To whom it may concern,

I write this short submission in regards to the consultation on “A sharing economy reporting regime”, simply to implore strongly that the phrase “sharing economy” not be used in the final version of the laws or regulations that will be made.

The majority of things described in the discussion paper are more appropriately termed “gig economy”, whereas the word “sharing” would imply that some physical asset is being shared by several/many people. The only examples I see where true “sharing” is occurring is, in the providing of cars for short-term hiring by people who will drive it themselves, perhaps amongst a group of 20 or so people who together fund the acquisition of the asset for them to share between themselves so that they don’t each have to buy a car, or the provision of housing for short term stays. Anything which involves a person’s skill (such as driving a car to deliver a person or a product) should be termed a “gig”, or even just a “service” – there is no “sharing” going on there, and to call it such is simply to confuse concepts. For example, I know of no Uber driver who would let me drive their car without them being present in the car, (nor even with them present in the car), so to say that they are “sharing” something is fallacious. Normal “Sharing” does not involve another party paying – if I share my lunch with you, I will not be paid for doing so!!!

Perhaps the solution is to use the longer phrase “gig and sharing economy” in the title and contents of the final legislation, perhaps prefixed by the word “mediated”.

Or maybe even the phrase: “mediated services and asset sharing economy”.

Just think very carefully about the final term(s) chosen to be used.