CEPOB
College of Europe POlicy Brief

7.26

NOVEMBER 2026

After the No: Iceland, the European Free Trade Association and the Future of the European Economic Area

Yannick Somauroo

Executive Summary

- **On 29 August 2026, Iceland rejected the resumption of European Union (EU) accession negotiations, 52.84% to 47.16% (turnout 82.5%).**
- **The advisory vote settles the European Economic Area (EEA) as Iceland's framework for internal-market participation and closes, for the current government, the membership question. Yet, the 'no' only preserves the EEA-EFTA (European Free Trade Area) pillar in the short term. Its structural fragility remains.**
- **The EU and the EEA-EFTA states should treat the outcome not as a rejection to be managed but as a stable basis on which to modernise the partnership: strengthening Iceland's and Norway's voice in shaping internal-market law and pre-empting future friction over regulatory divergence.**
- **The broader lesson for the EU: where sovereignty over a defining national resource is at stake, enlargement offers are unpersuasive; a credible, well-serviced association model is the more realistic instrument of European integration for small states.**
- **This policy brief examines the implications of Iceland's rejection of renewed EU accession negotiations for Iceland's position within EFTA and the EEA, and for the future functioning of the EEA's two-pillar structure. Rather than treating the referendum as a simple choice between EU membership and the status quo, the analysis considers what the result means for Iceland's economic and political relationship with the European Union, for the EFTA framework, and for the institutional balance underpinning the EEA. It then identifies the principal challenges arising from the outcome and proposes policy responses for Iceland, the EFTA-EEA framework and the European Union.**

On 29 August 2026, roughly 225,031 Icelanders answered a deliberately narrow question: whether accession negotiations with the European Union (EU), frozen in 2013, should start again. They answered it with a 'no'. The final result, 52.84% to 47.16% in favour on a turnout of 82.5%, reversed an early lead for the 'yes' camp (RÚV 2026). Although the ballot did not ask whether Iceland should join the Union, the outcome of the referendum confirms, for the lifetime of the present government, that Iceland's relationship with the Union will continue to run through the European Economic Area (EEA) rather than through membership.

This brief argues that the 'no' should not be read simply as a door closing. It is an opportunity to put the EEA partnership on a firmer, more openly acknowledged footing. Iceland already lives inside most of the Union's legal order without belonging to its political one through the two-pillar architecture of the EEA. The referendum has now tested that arrangement politically and found that, for a majority of Icelanders, it remains preferable to membership. The task for policy-makers in Brussels, Reykjavík and Oslo is to draw the right conclusions about the EEA's durability, its democratic cost, and the fragility of the European Free Trade Association (EFTA) pillar on which it rests.

The brief proceeds in three steps. It first sets out the evidence and analysis behind the result: what drove the vote, what the EEA already provides, the democratic cost of the arrangement, the structural fragility of the EFTA pillar, and the constitutional question the outcome leaves unresolved. It then draws out the policy implications and advances five targeted recommendations, addressed in turn to the EU institutions, to the EU and the EEA-EFTA states jointly, to the three EFTA states, and to Iceland. A short conclusion returns to the wider significance of the vote for the theory and practice of European integration.

From referendum to structural fragility: analysing the two-pillar EEA

This section establishes the analytical basis for the recommendations that follow, and it does two things. First, it reconstructs the referendum result and the forces behind it, in order to show that the outcome is stable and structural

rather than accidental or narrowly contingent. Second, it examines the arrangement the vote has now endorsed, the two-pillar EEA along the dimensions on which its durability will ultimately be tested: the democratic cost of continuously aligning with legislation adopted elsewhere, the institutional thinness of the EFTA pillar, and the constitutional obstacle that membership would have forced into the open and that the 'no' now defers. Before turning to the situation the vote has produced, however, it is worth being explicit about what was actually at stake and what a 'yes' would have meant, and for whom.

The vote and what drove it

The result of the Icelandic referendum was close in aggregate but displayed a clear urban-rural cleavage. Reykjavík's two constituencies leaned towards 'yes', with 57.5% in Reykjavík North and 54.5% in Reykjavík South, whereas the rural constituencies voted decisively against reopening EU accession negotiations (Euronews 2026). The Northwest constituency recorded the highest 'no' vote at 62.9%, followed by the Northeast at 61.2% and the South at 60.5% (ibid.).

Geopolitical considerations formed an important part of the context surrounding the renewed debate on Iceland's relationship with the European Union. Russia's war against Ukraine and its growing strategic presence in the Arctic and North Atlantic, together with uncertainty surrounding the United States' commitment to European security and President Donald Trump's threats concerning Greenland, contributed to a changing security environment in which closer European cooperation acquired renewed relevance.

Yet, these geopolitical considerations did not necessarily translate into the dominant concerns of the referendum campaign. For many Icelandic voters, fisheries, sovereignty and economic interests remained central to the debate (Bergmann 2009: 207; Thorhallsson 2013: 10). Iceland's fishing industry is a major component of its export economy and is closely associated with national identity and control over Iceland's maritime resources. The Icelandic government itself has described fisheries as the "life blood" of the Icelandic economy, noting that fish products historically accounted for nearly half of merchandise exports, emphasizing their importance to the country's cultural history and self-identity. It has also stressed Iceland's long-standing determination to retain control over marine resources within its exclusive economic zone (Government of Iceland n.d.). The Union's Common Fisheries Policy, by contrast, provides for shared fisheries management, including the setting of total allowable catches and the allocation of fishing opportunities among member states (Regulation (EU) No 1380/2013, Art. 16; Art. 43(3) TFEU). This institutional framework has therefore made fisheries management and control over marine resources a particularly sensitive issue in Iceland's relationship with the European Union. Even so, monetary instability and the appeal of the euro pulled the other way, especially in the capital, but did not outweigh the sovereignty argument over fishing grounds (Kirby and Thorhallsson 2012; Euronews 2026).

These material and identity-based factors were compounded by three features of the Icelandic case that together explain why the Union's offer proved so resistible (Thorhallsson 2001; Thorhallsson 2013, 9-16). The first is the absence of any settled national consensus in favour of accession. Unlike the candidate states of the Western Balkans or the Eastern neighbourhood, where a strategic orientation towards Brussels tends to command cross-party support and functions as a unifying national project, Iceland's political class has remained durably divided on the European question. Membership has been the flagship cause of no major party and the settled objective of no governing coalition, so that each attempt to advance it has depended on transient parliamentary arithmetic rather than on any durable popular mandate.

The second is security. As a founding member of NATO that has never maintained standing armed forces, Iceland already draws its hard-security guarantees from the Atlantic alliance and its bilateral relationship with the United States. The security rationale that has lent the Union fresh appeal elsewhere since 2022 therefore addresses, for Reykjavík, a need that is largely already met, and the marginal security value of accession is correspondingly low (Bailes and Thorhallsson 2013; Thorhallsson 2013, 10).

The third, and most fundamental, is that Iceland is a wealthy and long-consolidated democracy. The Union's historic power of attraction has rested on its capacity to serve as a vector of democratic consolidation and economic convergence for states emerging from authoritarian rule or relative poverty. For a prosperous state with mature institutions and a high standard of living, that promise offers little that it does not already possess. It is no coincidence that the two European democracies to have rejected accession at referendum, Iceland now, and Norway in both 1972 and 1994 (Fossum 2009, n. 2), are among the wealthiest and most institutionally settled on the continent. For such states, the Union is not an escape from a worse condition but, at best, a lateral move, and the sovereignty costs of membership are weighed against benefits that are marginal rather than transformative.

What a 'yes' would have meant and for whom

A vote to resume negotiations would not, by itself, have delivered membership, but it would have set in motion a sequence of consequences reaching well beyond Reykjavík. It is against that counterfactual that the significance of the 'no' is best measured. For Iceland, a 'yes' would have reopened the accession file frozen since 2013 and, with it, the fisheries question that has always been the true obstacle. Negotiators

would have had to reconcile national control of the exclusive economic zone with the Common Fisheries Policy's logic of shared management and relative stability of quotas, a reconciliation that touches not merely an economic sector but Icelandic national identity. The monetary argument, the appeal of the euro and an escape from the chronic instability of the króna could not outweigh the sovereignty concern over fishing grounds. A 'yes' would, in addition, have brought the constitutional difficulty examined below from the hypothetical to the immediate.

For Norway, the consequences would have been indirect but serious. Norwegian participation in the EEA has always rested, politically, on the reassurance of not being alone. Had Iceland moved toward the Union, Oslo would have found itself the sole 'larger' state in the EFTA pillar, reviving the perennial domestic debate about whether the EEA is a settled home or the longest of transitions, a debate successive Norwegian governments have preferred to keep dormant. The Icelandic vote thus carried a Norwegian stake that never appeared on the ballot. A Norwegian reappraisal, in turn, would place the whole EEA construction in question, since Oslo's participation gives the arrangement its economic weight. The Icelandic 'no' therefore matters as much for what it forecloses in Norway as for what it settles in Iceland.

For EFTA and the EEA as institutions, an Icelandic accession would have hollowed out the non-EU pillar, reducing it in substance to Norway alongside the microstate of Liechtenstein. A separate Surveillance Authority and a separate Court, designed to serve a plurality of states and to lend the pillar credibility and balance, would have been left to supervise, in practice, one large participant and one very small one, an arrangement increasingly difficult to justify in terms of proportionality, cost and institutional legitimacy.

For the EU, the constituency whose perspective the earlier draft rightly flagged as missing a 'yes' would have been a symbolic gain but a practical burden. It would have meant another accession negotiation to conduct, another set of sensitive derogations to broker over a defining national resource, and the precedent of admitting a state whose reservations about pooled sovereignty mirror those already voiced within the Union. The EU's revealed interest at this part of its periphery lies less in enlargement for its own sake than in a stable, homogeneous and well-functioning internal market. A resumed Icelandic accession would have advanced the former at some cost to the latter. Seen from Brussels, in other words, the 'no' is not obviously a setback, and may quietly be a convenience.

What the 'no' now means for each key stakeholder

Read against that counterfactual, the result is not a loss to be managed but a clarification to be used. For Iceland, it settles the external framework for the lifetime of the present government and converts an open question into a governing premise, even as it leaves the constitutional gap and the management of regulatory divergence to be handled by deliberate choice rather than by necessity. For Norway, it removes the immediate prospect of standing alone and buys time though not a permanent reprieve for its own unresolved EEA settlement. For EFTA and the EEA, the 'no' keeps the two-pillar architecture intact and supplies it with a fresh popular endorsement that its designers never sought and rarely obtain. For the EU, it confirms that association, not membership, is the operative instrument at this edge of the internal market, and that the market can be extended durably without the political costs of accession. In each case, uncertainty has been replaced by a stable premise on which to act.

That shared stability is precisely what makes the recommendations below both possible and necessary. Because none of these constituencies now faces an imminent change of framework, each has the room to address the weaknesses the vote has exposed rather than merely to react to them: the democratic deficit at the heart of the arrangement, the thinness of the EFTA pillar, and the latent constitutional question.

What the 'no' vote consolidates: EEA advantages and deficits

Iceland's participation in the internal market does not depend on membership. Through the 1994 EEA Agreement, the four freedoms (goods, persons, services and capital), together with competition, state aid and much of the regulatory acquis, extend to Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway. The arrangement works through two pillars: the Union pillar, supervised by the European Commission and the Court of Justice of the EU, and the EFTA pillar, supervised by a mirror institution, the EFTA Surveillance Authority, and the EFTA Court. This lets the three non-member states take part in the single market while answering, formally, to their own supervisory bodies (EEA Agreement, Art. 108; Surveillance and Court Agreement 1994; Baudenbacher 1997, 169). The 'no' vote leaves this legal structure intact and, in political terms, endorses it.

The unresolved democratic cost

The price of the arrangement is well-known in Reykjavík, where critics have long called it 'government by fax': to keep the market homogeneous, the EEA-EFTA states must continuously absorb internal-market legislation adopted in Brussels. They participate in shaping it only at the technical margins and hold no vote in the Council of the EU or seats in the directly elected European Parliament (Eriksen 2008; EEA Agreement, Arts 99–102). The referendum does not remove this democratic deficit; it accepts it as the lesser evil compared with the sovereignty transfer that membership would bring. That acceptance, however, is conditional and could erode if the volume and intrusiveness of incorporated

law continue to grow without a corresponding improvement in Iceland's and the other EEA members' voice.

The fragility of the EFTA pillar

The most important structural consequence of a 'yes' would have been the hollowing out the EEA-EFTA pillar, reducing it in substance to Norway alongside Liechtenstein. The 'no' averts that immediate risk, but the pillar remains thin: the separate Surveillance Authority and Court, designed to serve a plurality of EFTA states, now serves the most populous of the EEA-EFTA states participant, Norway, one medium-sized one, Iceland, and one small one. Its long-term viability and legitimacy are not settled by this vote (Fredriksen 2015, 102-117; Cremona 1994, 524). The Norwegian public matters, too: had Iceland left, Norway would have stood conspicuously alone, reopening its own perennial debate about whether the EEA is a permanent home or the longest of transitions. The 'no' spares Oslo that immediate pressure. Yet, the underlying question, whether associate participation through EFTA is a durable alternative to membership or a transitional stage that its larger participants eventually outgrow, remains unsettled.

A constitutional problem deferred rather than solved

Had the vote gone the other way, Iceland would nevertheless have faced an important constitutional question: its 1944 Constitution contains no specific provision expressly authorising the transfer of sovereign powers to a supranational organisation such as the EU (Constitution of the Republic of Iceland, Art. 21). This absence would not, in itself, have amounted to a constitutional prohibition on EU membership. Several EU members have likewise operated without a specific constitutional authorisation for European integration, relying instead on general constitutional provisions concerning international obligations, sovereignty and the transfer of powers. The question for Iceland would therefore have been whether its existing constitutional framework could accommodate the competences transferred to the Union, or whether constitutional amendment would ultimately have been required. Accession, entailing the direct effect and primacy of Union law and the binding jurisdiction of the Court of Justice, would likely have required constitutional amendment, itself a demanding two-parliament process (ibid., Art. 79). The 'no' means this problem does not arise now. But it also means that Iceland has, for a second time after the abandoned constitutional reform of 2012, stopped short of equipping itself with an integration-friendly constitutional framework (Landemore 2015, 166-191). The question remains latent for any future government.

Policy implications and recommendations

The referendum gives policy-makers in the EU and EFTA countries a stable premise: Iceland will remain in the EEA, not join the Union, for the foreseeable future. The right response on both sides is not damage control but consolidation, treating the EEA as a durable partnership worth deepening, while addressing the weaknesses the vote has exposed. This requires different action from different constituencies. The five recommendations that follow are thus addressed to specific actors and designed to turn a settled choice into a well-governed one, and to pre-empt the tensions that will otherwise resurface once the political relief of the result has faded.

1. For the EU institutions: treat the 'no' as a settled basis for partnership, not a rejection. The Commission and Council should publicly reaffirm the EEA as a long-term framework and avoid framing Iceland as a 'reluctant' or 'pending' member. A confident, forward-looking EEA relationship is more valuable to the internal market than repeated, unpersuasive enlargement overtures.

2. For the EU and the EEA-EFTA states jointly: modernise the EEA's decision-shaping mechanisms. The most corrosive feature of the arrangement is the democratic deficit. Strengthening early and structured involvement of Icelandic and Norwegian experts in the preparation of internal-market legislation, before it is finalised in Brussels, would reduce the 'government by fax' grievance at limited institutional cost and improve the quality and legitimacy of incorporated law (EEA Agreement, Arts. 99-100).

3. For the EEA-EFTA states, Norway, Iceland, Liechtenstein: reinforce the institutional viability of the EFTA pillar. With the pillar confirmed but thin, the three states and the EU should review whether the EFTA Surveillance Authority and the EFTA Court are adequately resourced and legitimate for such a small constituency. Pre-empting the risk that a future Norwegian debate destabilises the whole structure matters. Quiet institutional strengthening now is cheaper than crisis management later.

4. For Iceland: convert the result into a positive EEA strategy. Rather than leaving the question dormant until the next political cycle, the Icelandic government should set out how it intends to maximise the benefits of EEA membership and manage regulatory divergence. This is particularly true in fisheries-adjacent and financial-services files, so that the settled choice is actively governed rather than merely defaulted to.

5. For the EU, the broader lesson is that the enlargement instrument has limits for small, prosperous states whose economy and identity are built on a defining natural resource. Where sovereignty over such a resource, here fisheries, is at stake, the promise of membership is unpersuasive, however attractive the economic or security arguments. This is reinforced where the state is already wealthy, so that accession offers little material gain; and where its democracy is long consolidated, so that the EU's anchoring function holds little appeal. For states combining

these features, a credible, well-serviced association model is the more realistic vehicle of European integration. The EU's toolbox should reflect that.

Conclusion

The referendum of 29 August 2026 changed no law by itself and committed Iceland to nothing beyond continuity. Yet it answered, at least for now, a question the EEA was built to leave open: whether membership of the EEA short of EU accession is a permanent destination or merely a stage on the way in. Icelanders chose permanence and wished to remain outside the EU. For the study and practice of European integration, the value of the exercise is that it exposed both the ingenuity and the fragility of the two-pillar compromise on which the EEA rests. The prudent course for the EU and the EEA-EFTA states is to take the result at face value, as an endorsement of the partnership, and to use the stability it offers to deepen and modernise that partnership before its unresolved tensions over democratic voice and the thinness of the EFTA pillar resurface. The 'no' has secured the survival of EFTA; whether it also secures its long-term health is now a policy choice and should not be left to chance (Baudenbacher 1997, 169; Eriksen 2008; Thorhallsson 2015, 118-136).

Further Reading

Agreement on the European Economic Area, OJ L 1, 3.1.1994, p. 3 ('EEA Agreement').

Agreement between the EFTA States on the Establishment of a Surveillance Authority and a Court of Justice, OJ L 344, 31.12.1994, p. 3 ('Surveillance and Court Agreement').

Bailes, A. J. K. and Thorhallsson, B. 2013. "Instrumentalizing the European Union in Small State Strategies". *Journal of European Integration* 35(2): 99-115.

Baudenbacher, C. 1997. "Between Homogeneity and Independence: The Legal Position of the EFTA Court in the European Economic Area". *Columbia Journal of European Law* 3: 169.

Bergmann, E. 2009. "Sense of Sovereignty: How National Sentiments Have Influenced Iceland's European Policy", *Stjórnmál og stjórnsýsla* 5(2): 203-224.

Cremona, M. 1994. "The 'Dynamic and Homogeneous' EEA: Byzantine Structures and Variable Geometry". *European Law Review* 19(5): 508-526.

Eriksen, E. O. 2008. "Democracy Lost: The EEA Agreement and Norway's Democratic Deficit". ARENA Working Paper 21. Oslo: ARENA.

Euronews. 2026. "Iceland votes no to further EU Accession Talks in Tight Result" and "What does Iceland's "No" vote mean for the EU's Enlargement Policy?", 30 August 2026 and 1 September 2026.

Fossum, J. E. 2009. "Norway's European Conundrum". ARENA Working Paper 4. Oslo: ARENA.

Fredriksen, H. H. 2012. "Bridging the Widening Gap between the EU Treaties and the Agreement on the European Economic Area". *European Law Journal* 18(6): 868-886.

Kirby, P. and Thorhallsson, B. 2012. "Financial Crises in Iceland and Ireland: Does European Union and Euro Membership Matter?". *Journal of Common Market Studies*50(5): 801-818.

Landemore, H. 2015. "Inclusive Constitution-Making: The Icelandic Experiment". *Journal of Political Philosophy* 23(2): 166-191.

RÚV (Icelandic public broadcaster). *Official Referendum Results*. 30 August.

Thorhallsson, B. 2001. "The Distinctive Domestic Characteristics of Iceland and the Rejection of Membership of the European Union". *Journal of European Integration* 23(3): 257-280.

Thorhallsson, B. 2013. "Iceland's Contested European Policy: The Footprint of the Past – A Small and Insular Society". *Jean Monnet Occasional Papers* 1. La Valletta: Institute for European Studies, University of Malta.

Thorhallsson, B. 2015. "Iceland: A Reluctant European?", in Eriksen, E.O. and Fossum, J.E. (eds), *The European Union's Non-Members: Independence under Hegemony?* London: Routledge, pp. 118-136.

About the Author

Yannick Somauroo is a graduate of the College of Europe, Natolin Campus (Master in European Interdisciplinary Studies, specialisation in European Public Affairs and Policy, promotion Eliane Vogel-Polsky). He is a PhD candidate at the University of Mauritius and the University of La Réunion (co-tutelle), where his research concerns the European Public Prosecutor's Office and transnational financial crime.

Views expressed in the College of Europe Policy Briefs are those of the authors only and do not necessarily reflect positions of either the series editors or the College of Europe. Free online subscription at www.coleurope.eu/CEPOB.