost the potential of agents that act as engines of economic and social development in the region of Catalonia. It aims to promote local development based on social and sustainable economy that will contribute to job creation, strengthening the business, and social cohesion.

**Coworker.org** is a non-profit organization. It is an online platform that puts the power of collective bargaining into the hands of all workers, all over the world. It represents a scalable departure from traditional union organizing by providing ordinary people with online tools and training to organize their co-workers and advocate for changes on the job.

When coworker.org launches, it will be a petition-based internet service. The worker’s initial point of entry will be the creation of a petition targeted at their employers and centered on the change they would like to see in their workplace.

**Freelancers Union** promotes the interests of independent workers through advocacy, education, and services. Founded by Sara Horowitz, they are a group of practical revolutionaries who look for innovative ways to bring together and support the United States’ 54 million independent workers.

**Peerby** is a Dutch startup that operates a peer-to-peer sharing service for products. Users can share or request items from people in their neighborhood online, via their mobile or via social media channels. The product was launched (beta) for Amsterdam in August 2012, and the team is rapidly expanding to other areas.

Peerby raised $2.2 million over the course of a weekend from 1,051 crowdfunders through an equity crowdfunding campaign.

**Stocksy** is home to royalty-free stock photography and video footage owned by the artists producing them (coop). The contributing artists receive 50% of a Standard License Purchase and 75% of an Extended License Purchase—and every single co-op member receives a share of the company.
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