

EUROPEAN ECONOMIC AREA

CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

Ref. 22-1602

19 April 2023

2 Annexes

30th MEETING OF THE EEA CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

Bergen, Norway, Wednesday 11 May

***Draft* MINUTES**

I. Opening by EEA CC co-chairs

1. The co-chairs of the EEA Consultative Committee, Ms Liz Helgesen from the EFTA CC, and Ms Ellen Nygren from the EESC opened the meeting and welcomed participants to the Committee's 30th meeting.
2. Ms Helgesen reflected on the importance of the EEA CC cooperation and emphasised her wish to extend it further.
3. First, she explained that the EEA CC was created by the signing of the EEA Agreement to strengthen relations between social partners. The EEA cooperation had worked out well so far, but she stressed that should not be taken for granted.
4. Second, she said that the EEA EFTA States were a solid pillar of the European project; that they shared important values with the EU and EU social partners such as democracy, rule of law, human rights, and a peaceful disposition. She underlined that the EEA EFTA States had been the closest and most reliable partners of the EU over the last decades.
5. Third, she underlined that in the EEA CC, representatives of organisation which were European leaders in vital sectors that brought added value to areas such as energy, fisheries, public sector issues, and research and innovation, to name a few. She mentioned unique characteristics of the EFTA pillar such as high labour union density and high collective bargain coverage.
6. Fourth, she emphasised that the EEA Agreement and EEA CC provided a stable

cooperation framework and increased accountability within the EEA framework. Finally, she reiterated her wish to do more together, and referenced the decision of the EFTA CC to appoint special rapporteurs to follow EESC Observatories. She then gave the word to her co-chair.

7. Ms Nygren thanked her co-chair and the organisers for preparing the meeting, the social programme in Bergen and the joint dinner. She reflected that the meeting schedule was highly interesting, topical, and relevant. She then gave the word back to her co-chair.
8. Ms Helgesen presented the draft meeting agenda.

II. Adoption of the agenda

9. The draft agenda (ref. 22-552) was adopted.

III. Adoption of the draft minutes of the previous meeting

10. The draft minutes (ref. 21-4147) from the previous meeting on Tuesday 14 December 2021, were adopted.

IV. EEA CC resolution and report on the social dimension of the Fit for 55 package

11. Ms Helgesen, co-chair of the EEA CC, presented the next agenda item, the EEA CC [resolution and report on the social dimension of the Fit for 55 package](#). She asked the co-rapporteurs Ms Nora Hansen from the EFTA CC and Ms Kinga Joó from the EESC to provide the committee with a background.
12. Ms Hansen gave a short overview of the resolution and report. She first explained that the report outlined the social and economic effects of the Fit for 55 package. The resolution and report referred to the package [presented](#) by the Commission which was a step towards achieving the EU goal of 55% GHG reduction by 2030. This could however cause social issues. This was supposed to be addressed by the creation of a [Social Climate Fund](#). She added that energy prices had risen considerably in recent months after that due to the war in Ukraine. She underlined that the resolution and

report emphasised the importance protecting the most vulnerable groups of society, involving social partners. It further referred to the avoidance of carbon leakage and the investment in new jobs, reskilling and upskilling.

13. Ms Kinga Joó stated that the document was supportive of the objectives of the Fit for 55 package. She underlined that the fair transition should be seen as an opportunity and that CBAM revenues could be used to raise revenue and fight energy poverty. She stated that some groups could be disproportionately affected by the energy transition. She explained that low-income households paid a high price for energy. She explained that low-income households did not have the same access to capital and loans to finance alternative energy sources. She referred to the Social Climate Fund which could be helpful but needed to be implemented in the right way in various countries. She referred to three different examples of social impacts of energy transition in Bulgaria, Hungary, and Ireland.

Discussions

14. Dr István Komoróczy asked a question to his Norwegian colleagues. Due to the war in Ukraine, there were discussions on stopping oil imports from Russia. He asked to what extent Norway could help EU Member States to meet energy need.
15. Ms Hansen answered that Norwegian oil and gas production was at full capacity and that it was impossible to add volumes in a short period of time. To do so Norway would need to invest in new oil and gas producing capabilities. This in turn played into the domestic discourse on climate change and oil and gas production in Norway. She added that the Norwegian government recently announced major investments in wind energy in the North Sea. The objective in Norway was to increase energy sustainability.
- Mr Jarle Hammerstad added that Norwegian companies kept production as high as possible, especially with regards to gas. There had been close contacts between the EU and Norwegian government. He also stated that Norway was connected to the EU energy market through pipelines.
16. Ms Zuzana Brzobohatá asked about the high the support for e-mobility in Norway. Mr

Hammerstand answered that there had been support for electric cars for a long time, both with tax incentives. The plan was to increase coverage along roads and move to heavy transport. Dr Zoltán Illés added that Iceland and Norway were in a privileged position due to their abundant hydro energy sources. There was also a consideration to be made that those that are less affluent should be considered. They would need good public electric transportation. Another element to consider was the infrastructure development which could also create jobs.

17. Mr Bjarte Rørmark stated that the document was good and balanced and proposed an amendment to the text to better reflect the role of local municipalities in the implementation of all climate goals.
18. Dr Komoróczyki stated that the implementation of the Fit for 55 package would have a major impact on the standards of living and global competitiveness of Europe. He proposed to amend the document to reflect that.
19. Mr Robert René Hansen remarked that there would need to be more investment in just transition in the workplace.
20. During the break the co-rapporteurs amended the document to accommodate the proposals tabled by the EEA CC members before and during the meeting. Later during the meeting, the resolution and report was **adopted** by the EEA CC with the amendments.

V. Discussion on EEA law and the role of the EFTA Court

21. Ms Nygren introduced the next topic on the agenda, that is a discussion on EEA law and the role of the EFTA Court. The topic had been suggested by the EESC-side to learn more about how EEA law worked and about the role of the EFTA Court.
22. She explained that the EEA CC would be joined by Mr Olafur Johannes Einarsson the EFTA Court Registrar and Professor Halvard Haukeland Fredriksen from the University of Bergen. She first gave the word to Mr Einarsson.
23. The EFTA Court Registrar started by explaining a key term in EEA law: homogeneity,

i.e., that the same rules should apply in the EEA EFTA pillar as on the EU pillar. He stated that the EEA Agreement was an Agreement of Public international law “with a twist”.

24. Importantly, the EFTA States did not transfer sovereignty to EEA institutions. He referred to the exception of that principle mainly in competition law. There was no direct effect and primacy as was found in EU law in EEA law.
25. He referred to the fact that the original proposal was to create a joint EEA Court, but the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU) did not like that proposal. Therefore, the solution was establishing an independent EFTA Court. The Surveillance and Court Agreement (SCA), Protocol 5 to the SCA, and Rules of Procedures set down the role and mandate of the EFTA Court. The jurisdiction of the EFTA Court was to rule on the interpretation of the EEA Agreement regarding the EFTA States. This importantly included secondary EEA legislation.
26. Mr Einarsson explained that there were two types of cases brought to the EFTA Court. On one hand, the advisory opinions (AO), which were more important. They were similar to the preliminary rulings of the CJEU. The advisory opinions allowed the EFTA States to pause proceedings in a case to ask the EFTA Court to interpret. The Court then invited Parties to the case: EEA States and ESA, to submit written observations and participate in the hearing. These opinions were not legally binding, but they were nearly always followed. There were very few examples of these not being followed. The second category of cases were the direct-action cases, which were infringement actions against EEA EFTA States and challenges against ESA decisions.
27. He further stated that the EEA Agreement should be interpreted in conformity with relevant case law and the EFTA Court usually tried to strive to arrive at the same conclusion as with EU law. There were however differences in scope and purposes and different interpretations and specific circumstances, but these were rare. The main logic as presented in the E-3/98 Rainford-Towning judgment was that: “without any such specific circumstances being present, homogeneity should prevail.” This argument had been endorsed often by the European Court of Justice (ECJ) on many

occasions.

28. Among the milestone judgements of the EFTA Court was the E-9/07 Sveinbjörnsdóttir case which established state liability under EEA law. There it was stated that: “the scope and the objective of the EEA Agreement goes beyond what is usual for an agreement under public international law.”
29. He then went on to cite a few important judgements of the EFTA Court with relevance to social policy objectives. He first discussed the case [E-8/00 LO](#) which presented questions on whether and to what extent collective bargaining agreements were outside the scope of the Article 53 of the EEA. He also referred to several cases on the working time directive. The latest [E-11/20 Sverrisson](#) found that the time spent travelling for employer was working time. Further he referred to important case law on health and safety such as case [E-2/10 Kolbeinsson](#) found that there the general rule under Directives that the main responsibility was placed on the employers and that there existed a duty under EEA to provide for sanctions for breaches of such obligations.
30. Mr Einarsson then presented EFTA Court case law on transfer of undertakings such as case [E-10/14 Enes Devici](#) which referred to partial harmonisation or a fair balance between the transferred employees and the buyers. Finally, he presented two cases on the NAV scandal regarding the export of social security in Norway. NAV I and NAV II and III had different conclusions for unemployment benefits whereas sickness benefits were generally found to be exportable, while there were limited possibilities to export while looking for work in another EEA State.
31. The EEA CC co-chair next gave the word to Professor Halvard Haukeland Fredriksen of Bergen University.
32. Professor Fredriksen emphasised the importance of the EFTA Court for the EEA Agreement and referred to the importance to strengthen the Court. He referred to the infamous Polydor principle which was ruled on a free trade agreement between EU and Portugal stating that: “It is apparent from an examination of the Agreement that although it makes provision for the unconditional abolition of certain restrictions on

trade between the Community and Portugal it does not have the same purpose as the EEA Treaty, inasmuch as the latter seeks to create a single market reproducing as closely as possible the conditions of a domestic market.” This effectively meant that reciprocity was not guaranteed.

33. This had also been used against the Swiss Government. In the judgment of the [CJEU C-351/08](#) Grimme case that: “The Swiss Confederation, by its refusal [to join the EEA], did not subscribe to the project of an economically integrated entity with a single market, based on common rules between its members, but chose the route of bilateral arrangements between the Community and its Member States in specific areas.”
34. Professor Haukeland Fredriksen argued that this showed the importance of the EFTA Court. He said that without a credible control mechanism in the EFTA Pillar of the EEA, the EEA Agreement could not fulfil its objective of the EEA EFTA States into the internal market. The only alternative was politically impossible: direct control by the European Commission and the CJEU. He explained that the CJEU was originally sceptical of the merit of the EFTA Court (Opinions 1/91 and 1/92), but eventually won over by the EFTA Court’s strive for homogeneity between EU and EEA law. This was underlined in by case [C-897/19 I.N.](#): which stated that the internal market established within the EU was extended to the EFTA States.
35. He referred to the Icesave case whereas the EFTA Court was called upon to interpret EEA law. The UK and the Netherlands had claimed around 4 billion EUR in compensation for alleged violations of EEA rules on national deposit guarantee scheme. The Court dismissed the application, and the ruling of the Court was respected by the EU-side which had argued in favour of UK and Dutch interests. This showed how much the EFTA Court was trusted by the EU-side.
36. He commented that there was a price to pay for this respect. That was that the EFTA Court limited room to manoeuvre and they had to follow the same legal philosophy as EU Courts. There was very limited room to diverge from rulings in cases which concerned common EEA rules that were adopted by the EEA EFTA States such as directives, regulation etc. However, there was more freedom to interpret EEA specific

rules such as on state liability, adaptations, and constitutional questions.

37. Professor Haukeland Fredriksen presented various constructive proposals to reform the EFTA Court such as to strengthen it by adding two judges. To strengthen the appointment procedure of the EFTA Court judges. To strengthen the cooperation between the EFTA Court and the CJEU. To broaden the jurisdiction of the EFTA Court to include the Lugano convention, Schengen, and Dublin agreements. To update the SCA to reflect Article 2 and 19 TEU and Article 47 CFR. Finally, he suggested to introduce an obligation on the highest courts and tribunals of the EFTA States to refer questions of interpretation of the EEA Agreement to the EFTA Court.

Discussions

38. Mr Robert René Hansen referred to the [KLP case](#) on pensions and collective bargaining agreements. He asked about changes in the Court's approach and whether it would come to the same conclusion now. He then asked about the role of EU Agencies and Norway's domestic room to manoeuvre. The Registrar answered that he was not sure whether developments in case law and legislation would lead to a different conclusion in the KLP case. He added that the case could be differently pleaded which could lead to a different conclusion. On the agencies he stated that the approach of the EEA EFTA States had been to deal with them on an ad hoc basis which in his opinion was the best approach. It was hard to find a one-fits-all solution. He further stated he believed that the problem had been exaggerated and referred to the fact that the European Union Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) had wide-ranging powers for around 15 years.
39. Professor Haukeland Fredriksen added that it was important to note that EU and EEA law was in constant development. Since the KLP judgement fell, things have moved on in the social pillar. Regarding the EU agencies he stated it was a difficult topic for the two-pillar set-up and there was no quick fix. One possible solution would be to grant EEA EFTA experts voting rights in those agencies, but the EU is unwilling to do so.
40. Mr Hammerstad asked about the follow-up to the [Viking Line](#) and [Laval](#) cases in CJEU jurisprudence. The panellists stated there had been no recent case on the issue which dealt with the balancing of collective bargaining and freedom of association.

41. Dr Komoróczy referred to the delay in CJEU proceedings and the adverse effects to economic operators. He asked whether there were rules on the duration of cases before the EFTA Court. Prof Fredriksen stated that it was important to the credibility of the Court to quickly process cases. This had not been a problem in the EFTA Court or the EEA EFTA States due to the efficacy of the courts. The only rule in Iceland and Norway was that the cases should be processed within reasonable time.
42. Mr Halldór Oddsson referred to a case he had worked on in Iceland related to the anti-discrimination directive of the EU which had been partly implemented in Iceland. He complained over a lack of legal certainty due to this. Professor Haukeland Fredriksen stated that this legal certainty was the creation of the EEA EFTA States. The Norwegian Supreme Court had dealt with the issue right away.
43. Ms Marianne Breiland referred back to the Viking Line and Laval cases and the tension between the social pillar and economic freedom within EU and EFTA jurisprudence.
44. The EFTA Court advisory [opinion](#) E-14/15 *Holship Norge AS v Norsk Transportarbeiderforbund* or the so-called 'Holship case' was discussed throughout the session. This case is related to the Viking and Laval rulings of the CJEU [effectively](#) made the rights of trade unions to take collective action subject to the requirements of the four freedoms. The EFTA Court based its ruling on the Viking and Laval case-law of the CJEU. Since then, the ECtHR had challenged those rulings.

VI. EEA CC resolution and report on challenges and opportunities of greater use of artificial intelligence in working life

45. Ms Nygren, co-chair, presented the next agenda item the [resolution and report on the challenges and opportunities of greater use of artificial intelligence \(AI\) in working life](#). She asked the co-rapporteurs, Dr István Komoróczy and Mr Philip André Charles, of the file to say a few words about the resolution and report. The expert working with the EESC-side Dr Zoltán Illés was also to be given the floor.
46. Dr Komoróczy stated that they had tried to compile a resolution and report that

represented the interests of employers, employees, and civil society. He referred to the importance of the EEA to maintain its role as global leaders and retain competitiveness. He explained that of the 200 companies considered to be major players in AI only 8 of them were based in Europe. He stated that Europe was chasing recent developments in AI. He stated that younger generations were more adept to technological developments.

47. He argued that AI created various opportunities for employers. They were interested to reduce cost related to production of goods and services. This however raised the question of what happened to the labour force. The social dialogue stakeholders needed to cooperation by designing and planning AI related applications. He named positive examples from his own experience involving increased use of AI in online ordering in Hungarian cooperatives.
48. He reiterated that the use of AI was favourable for businesses and the labour force. They should however approach AI in a balanced way. It needed to be tackled properly.
49. Mr Charles stated that the questions raised by the greater use of AI in working life were complex and important. Social dialogue and clear rules when implementing new AI systems were of great importance. He explained that some of the AI systems were developed in different countries with different values than the EEA States so he encouraged that the EEA States should be mindful to protect their work life models. He also stated that AI presented opportunities for example in the health sector.
50. Professor Illés stated that the quality of the report was high. He referred to the advantages and disadvantages of AI. He stated it was normal that mankind wanted to improve the quality of life and labour. There needed to be transparency on how the algorithms worked. He argued that we should never give away the opportunity to make our own decisions to AI on our actions. He stated that we needed monitoring of AI.
51. He added that AI took important decisions such as firing, hiring, controlling, and monitoring the workplace. We should be able to contest automatic decisions. Information sharing and transparency and ethical data management were of utmost

importance. He stated that the risks were severe. Discrimination or manipulation could be possible outcomes. AI was not a magical tool, he stated that human creativity was also needed.

52. He finally stated that involvement of trade unions was greatly important on questions of algorithms, and data collection.

53. Prior to the meeting Ms Helgensen had tabled amendments to the resolution and report on behalf of UNIO which were approved.

54. At the meeting Mr Rørmark also tabled amendments to the resolution and report on behalf of KS which were approved.

55. The resolution and report were **adopted** at the meeting by the EEA CC with the amendments.

VII. Discussion on Arctic security and defense

56. Ms Helgensen presented the next agenda item, Arctic Security and Defense. She presented Dr Karsten Friis who had travelled from Oslo to join the meeting. He was Head of the Research Group on Security and Defense at the Norwegian International Affairs Institute (NUPI) and highly knowledgeable on the subject.

57. She recalled the discussion on the EU Arctic Policy at the last EEA CC meeting in December 2021. She stated that much had happened since their last discussion: Recent geopolitical developments and Russia's illegal and terrible war in Ukraine had changed perspectives on the political landscape. Countries which had traditionally been neutral such as EU Member States Finland and Sweden or EFTA Member State Switzerland had shifted their neutrality positions due to the threat posed by Russia. There were now serious discussions in Finland and Sweden about joining NATO. She stated that these developments were sure to have an impact on the Arctic region and power dynamic in the high north. She then gave the floor to the speaker.

58. Dr Friis started by explaining the enormity of the Arctic region. He proclaimed that the recent developments could mean an end to "Arctic exceptionalism". He stated that

overall, the Arctic had been well governed. There had been good cooperative structures in the Arctic. Russia's 2014 annexation of Crimea changes the day-to-day running.

59. There were various drivers for change in the region, not least climate change. There would be a 2% decrease of the snow caps in the Arctic.
60. There was no looming threat of conflict in the Arctic but there was horizontal escalation and a spill-over effect from the aforementioned conflict. The Arctic Council had been put on ice and it was not possible to pretend that we still had business as usual.
61. He argued that Russia was weak militarily so they would not expect any "adventures" from Russia in the Arctic. However, Finland and Sweden joining NATO was a game changer when it comes to hard security. They had not been neutral but non-aligned since they joined the EU. It was a formal change, but it meant a lot for Norway if Finland and Sweden would join, not least logistically.
62. He believed that China's presence in the Arctic had been hyped. He explained that China was an observer in the Arctic Council, but Russia is aware of Chinese interests in the Arctic as well. However, with the latest alignments the West could push Russia towards China. This could pose a future challenge and increased the chances for tension in the region.
63. Now it was a question of who would blink first. Russia was indispensable in the Arctic. We could hope for a democratic miracle in Russia, but there was no sign of that happening. He finally stated that there were no people-to-people links between Russia and Norway to be found anymore.
64. Mr Hansen asked about a possible exit strategy for Russia. Dr Friis stated that Russia's war was not a rational war. His guess was that the aim of the current campaign was to have a military victory and control of Donbass. The major problem for Russia was that the West kept on supporting Ukraine so the war would continue.

65. Mr Charles asked about the role of the EU in the region. Dr Friis answered that various EU States had a great interest in the region. There is a possibility that the EU might deprioritise climate change which would require long-term investments. All large EU projects are frozen in the Arctic for now.
66. Professor Illés asked about winners in the war at the moment. Dr Friis answered that there were no real winners. Wars created losers on both sides. Russia's war was irrational and spurred on by honour and hurt feelings. Both Russia and the West was losing.
67. Dr Komoróczy asked about possible changes to the UN structure due to the war. Dr Friis answered that the UN Security Council had never worked well when the P5 States were involved in conflicts. There would be many issues that would change due to the war but he was doubtful that the UN Security Council would change.

VIII. Any other business

68. Ms Nygren raised under any other business the work of the EEA CC in 2023. She explained that it had been proposed at the EEA CC Bureau meeting that took place on 10 May 2022, that the next meeting of the EEA CC would take place in Stockholm, Sweden in the first quarter of 2023. This would coincide with the Swedish Presidency of the EU Council.
69. Further, possible topics for 2023 EEA CC resolutions and reports were discussed. Ms Nygren stated that the following topics were discussed at the EEA CC Bureau meeting:
- (A) Free movement of people within the internal market and the Single Market Emergency Instrument;
 - (B) Trade and sustainable development and Domestic Advisory Groups;
 - (C) Sustainable products in the circular economy;
 - (D) Energy supply in the EEA in view of the geopolitical situation;
 - (E) Future cooperation of the European Political Community.
70. She stated that the co-rapporteurs and the two topics would be decided in a written

procedure after the meeting.

71. Finally, the co-chair said that the EEA CC would adopt a [statement](#) to show solidarity with Ukrainian social partners and civil society, in written after the meeting.

IX. End of meeting

End of meeting

ANNEX I

Ref. 22-552
19 April 2023

30th MEETING OF THE EEA CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

Radisson Blu Royal Hotel, Bergen, Norway, Wednesday 11 May 2022

AGENDA

09:00 – 10:00

I. Opening by the EEA CC Co-chairs

Ms Liz Helgesen, EFTA CC, and Ms Ellen Nygren, EESC

II. Adoption of the agenda

Co-Chair, Ms Liz Helgesen, will present the draft agenda for adoption (ref. 22- 552)

III. Adoption of the draft minutes of the previous meeting

Draft minutes from the previous meeting on Tuesday 14 December 2021, have been distributed

Document: Draft minutes (Ref. 21-4247)

IV. EEA CC Resolution and Report on the Social Dimension of the Fit for 55 Package

- Presentation by the Co-rapporteurs Ms Nora Hansen and Ms Kinga Joó

Followed by discussion and adoption

10:00 – 10:30

Coffee break

10:30 – 12:00

V. Discussion on EEA law and the role of the EFTA Court

- Interventions by Mr Ólafur Jóhannes Einarsson, EFTA Court Registrar, and Professor Halvard Haukeland Frediksen from the University of Bergen

Followed by discussion

12:00 – 13:30

Lunch break

13:30 – 15:00

VI. EEA CC Resolution and Report on Challenges and Opportunities of Greater Use of Artificial Intelligence in Working Life

- Presentation of the resolution by the Co-rapporteurs Mr István Komoróczy, EESC and Mr Phillip André Charles, EFTA CC. Expert: Zoltán Illés, Ph.D.

Followed by discussion and adoption

VII. Discussion on Arctic, Security and Defence

Presentation by Dr Karsten Friis, Senior Research Fellow, Head of Research Group on Security and Defense, Norwegian Institute of International Affairs (NUPI)

VIII. End of meeting

EUROPEAN ECONOMIC AREA

CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

ANNEX II

Ref. 22-835

9 May 2022

30th EEA CC MEETING, 11 May 2022

Bergen

List of participants

EEA Consultative Committee

EESC Members

Ms Ellen NYGREN – EEA CC Co-Chair	Trade Union Official, Swedish Trade Union Confederation (LO), Sweden, Workers' Group
Ms Zuzana BRZOBOHATÁ	Self-employed, Czech Republic, Diversity Europe Group
Mr Philippe CHARRY	Deputy senior shop steward for FOCOM (Force Ouvrière - COM) at UES Orange, France, Workers' Group
Mr Vitālijs GAVRILOVS	President of the Employers' Confederation of Latvia (LDDK), co-chair of the Latvian National Tripartite Cooperation Council (NTSP), member of the Council of Presidents of BusinessEurope, private investor, Latvia, Employers' Group
Ms Kinga JOÓ	Vice-President of the National Association of Large Families (NOE), President of the Social Responsibility Board, National Cooperation Fund (NEA), Hungary, Diversity Europe Group
Dr István KOMORÓCZKI	Advisor to the President of the Hungarian National Federation of Consumer Co-operative Societies and Trade Associations (ÁFEOSZ-COOP), Hungary, Employers' Group

EFTA Members and Alternate Members

Ms Liz HELGESEN – EEA CC Co-Chair	Norwegian Confederation of Unions for Professionals (UNIO)
Ms Marianne BREILAND	Norwegian Confederation of Trade Unions (LO)
Ms Dagný ARADÓTTIR PIND	Federation of State and Municipal Employees (BSRB)
Mr Phillip André CHARLES	Norwegian Confederation of Vocational Unions (YS)
Ms Brigitte HAAS	Liechtenstein Chamber of Commerce and Industry (LCCI)
Mr Jarle HAMMERSTAD	Federation of Norwegian Commercial and Service Enterprises (Virke)
Mr Robert Rene HANSEN	Norwegian Confederation of Trade Unions (LO)
Ms Nora HANSEN	Norwegian Confederation of Trade Unions (LO)
Mr Sigi LANGENBAHN	Liechtenstein Employees Association
Mr Halldór ODDSSON	Icelandic Confederation of Labour (ASÍ)
Mr Bjarte RØRMARK	Norwegian Association of Local and Regional Authorities (KS)
Ms Björg Ásta ÞÓRÐARDÓTTIR	Federation of Icelandic Industries (SI)

Speakers and guests

Mr Ólafur Jóhannes EINARSSON	Registrar, EFTA Court
Dr Halvard Haukeland FREDIKSEN	Professor, University of Bergen
Dr Karsten FRIIS	Head of Research Group on Security and Defense, NUPI
Dr Zoltán ILLÉS	Associate Professor, Central European University (CEU); expert of Dr. Komoróczy

EESC Secretariat

Ms Maarit LAURILA	Administrator, External Relations
-------------------	-----------------------------------

EFTA Secretariat

Mr Andri LÚTHERSSON	Deputy Secretary-General, Brussels
Mr Petur GUNNARSSON	Officer, EEA Coordination Division
Mr Christophe ZUFFEREY	Officer, EEA Coordination Division
Mr Stefano CASELLINI	Administrative Coordinator, EEA Coordination Division