

NVAO • THE NETHERLANDS

ACCREDITATION

JOINT PROGRAMME

ADVANCED MASTER IN ENERGY LAW

University of Groningen (the Netherlands)
University of Aberdeen (Scotland);
University of Copenhagen (Denmark)
University of Oslo (Norway)

ADVISORY REPORT
1 JULY 2026

Content

1	Peer Review	3
2	Programme	4
2.1	General data	4
2.2	Profile of the consortium	4
2.3	Profile of the programme	4
2.4	Panel	5
3	Outcome	6
4	Commendations	8
5	Recommendations	9
6	Assessment	10
6.1	Standard 1: Eligibility - 1.1 Status	10
6.2	Standard 1: Eligibility – 1.2 Joint design and delivery	10
6.3	Standard 1: Eligibility – 1.3 Cooperation Agreement	11
6.4	Standard 2: Learning Outcomes – 2.1 Level [ESG 1.2]	12
6.5	Standard 2: Learning Outcomes – 2.2 Disciplinary field	12
6.6	Standard 2: Learning Outcomes – 2.3 Achievement [ESG 1.2]	13
6.7	Standard 2: Learning Outcomes – 2.4 Regulated Professions	14
6.8	Standard 3: Study Programme [ESG 1.2] – 3.1 Curriculum	14
6.9	Standard 3: Study Programme [ESG 1.2] – 3.2 Credits	15
6.10	Standard 3: Study Programme [ESG 1.2] – 3.3. Workload	15
6.11	Standard 4: Admission and Recognition [ESG 1.4] – 4.1 Admission	16
6.12	Standard 4: Admission and Recognition [ESG 1.4] – 4.2 Recognition	16
6.13	Standard 5: Learning, Teaching and Assessment [ESG 1.3] – 5.1 Learning and teaching	17
6.14	Standard 5: Learning, Teaching and Assessment [ESG 1.3] – 5.2 Assessment of students	18
6.15	Standard 6: Student Support [ESG 1.6]	19
6.16	Standard 7: Resources [ESG 1.5 & 1.6] – 7.1 Staff	20
6.17	Standard 7: Resources [ESG 1.5 & 1.6] – 7.2 Facilities	20
6.18	Standard 8: Transparency and Documentation [ESG 1.8]	21
6.19	Standard 9: Quality Assurance [ESG 1.1 & part 1]	21
	Annex 1: Agenda site visit	23
	Annex 2: Documents reviewed	24
	Annex 3: Abbreviations	25

1 Peer Review

The Accreditation Organisation of the Netherlands and Flanders (NVAO) assesses the quality of an existing programme through a peer review process. To maintain accreditation an existing programme is reviewed every six years. This accreditation is necessary to be able to award a recognised degree upon the successful completion of a study programme.

The procedure for accrediting an existing programme serves as an ex-post assessment of a programme's quality. The quality of an existing programme is assessed by means of peer review. A panel of independent peers, including a student, reviews the programme during a site visit to the institution. A discussion amongst peer experts forms the basis for the panel's final judgement and advisory report. The focus is on the curriculum, the teaching and learning environment, and student assessment. The agenda for the site visit and the documents reviewed are attached as an annex to this report.

The peer review outcome is guided by the standards for the European Approach for quality assurance of joint programmes in the European Higher Education Area (EHEA), issued in October 2014 and approved by the EHEA ministers in May 2015. The peer review outcome is also guided by standards outlined and published in the NVAO Assessment framework for the higher education accreditation system of the Netherlands (Staatscourant 2024, nr. 6405). Each standard is evaluated on a three-point scale: meets, partially meets, or does not meet the standard. Based on this evaluation, the panel will rate the programme's overall quality as positive, conditionally positive, or negative.

NVAO makes the decision on the programme's quality based on this advisory report. This accreditation decision can be positive, conditionally positive or negative. If the decision is positive, with or without conditions, the institution may proceed with the programme. Graduates of the programme are entitled to receive a legally accredited degree.

This report presents the panel's findings, analysis and judgements resulting from the peer review. It also details the commendations and recommendations for follow-up actions.

The reports of each peer review are published on NVAO's website www.nvao.net. There you can also find more information about NVAO and peer reviews of existing programmes. The report will also be published in the database of external quality assurance results (DEQAR).

2 Programme

2.1 General data

Consortium Coordinator Institution	University of Groningen (the Netherlands)
Partner institution 1	University of Aberdeen (United Kingdom)
Partner institution 2	University of Copenhagen (Denmark)
Partner institution 3	University of Oslo (Norway)
Programme	Advanced Master in Energy Law
Level	Master
Variants	Part-time
Degree	Master of Laws
Joint programme	Joint degree
Tracks/Specialisations	not applicable
Locations	Groningen (the Netherlands) Aberdeen (United Kingdom) Copenhagen (Denmark) Oslo (Norway)
Study load	90 ECTS ¹
Language	English

2.2 Profile of the consortium

The application was filed by a consortium of four higher education institutions in four countries - they form the North Sea Energy Law Partnership (NSELP). They jointly develop and deliver the Advanced Master in Energy Law programme. The partner institutions have signed a consortium agreement that specifies the terms and conditions of the joint programme as well as the structure of the consortium and the partner institutions' responsibilities. The current agreement was signed by all partner institutions in March 2025, and covers six academic years, from January 1, 2025, to August 31, 2031.

2.3 Profile of the programme

The Advanced Master in Energy Law is a specialised, part-time programme leading to a joint degree offered by the North Sea Energy Law Partnership, a consortium comprising the University of Groningen, University of Aberdeen, University of Copenhagen, and University of Oslo. Established in 2009 and accredited since 2014, the programme was designed to address the growing complexity and internationalisation of energy law in the context of market liberalisation, climate change, and energy transition.

The programme is a 90 ECTS, two-year, part-time Master of Laws tailored for professionals with prior work experience in the energy sector or related legal fields. Its structure consists of four ten-week modules including an intensive two-week session on location per module, delivered sequentially across the partner universities, complemented by a 30 ECTS master's thesis. Each module focuses on a core area of energy law: market regulation, climate change and energy transition, energy security and investment protection, and energy trade and contracting. This structure aims to ensure both thematic depth and coherence, while the mobility component exposes students to diverse legal systems, academic environments and the possibility to gain input and synergies from experiences from other students.

All partner institutions contribute to curriculum development, teaching, and assessment, ensuring a comprehensive and comparative perspective on international and European energy law. The curriculum is closely aligned with current developments in the energy sector and is enriched by guest lectures, site visits, and strong links to professional practice.

The programme's mission is to equip legal professionals with advanced, practice-oriented knowledge and critical skills to navigate and shape the evolving energy landscape. Graduates develop expertise in complex legal

¹ European Credits

frameworks, research and analytical skills, and the ability to operate in multidisciplinary and international contexts. The programme thereby contributes to enhancing professional careers and supporting the transition towards a sustainable and secure energy future.

2.4 Panel

Peer experts

- Prof. mr. dr. Bald de Vries (chair), Professor Interdisciplinary legal education, Institute of Constitutional and Administrative Law, and Jurisprudence Utrecht University, and Academic director of the Centre for Academic Teaching & Learning, Utrecht University (The Netherlands).
- Prof. Birgitte Bak-Jensen, Professor in development of technical solutions for energy system mainly at distribution level, with focus on local energy, Head of studies in Energy at Aalborg University 2007-2018, leading the development of curriculum in Energy Engineering at Aalborg University (Denmark).
- Prof. Engobo Emeseh, Head of Department of Law and Criminology, Professor of Environmental and Energy law, Aberystwyth University (United Kingdom).
- Tamara Ciobanu (student member), PhD student Environmental Sciences, Babeş-Bolyai University in Cluj-Napoca, Romania, MSc Environmental engineering - Sustainable Development and Environmental Management and LLB - Bachelor of Law (Romania).

Assisting staff

- Drs. Miranda Valkenburg, secretary
- Tinka Thede, NVAO Chief International Policy & Affairs and process coordinator
- Joey Alberts, NVAO policy advisor (observer)

Site visit

Online, May 4, 2026

3 Outcome

The NVAO approved panel reached a positive conclusion regarding the quality of the Advanced Master in Energy Law offered jointly by the University of Groningen, University of Aberdeen, University of Copenhagen, and University of Oslo.

The panel concludes that the Advanced Master in Energy Law convincingly meets all applicable standards of the European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes in the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) and NVAO framework. The programme demonstrates a strong and authentic joint character, high academic quality and clear professional relevance within the specialised field of energy law.

A major strength of the programme is the close and longstanding collaboration between the Universities of Groningen, Aberdeen, Copenhagen and Oslo. The consortium is legally and academically robust, with all partner institutions fully recognised within their respective national higher education systems and authorised to award the joint degree. The programme benefits from a clear governance framework, effective coordination mechanisms and a strong culture of cooperation, supported by both formal structures and exceedingly effective informal collaboration.

The panel is particularly positive about the genuinely integrated nature of the programme. Joint design and delivery are clearly visible throughout the curriculum, teaching, assessment and supervision. The mobility component, with compulsory study periods at all four institutions, contributes significantly to the international and comparative learning experience and is very much valued by students and alumni. At the same time, the programme is aware that this can create challenges (personal, financial and logistical) and, hence, an obstacle for prospective students to enroll. The programme's interdisciplinary approach, combining legal, economic, geopolitical and sustainability perspectives, was regarded as very relevant to contemporary developments in the energy sector and the energy transition.

The intended learning outcomes are clearly formulated, aligned with European and national qualification frameworks and achieved at the appropriate Master's level. The programme successfully combines academic depth with strong professional orientation and provides students with advanced analytical, research and communication skills. Students and alumni consistently confirmed the direct relevance of the programme to professional practice and career development. The panel also considered the interaction between experienced professionals from diverse international backgrounds to be one of the programme's defining educational strengths.

Teaching, supervision and student support are of a high standard. The small-scale nature of the programme creates an interactive and personalised learning environment in which students receive substantial academic and practical support. Staff commitment, collegiality and disciplinary expertise were considered exceptional strengths of the consortium. Assessment procedures are generally well aligned with the intended learning outcomes and supported by common regulations, double marking and active oversight by the Board of Examiners. At the same time, the panel identified several areas for further enhancement. Although the programme demonstrates strong coherence and a clear educational philosophy in practice, it is recommended to articulate this educational philosophy more explicitly in programme documentation and external communication. It is also recommended to have greater transparency regarding module-level learning outcomes, assessment expectations and curriculum progression prior to enrolment since it would further strengthen the student experience and external positioning of the programme. It also allows (prospective) students to plan their studies well in advance. This may help increasing the number of students enrolling.

The panel also advises the consortium to continue strengthening formalisation and long-term sustainability in several areas. Several processes currently rely heavily on informal communication, personal commitment and the expertise of key individuals, particularly in respect of programme coordination and quality assurance. While these arrangements function effectively in the current small-scale setting, the advice is to set up additional formalisation and safeguarding of continuity, since it would improve resilience in the event of future growth or staffing changes. The strategic involvement of the Advisory Board, alumni and professional stakeholders could likewise be developed more systematically.

Overall, however, these recommendations and advice do not detract from the panel's very positive assessment. The programme demonstrates a strong academic and professional quality culture, clear responsiveness to stakeholder feedback and a high level of commitment from all consortium partners. The Advanced Master in Energy Law offers a distinctive, internationally oriented and professionally relevant joint programme that is fully consistent with the standards and objectives of the European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes (hereafter European Approach).

The panel therefore concludes that the programme meets the applicable standards and provides a solid foundation for its continued development and future sustainability.

Standard	Judgement
1. Eligibility	
1. Status	meets the standard
1.2 Joint design and delivery	meets the standard
1.3 Cooperation Agreement	meets the standard
2. Learning Outcomes	
2.1 Level	meets the standard
2.2 Disciplinary field	meets the standard
2.3 Achievement	meets the standard
2.4 Regulated Professions	meets the standard
3. Study Programme	
3.1 Curriculum	meets the standard
3.2 Credits	meets the standard
3.3 Workload	meets the standard
4. Admission and Recognition	
4.1 Admission	meets the standard
4.2 Recognition	meets the standard
5. Learning, Teaching and Assessment	
5.1 Learning and teaching	meets the standard
5.2 Assessment of students	meets the standard
6. Student support	
	meets the standard
7. Resources	
7.1 Staff	meets the standard
7.2 Facilities	meets the standard
8. Transparency and Documents	
	meets the standard
9. Quality assurance	
	meets the standard
Conclusion	positive

4 Commendations

The programme is commended for the following features of good practice.

1. Collaboration – The programme is built on a long-standing collaboration between the four universities, characterised by strong mutual trust and informal communication lines.
2. Integration of professional practice and academic learning– The programme demonstrates an excellent integration of professional practice and academic learning, with students actively bringing their professional experience into teaching sessions and assessments.
3. Learning environment – Cohorts consist of students from a wide range of regions and professional backgrounds. This diversity is actively integrated into the international classroom discussions and comparative learning, enriching the academic experience and exposing students to different legal systems and perspectives.
4. Curriculum – The curriculum is updated regularly to reflect developments in the energy sector and broader geopolitical changes. It is supported by a strong research base across all four partner institutions and demonstrates a clear connection between academic theory and professional practice.
5. Teaching staff – The teaching staff is highly committed and collaborates closely across the partner institutions. The small-scale nature of the programme enables intensive supervision and close student–staff interaction.

5 Recommendations

The panel recommends some follow-up actions to improve the programme further. These recommendations do not detract from the positive assessment of the programme's quality.

1. External positioning – Strengthen the student experience and external positioning of the programme by formalising the articulation of programme-wide coherence and providing information about the curriculum progression and overarching educational philosophy emphasising the jointness of the programme and its integrated nature. It may help improve enrolment and hence the viability of the programme.
2. Provide information at an early stage – Improve communication regarding assessment criteria, assessment expectations and module requirements by providing that information before enrolment of students. Also, provide lecture information and reading materials and module information earlier and be clear about expectations regarding preparation and self-study.
3. Curriculum alignment – Improve transparency and formalisation of curriculum alignment, by developing a clearer overall curriculum overview, and making constructive alignment between programme learning outcomes, module learning outcomes, teaching and assessment more explicit. Also, formalise curriculum updates and alignment procedures more clearly across institutions.
4. AI / GenAI policy – Develop a more explicit and aligned assessment policy across the consortium in respect of the use of Generative AI, academic integrity as well as in respect of issues of calibration to ensure assessment methods and thesis supervision continue adapting to AI developments.
5. Alumni – Strengthen and formalise the alumni network, by inviting alumni for mentoring, guest lectures, recruitment and professional feedback. Establish more systematic alumni consultation within quality assurance and use this network more strategically as a distinctive feature of the programme.

6 Assessment

6.1 Standard 1: Eligibility - 1.1 Status

The institutions that offer a joint programme should be recognised as higher education institutions by the relevant authorities of their countries. Their respective national legal frameworks should enable them to participate in the joint programme and, if applicable, to award a joint degree. The institutions awarding the degree(s) should ensure that the degree(s) belong to the higher education degree systems of the countries in which they are based.

Judgement

Meets the standard.

Findings, analysis and considerations

The Advanced Master in Energy Law is a fully recognised joint programme offered by the Universities of Groningen, Aberdeen, Copenhagen and Oslo. All four institutions are legally authorised to award a joint degree. The programme is embedded within the law faculties or schools of the partner universities and is positioned at EQF level 7 with a workload of 90 ECTS. The panel confirmed that all four universities are established and accredited higher education institutions with recognised authority to award degrees, including joint degrees where applicable, and that the programme complies with relevant national qualification frameworks and higher education regulations.

The consortium institutions were consistently described by students, alumni and external stakeholders as highly competent and well known within the field of energy law. Alumni in particular expressed strong appreciation for the academic quality and international reputation of the programme and the partner universities. Despite the relatively small scale of the programme, the panel observed a strong focus on educational quality, student support and disciplinary expertise. The consortium was considered academically robust, professionally relevant and fully eligible to participate in a joint programme arrangement within the framework of the European Approach.

In conclusion, the panel judges that Standard 1.1 is fully satisfied. The consortium consists of four well-established and accredited universities with recognised authority to deliver higher education and award degrees within their respective national systems. The programme benefits from strong disciplinary expertise, institutional credibility and a clear legal basis for joint delivery, providing a solid foundation for the continued development of the programme.

6.2 Standard 1: Eligibility – 1.2 Joint design and delivery

The joint programme should be offered jointly, involving all cooperating institutions in the design and delivery of the programme.

Judgement

Meets the standard.

Findings, analysis and considerations

The programme is genuinely joint in both design and delivery. Each partner university is responsible for one thematic module, but all partners contribute across the curriculum through teaching, supervision, assessment and curriculum development. Equal distribution of credits and compulsory onsite delivery at each consortium institution further reinforce the integrated nature of the programme. Monthly management meetings, joint attendance during teaching periods and close academic cooperation ensure coherence and alignment across the programme.

The consortium also benefits from strong informal collaboration, long-standing academic relationships and shared research activities, which were clearly visible during the site visit. Formal governance structures are complemented by close collegial relations and highly effective informal communication channels. The Management Board, teaching staff and Board of Examiners all demonstrated a shared responsibility for programme implementation and continuous improvement.

Students and alumni confirmed the strong joint character of the programme and highlighted the added value of studying across four institutions and jurisdictions. Alumni and professional representatives described the programme as highly interdisciplinary, professionally relevant and strongly connected to developments within the energy sector. The panel noted that the programme's vision and educational philosophy are clearly visible in practice and strongly embedded in the programme's culture, although they are not always sufficiently formalised or documented in strategic programme materials.

At the same time, the panel observed that the consortium itself sometimes underestimates the uniqueness and strength of the joint character of the programme. The alumni panel in particular, articulated the concept of "jointness" more explicitly than the consortium representatives themselves. The panel therefore considers the joint nature of the programme to be a major strategic strength that could be communicated more clearly for external positioning, recruitment and marketing purposes.

Overall, the panel concludes that Standard 1.2 is met. The programme demonstrates a strong and authentic joint character in both governance and educational delivery, supported by intensive collaboration between the partner institutions. The panel particularly valued the coherence achieved through formal coordination structures combined with long-standing informal academic cooperation. Although the consortium could articulate and formalise its programme vision more explicitly, the joint nature of the programme is clearly evident in practice and represents one of its principal strengths.

6.3 Standard 1: Eligibility – 1.3 Cooperation Agreement

The terms and conditions of the joint programme should be laid down in a cooperation agreement. The agreement should in particular cover the following issues:

- *Denomination of the degree(s) awarded in the programme*
- *Coordination and responsibilities of the partners involved regarding management and financial organisation (including funding, sharing of costs and income etc.)*
- *Admission and selection procedures for students*
- *Mobility of students and teachers*
- *Examination regulations, student assessment methods, recognition of credits and degree awarding procedures in the consortium*

Judgement

Meets the standard.

Findings, analysis and considerations

The consortium agreement clearly defines responsibilities regarding management, admissions, mobility, finance, assessment and the awarding of degrees. The University of Groningen acts as the coordinating institution and hosts the central administration. Governance is organised through several formal bodies, including the Management Board, Board of Examiners, Programme Committee, Admissions Board and Advisory Board, all supported by a dedicated Administrative Coordinator. The cooperation agreement covers all required elements in a clear, detailed and accessible manner and is formally renewed every three programme cycles.

Students follow modules at all four universities, ensuring compulsory mobility and international exposure. The governance structure combines formal procedures with efficient informal cooperation and was viewed positively by the panel. Members of the various boards described both formal and informal mechanisms for coordination and communication, and the central administrative support team was consistently praised for its expertise and effectiveness in ensuring the smooth functioning of the programme.

At the same time, several governance-related nuances were discussed. The Advisory Board appeared less active than other governance bodies, which was also confirmed during discussions with external stakeholders. The panel therefore advice strengthening the strategic role of the Advisory Board and making more systematic use of alumni and professional representatives as part of programme development and external engagement. Alumni were regarded as enthusiastic and engaged and as a potentially underused strategic asset for networking, curriculum development, promotion and quality assurance.

The panel additionally noted that the programme relies heavily on an experienced central coordination structure. While this currently functions very effectively, the consortium should remain attentive to potential vulnerability in the event of staffing changes or turnover within key administrative positions. The panel therefore encourages the consortium to ensure that knowledge, procedures and responsibilities remain sufficiently embedded institutionally and formally documented.

In conclusion, the panel considers Standard 1.3 to be fully achieved. The cooperation agreement is comprehensive, operational and well supported by effective governance and coordination structures. Responsibilities are clearly defined and collaboration between institutions functions smoothly in practice. While some advisory and continuity-related aspects could be strengthened further, the overall governance framework provides a stable and effective basis for the joint delivery of the programme.

6.4 Standard 2: Learning Outcomes – 2.1 Level [ESG 1.2]

The intended learning outcomes should align with the corresponding level in the Framework for Qualifications in the European Higher Education Area (FQ-EHEA), as well as the applicable national qualifications framework(s).

Judgement

Meets the standard.

Findings, analysis and considerations

The learning outcomes are aligned with the Qualifications Framework for the European Higher Education Area, the Dublin descriptors and the Dutch subject-specific framework for law programmes. The programme combines academic rigour with professional relevance and is designed for experienced professionals working in the energy sector. Students develop advanced research, analytical, communication and reflective skills, while also gaining expertise in international and comparative energy law.

The programme demonstrates the ability to revise and update learning outcomes in response to developments within the field and changing professional requirements.

The programme offers an interdisciplinary learning experience, in the sense that the law modules are placed in their relevant disciplinary contexts. Students and alumni consistently confirmed the close relationship between theory and professional practice and appreciated the relevance of the programme to their own professional contexts. While module descriptors differ somewhat in layout and presentation across institutions, students generally demonstrated a strong understanding of expectations and learning objectives.

The panel concludes that Standard 2.1 is convincingly met. The programme clearly operates at Master's level and demonstrates strong alignment with European and national qualification frameworks. The learning outcomes appropriately combine advanced academic and professional competences and are well suited to the target group of experienced professionals in the energy sector.

6.5 Standard 2: Learning Outcomes – 2.2 Disciplinary field

The intended learning outcomes should comprise knowledge, skills, and competencies in the respective disciplinary field(s).

Judgement

Meets the standard.

Findings, analysis and considerations

Academic and professional profile

The programme focuses on four key themes: liberalisation and regulation of energy markets, climate change and the energy transition, energy security and investment protection, and energy trade law and contracting. Together, these themes provide students with a broad yet coherent overview of contemporary energy law. The curriculum

integrates economic, geopolitical, sustainability and technological perspectives within the legal context, including issues relating to cybersecurity and energy markets, and combines academic teaching with practical application.

The programme strongly benefits from the professional backgrounds of its students. Teaching is highly interactive and discussion-based, with lecturers often acting as moderators who facilitate exchanges between participants from different jurisdictions and sectors. Students and alumni particularly valued the integration of professional practice, networking opportunities and international perspectives. The panel notes that the programme successfully balances theory and practice and that concerns regarding disciplinary breadth were removed during the visit.

Programme-level learning outcomes are clearly outlined and mapped to the modules, combining specialist disciplinary expertise with professional and transferable skills such as research, legal analysis and communication. Delivery by both academics and practitioners, together with guest lectures, presentations, site visits and professional exchanges, contributes strongly to the professional orientation of the programme. Student and alumni panels consistently highlighted the relevance of the programme for professional development and career advancement within the energy sector.

International and interdisciplinary dimension

The programme attracts students from a wide range of countries and professional backgrounds. Diversity within the cohorts is considered a major strength and contributes to comparative learning and classroom dynamism. Site visits, guest lectures and professional case studies further strengthen the interdisciplinary and international nature of the programme. The panel noted particularly positively the strong engagement and enthusiasm of representatives from the professional field, who described the programme as highly relevant for the sector and strongly connected to contemporary developments within energy law and the energy transition.

The panel also discussed the extent to which the curriculum should broaden its international orientation beyond primarily European regulatory perspectives. While some stakeholders suggested exploring a more global focus, the panel recognised that the current programme already covers a very broad disciplinary and comparative field and that further expansion could risk reducing academic depth.

Overall, the panel judges Standard 2.2 positively. The programme demonstrates a clear and coherent disciplinary focus within the specialised field of energy law while successfully integrating interdisciplinary, international and professional perspectives. The panel regards the strong interaction between academic content and professional practice as a defining characteristic and major strength of the programme.

6.6 Standard 2: Learning Outcomes – 2.3 Achievement [ESG 1.2]

The programme should be able to demonstrate that the intended learning outcomes are achieved.

Judgement

Meets the standard.

Findings, analysis and considerations

The programme demonstrates that the intended learning outcomes are achieved through a combination of written assignments, oral presentations and the Master's thesis. Students complete twelve papers of different depths and lengths across the four modules and write a 30 ECTS thesis under close supervision. Assessment criteria are aligned with the programme learning outcomes and supported by common assessment forms and double marking procedures. When starting a module, students are appropriately informed about the criteria and attendant requirements.

The structure of the programme reflects the main pillars of energy law while situating these within broader developments relating to climate change and the energy transition. The panel reviewed assessed student work and thesis assignments and concluded that students achieve the intended learning outcomes at the required Master's level.

Graduates appear to strongly benefit from the programme in their professional careers. Alumni reported career advancement, increased international opportunities and enhanced expertise in specialist areas of energy law. Internal evaluations indicate high levels of student satisfaction regarding learning outcomes, relevance to professional practice and overall programme quality. The panel considers the interplay between academic depth and professional applicability to be one of the programme's strongest features.

The panel concludes that Standard 2.3 is achieved. Students demonstrably attain the intended learning outcomes through a balanced combination of written work, presentations and thesis research. Graduates benefit substantially from the programme in their professional careers, and the overall level of achievement is clearly supported by student work, alumni feedback and assessment practices.

6.7 Standard 2: Learning Outcomes – 2.4 Regulated Professions

If relevant for the specific joint programme, the minimum agreed training conditions specified in the European Union Directive 2005/36/EC, or relevant common trainings frameworks established under the Directive, should be taken into account.

Judgement

Not applicable.

6.8 Standard 3: Study Programme [ESG 1.2] – 3.1 Curriculum

The structure and content of the curriculum should be fit to enable the students to achieve the intended learning outcomes.

Judgement

Meets the standard.

Findings, analysis and considerations

The curriculum consists of four 15 ECTS modules delivered consecutively across the four partner universities, followed by a 30 ECTS Master's thesis. The structure is specifically designed for professionals and combines two-week intensive onsite teaching periods with substantial preparation and independent study. Students can integrate assignments into their professional practice and complete much of the work remotely.

The curriculum responds actively to developments in energy law and the energy transition and is updated continuously. Recent adjustments to module titles and sequencing were made to improve thematic coherence and reflect changes in the field. The panel concludes that the curriculum is academically coherent and responsive to current developments. At the same time, the panel discussed whether the programme is always presented externally as a fully coherent curriculum rather than as four separate thematic modules. While coherence is clearly visible in practice and reinforced through coordination between staff and governance bodies, the panel recommends a more formalised articulation of programme-wide coherence, curriculum progression and overarching educational philosophy as well as emphasising the jointness of the programme and its integrated nature.

The programme structure was viewed very positively by students and alumni, particularly because it accommodates professional responsibilities and part-time study. The self-study periods are scaffolded through preparatory assignments, structured guidance and progressive development of research and writing skills. Alumni noted positively that modules can in some cases be followed in different sequences without undermining progression.

Staff indicated that academic colleagues attend each other's teaching sessions not only to support coordination, but also to identify potential overlap, duplication or gaps across modules and to maintain programme-wide coherence. This peer observation is institutionalised rather than being ad-hoc.

Students valued the onsite modules, excursions and networking opportunities highly. At the same time, several students indicated that reading materials, lecture content and assessment information should be provided earlier

and with greater clarity to facilitate preparation and workload planning. The panel therefore recommends improving transparency regarding expectations, assessment criteria and the overall student journey to be ready even before enrolment of the students.

Overall, the panel concludes that Standard 3.1 is met. The curriculum is well structured, professionally relevant and carefully adapted to the needs of part-time working professionals. The combination of intensive onsite teaching, independent study and international mobility creates a distinctive and effective educational model. Further articulation of programme-wide coherence and clearer communication regarding expectations would nevertheless strengthen the curriculum further.

6.9 Standard 3: Study Programme [ESG 1.2] – 3.2 Credits

The European Credit Transfer System (ECTS) should be applied properly, and the distribution of credits should be clear.

Judgement

Meets the standard.

Findings, analysis and considerations

The programme follows the European Credit Transfer System and consists of 90 ECTS at Master's level. Credits are awarded for different types of learning activities, like lectures, seminars, papers, and presentations. The workload is spread across two years in part-time mode, allowing professionals to combine study with employment. The structure consists of four 15 ECTS modules and a 30 ECTS thesis, and students confirmed that the credit distribution is transparent and well balanced.

Evaluations indicate that students consider the structure feasible and the timing of modules appropriate.

The panel judges Standard 3.2 positively. The allocation and distribution of credits are transparent, appropriate and consistent with European standards for Master's-level education.

6.10 Standard 3: Study Programme [ESG 1.2] – 3.3. Workload

A joint bachelor programme will typically amount to a total student workload of 180-240 ECTS-credits; a joint master programme will typically amount to 90-120 ECTS-credits and should not be less than 60 ECTS-credits at second cycle level (credit ranges according to the FQ-EHEA); for joint doctorates there is no credit range specified. The workload and the average time to complete the programme should be monitored.

Judgement

Meets the standard.

Findings, analysis and considerations

The programme workload is consistent with the expectations for a joint Master's programme within the European Higher Education Area. According to the Teaching and Examination Regulation 2023/2025 Article 1.2f, 1 ECTS is equivalent to a student workload of 28 hours. Monitoring mechanisms are in place through evaluations and ongoing discussions within the consortium. Students generally regarded the workload as demanding but manageable alongside professional responsibilities.

The panel nevertheless discussed the relationship between perceived workload and allocated credits, especially because workload experiences differ according to students' prior expertise and professional background. Some students reported significantly lower preparation times than would normally be associated with a 15 ECTS module, whereas others described extensive reading and preparation demands. The panel therefore suggests that the consortium formulates a clearer educational vision concerning preparation, study expectations and student investment before each module.

Students and alumni generally expressed satisfaction with the overall workload balance and recognised that experiences differ according to professional background and prior legal expertise. The panel therefore

recommends providing lecture information and reading materials earlier and communicating more clearly about expectations regarding preparation and self-study.

In conclusion, the panel considers Standard 3.3 to be met. The workload is demanding but generally manageable for the target group of experienced professionals. Monitoring mechanisms function adequately, and students broadly confirmed the feasibility of combining the programme with employment. Earlier provision of materials and clearer communication regarding preparation expectations would nevertheless contribute to a more balanced workload experience. Although perceptions of workload differ among students with varying professional backgrounds, the overall workload were considered sound and appropriate.

6.11 Standard 4: Admission and Recognition [ESG 1.4] – 4.1 Admission

The admission requirements and selection procedures should be appropriate in light of the programme's level and discipline.

Judgement

Meets the standard.

Findings, analysis and considerations

Admission is selective and aimed at professionals with relevant academic qualifications and at least two years of work experience. Applicants must demonstrate sufficient English proficiency and provide evidence of employer support. The Admissions Board evaluates applications independently from management considerations to ensure objectivity. The necessary information for applicants is clearly available on the programme's website.

The programme attracts a highly international student population and offers preparatory support to applicants without a law background, including reading materials and introductory courses. The panel notes positively that the admissions process is flexible and responsive to diverse student backgrounds and that both legally trained applicants and professionals with technical or engineering backgrounds are admitted successfully.

The panel notes that during the conversations it was not entirely clear how many applicants are accepted relative to the total number of applications received. The programme provided detailed information afterwards.

Still the panel is of the opinion that greater transparency regarding admissions data and recruitment strategy could support future programme development.

The onboarding process was discussed very positively by students and alumni. Students appreciated the timely communication, introductory guidance and practical support provided prior to the first onsite module. The consortium was considered highly responsive in helping students prepare for participation across multiple institutions and jurisdictions.

At the same time, the panel discussed the relatively small cohort size and the financial barriers associated with participation. Tuition fees, travel and accommodation costs may limit accessibility for potential applicants, especially for those from underrepresented regions and backgrounds. The previous panel therefore recommended to focus on exploring sponsorships, scholarships and other funding mechanisms to improve accessibility and long-term sustainability. The documentation shows that the institutions have further explored this recommendation made by the previous panel regarding scholarships. Due to the programme's modular structure, it does not qualify for many scholarship schemes. The panel therefore advises the institutions to explore alternative options, such as private funding for scholarships.

Overall, the panel concludes that Standard 4.1 is fulfilled. Admission procedures are appropriate, transparent and well aligned with the specialised and professional nature of the programme. The programme successfully accommodates students from diverse professional and academic backgrounds while maintaining clear entry requirements. At the same time, the programme is aware that the programme can create challenges (personal, financial and logistical) and, hence, an obstacle for prospective students to enroll. The partner institutions have noted how difficult it is to secure external funding to manage the costs for students.

6.12 Standard 4: Admission and Recognition [ESG 1.4] – 4.2 Recognition

Recognition of qualifications and of periods of studies (including recognition of prior learning) should be applied in line with the Lisbon Recognition Convention and subsidiary documents.

Judgement

Meets the standard.

Findings, analysis and considerations

Recognition procedures are aligned with the Lisbon Recognition Convention. Students who complete individual modules receive certificates of participation, while graduates of the full programme receive a joint degree issued collectively by the four universities. Credits obtained at one institution are formally recognised by all consortium partners.

Alumni reported no major problems regarding the recognition or reputation of the degree in professional practice and expressed strong appreciation for the usefulness and relevance of the diploma for career development. Recognition arrangements were considered fully operational in practice and not merely formal on paper.

The panel concludes that Standard 4.2 is fully met. Recognition procedures function effectively across the consortium and are aligned with international principles for recognition within higher education. Students and alumni did not report any significant practical difficulties concerning recognition or the professional value of the degree. The panel also notes positively that students who complete only parts of the programme receive a certificate for completed modules.

6.13 Standard 5: Learning, Teaching and Assessment [ESG 1.3] – 5.1 Learning and teaching

The programme should be designed to correspond with the intended learning outcomes, and the learning and teaching approaches applied should be adequate to achieve those. The diversity of students and their needs should be respected and attended to, especially in view of potential different cultural backgrounds of the students.

Judgement

Meets the standard.

Findings, analysis and considerations

Teaching methods are closely aligned with the intended learning outcomes and tailored to the needs of experienced professionals. The programme combines lectures, discussions, presentations, site visits and independent research. The small cohort sizes create an interactive and highly personalised learning environment. Students and alumni expressed strong satisfaction with the teaching quality and the integration of professional practice into classroom discussions. The programme enables students to personalise their studies to a considerable extent by allowing them to choose presentation and paper topics that are relevant to their professional practice or employer.

The diversity of the student population is explicitly used as a pedagogical strength. Students from different countries, sectors and levels of experience contribute actively to comparative discussions and peer learning. Online meetings and guidance before teaching periods further support preparation and self-study. Students with a non-legal background receive sufficient structured support to engage equally in advanced legal discussions and writing tasks. The panel observed that the programme demonstrates a clear educational vision in practice (also in respect of the 'international classroom'), even if this is not always explicitly articulated in policy documents.

The programme appears highly attentive to the diversity of academic, professional and jurisdictional backgrounds within the student cohort. Students without previous experience in the energy law sector are generally not admitted, which supports the advanced and professionally oriented character of classroom discussions. Students also indicated that cultural diversity does not create major barriers within the programme and that the mature professional profile of the cohort contributes positively to collaboration.

Students appreciated the interactive lectures and the balance between academic and practical perspectives. They also recommended providing course materials and reading lists earlier in order to facilitate preparation. Some students suggested broadening attention beyond European Union regulation in certain modules, although this did not emerge as a major concern.

One area discussed by the panel concerned support for students entering the programme with diverse educational and disciplinary backgrounds, especially those without prior legal training or those joining the

programme at different stages. The panel advises ensuring sufficiently structured support and clearer mapping of the student journey, particularly regarding foundational aspects such as academic writing, introduction to legal methodology and legal terminology.

The panel judges Standard 5.1 positively. Teaching and learning methods are well aligned with the programme's intended learning outcomes and effectively tailored to the needs of experienced professionals.

Coordination mechanisms are in place to ensure consistency in assessment and alignment between intended learning outcomes and programme delivery. The interactive and international learning environment is regarded as a major strength, particularly because of the diversity and professional expertise of the student cohort.

6.14 Standard 5: Learning, Teaching and Assessment [ESG 1.3] – 5.2 Assessment of students

The examination regulations and the assessment of the achieved learning outcomes should correspond with the intended learning outcomes. They should be applied consistently among partner institutions.

Judgement

Meets the standard.

Findings, analysis and considerations

Assessment is based primarily on written assignments and oral presentations, culminating in the Master's thesis. The consortium applies common regulations, assessment forms and grading procedures across institutions. Double marking and the involvement of the Board of Examiners contribute to consistency and quality assurance. Students appreciated the amount of feedback they received and considered feedback meaningful and actionable. The programme places strong emphasis on the development of legal writing skills, which students regarded as highly valuable professionally and academically.

Although assessment criteria, rules, and regulations are available, for example in the Teaching and Examination Regulations (TER), the Assignment Guidelines, and the Thesis Guide, several students nonetheless indicated that assessment criteria and expectations were not always sufficiently transparent in advance. Students sometimes experienced uncertainty regarding whether assessments primarily evaluated substantive legal content, academic writing quality or presentation skills. The panel therefore recommended clearer communication about assessment standards and module requirements.

The panel also discussed the challenge of harmonising grading standards and calibration practices across four institutions and different national academic cultures. Although the consortium has established common procedures and assessment forms, questions remain regarding the extent to which calibration takes place systematically at staff level. The panel therefore encourages continued attention to alignment, moderation and consistency in grading practices across institutions.

The consortium is also considering the implications of artificial intelligence for assessment and academic integrity. Discussions with staff indicated that AI-related policies and practices are still evolving across all participating universities and remain a work in progress. While the small-scale nature of the programme and close staff-student interaction currently limit concerns about misuse, the panel recommends that a more explicit and aligned assessment policy should be developed across the consortium in respect of the use of Generative AI as well as in respect of issues of calibration.

Students valued the programme's emphasis on legal writing skills and acknowledged that writing assignments, iterative feedback and guidance from different teachers contributed substantially to their professional development. At the same time, the panel discussed the organisational intensity associated with the large number of written assignments and the cumulative workload connected to legal writing activities throughout the programme.

Several students also indicated that assessment expectations were not always fully transparent at the beginning of modules. In some cases, students experienced uncertainty regarding whether assessments primarily focused on substantive legal content, writing quality or presentation skills. Although these issues were generally clarified

during the modules themselves, the panel recommended communicating assessment expectations and criteria more explicitly and consistently in advance.

Overall, the panel concludes that Standard 5.2 is met. Assessment methods are appropriate, varied and generally well aligned with the intended learning outcomes. Students receive meaningful feedback and demonstrate achievement at the required level. The Board of Examiners, responsible for the quality assurance of the examination within the programme and the policy regarding the examination and assessments, is appropriately staffed and performs its statutory duties adequately. Clear mechanisms derived from the Dutch system are used to support consistency in assessment and grading practices across institutions. Additional attention to grading calibration, assessment transparency and the further development of a consortium-wide AI policy would nevertheless strengthen consistency and clarity further. Some additional clarity regarding assessment expectations would further strengthen the student experience.

6.15 Standard 6: Student Support [ESG 1.6]

The student support services should contribute to the achievement of the intended learning outcomes. They should take into account specific challenges of mobile students.

Judgement

Meets the standard.

Findings, analysis and considerations

Student support is organised centrally through the Administrative Coordinator, who functions as the primary contact point for students, staff and applicants. Support includes assistance with admissions, visas, practical arrangements, academic guidance and special facilities for students with disabilities. Students generally expressed high levels of satisfaction with the accessibility and responsiveness of support services.

The onboarding process received particularly positive feedback. Students appreciated the timely provision of practical information, introductory sessions at host universities and the availability of support before the first onsite module.

The small scale of the programme contributes significantly to personalised support and close communication. Flexible solutions are available when personal circumstances affect participation, including examples of temporary online participation arrangements introduced during the Covid-19 pandemic and maintained where appropriate afterwards. Students also highlighted the accessibility of supervisors and administrative staff, as well as the positive atmosphere during onsite modules.

The panel nevertheless discussed the vulnerability associated with reliance on a highly centralised coordination structure. The Administrative Coordinator currently fulfils several interconnected functions, including programme administration, communication and aspects of student advising. While this arrangement functions effectively, the panel advise the programme to ensure sufficient institutional backup and formalisation of procedures in order to reduce dependency on individual staff members.

The panel notes that a significant amount of student support and educational coordination currently operates through informal practices. While this functions effectively within a small cohort environment, the panel encourages the consortium to formalise some of these practices more explicitly in order to safeguard sustainability in the event of programme growth or staffing changes.

The panel also noted that support for students entering the programme mid-cycle or with diverse legal backgrounds could be formalised further through clearer guidance and preparatory structures.

The panel concludes that Standard 6 is fully achieved. Student support is highly appreciated by students and alumni and functions effectively across the consortium. The personalised and responsive character of the support structure is a clear strength of the programme. At the same time, greater formalisation and safeguarding of continuity would enhance long-term resilience.

6.16 **Standard 7: Resources [ESG 1.5 & 1.6] – 7.1 Staff**

The staff should be sufficient and adequate (qualifications, professional and international experience) to implement the study programme.

Judgement

Meets the standard.

Findings, analysis and considerations

The programme benefits from highly qualified academic and professional staff with extensive international and sector-specific expertise. Teaching is delivered by leading scholars and practitioners in energy law, and staff collaboration across institutions is strong. Students did not report significant differences in teaching quality between senior academics, practitioners and junior staff.

The panel considers staff commitment to be one of the programme's major strengths. Staff demonstrated strong collegiality, engagement and ownership of the programme. The diversity of the teaching team, including both academics and professionals from practice, was viewed very positively by students and alumni. Staff members are also actively involved in a range of research projects and maintain regular contact outside scheduled teaching hours, including through joint participation in conferences and other discipline-related activities.

The site visit confirmed that teaching staff are highly knowledgeable within their specialist areas and committed to maintaining programme coherence across institutions. Concerns regarding staffing and coordination were fully removed during the visit. Most of the teaching staff also meets the requirements regarding didactic qualifications and the language proficiency required for teaching in English.

The panel also discussed future sustainability in relation to potential growth in cohort size. The current small-scale structure strongly supports personalised interaction, close supervision and intensive collaboration between institutions. However, the panel noted that significant growth in student numbers could place pressure on coordination, assessment alignment and individual student support if additional formal structures and staffing arrangements are not developed accordingly.

Overall, the panel considers Standard 7.1 to be fully met. The programme benefits from an exceptionally strong academic and professional teaching team with substantial expertise in the field of energy law. Staff commitment, collegiality and collaboration across institutions form a few of the core strengths of the programme.

6.17 **Standard 7: Resources [ESG 1.5 & 1.6] – 7.2 Facilities**

The facilities provided should be sufficient and adequate in view of the intended learning outcomes.

Judgement

Meets the standard.

Findings, analysis and considerations

The four partner universities provide appropriate educational and technical facilities, including teaching rooms, digital learning environments, (online) library access and IT services. Students have online access to all partner libraries and can use university facilities during onsite modules. The Brightspace environment functions as the main digital platform for teaching materials and communication.

Students valued the facilities and particularly appreciated the opportunities for networking and social interaction during onsite periods. Access to (online) libraries, study spaces, Eduroam and digital resources was considered effective across all institutions. Students also highlighted the practical support provided during onsite modules, including organisational assistance and hospitality.

The panel concludes that Standard 7.2 is achieved. Facilities and learning resources across the four institutions adequately support the delivery of the programme and provide students with appropriate academic, digital and practical support throughout their studies.

6.18 **Standard 8: Transparency and Documentation [ESG 1.8]**

Relevant information about the programme like admission requirements and procedures, course catalogue, examination and assessment procedures etc. should be well documented and published by taking into account specific needs of mobile students.

Judgement

Meets the standard.

Findings, analysis and considerations

The programme communicates information through the consortium website, partner university websites, webinars, LinkedIn and Brightspace. Students receive information about admissions, regulations, assessments, module content and practical matters through both digital platforms and direct communication from the Administrative Coordinator.

Although the available information is extensive, the panel identified room for improvement regarding transparency and coherence. Students requested earlier access to reading materials and clearer communication about assessment expectations, module-level learning outcomes and programme structure. The panel therefore recommends developing a more explicit curriculum overview and a clearer student roadmap. The panel also discussed whether students have sufficient early access to curriculum information, module descriptions and assessment expectations before enrolment. While programme-level information is available publicly, more detailed module-level information and assessment criteria are mainly accessible through Brightspace after admission. Given the programme's intensive structure and international mobility requirements, the panel considers timely and transparent access to curriculum and assessment information essential rather than optional. Delayed or insufficient communication may disproportionately disadvantage working professionals and students managing complex personal, financial and travel arrangements.

While programme-level learning outcomes and the general structure of the programme are publicly available, module-level learning outcomes and detailed assessment information are mainly accessible after enrolment through Brightspace. The panel discussed whether prospective students could obtain sufficiently detailed insight into curriculum expectations before registering and recommended strengthening transparency in this respect. At the same time, students and alumni generally expressed satisfaction with communication and organisation. They appreciated the smooth start of the programme, the clarity of practical information and the responsiveness of the consortium staff. The panel also observed that greater transparency could function not only as an educational improvement but also as a strategic marketing instrument that more effectively highlights the programme's distinctive joint and international character.

In conclusion, the panel judges Standard 8 positively. The programme provides students with substantial information and communication support throughout the student journey. Further improvements regarding the accessibility of curriculum information, module-level learning outcomes and assessment expectations prior to enrolment would nevertheless strengthen both transparency and external positioning.

6.19 **Standard 9: Quality Assurance [ESG 1.1 & part 1]**

The cooperating institutions should apply joint internal quality assurance processes in accordance with part one of the ESG.

Judgement

Meets the standard.

Findings, analysis and considerations

Quality assurance is organised jointly across the consortium and involves the Management Board, Programme Committee, Board of Examiners and student evaluations. Students complete evaluation forms during and after modules, and feedback is discussed repeatedly within the Management Board and Programme Committee. This creates a continuous cycle of monitoring and improvement.

The programme demonstrates a strong quality culture characterised by close interaction, responsiveness and informal communication. Students confirmed that feedback is taken seriously and that visible improvements have resulted from evaluations, including adjustments to catering, logistics and educational activities such as field trips. The panel also observed examples of flexibility and responsiveness during and after the Covid-19 pandemic, including arrangements for temporary online participation where physical attendance was not possible.

The panel considered the formal quality assurance structures appropriate for a joint programme and noted positively the involvement of reviewers, double marking procedures, programme evaluations and recurring committee discussions. At the same time, the panel observed that several quality assurance practices currently rely heavily on informal communication and personal engagement rather than fully formalised procedures. The panel therefore encourages the consortium to ensure that informal strengths continue to complement rather than replace formal quality assurance mechanisms. Delays in certain planned procedures, including programme-file activities and additional review mechanisms, were explained partly by staffing changes and the aftermath of the Covid-19 pandemic.

The panel also noted that the Advisory Board currently meets irregularly and recommends strengthening the strategic involvement of alumni and professional stakeholders within quality assurance and programme development. Alumni were viewed as a highly enthusiastic and engaged group whose expertise, networks and professional perspectives could be utilised more systematically for feedback, promotion, curriculum development and long-term programme sustainability.

Overall, however, the panel concluded positively that the programme demonstrates a strong academic and professional quality culture and meets all standards of the European Approach. In conclusion, the panel considered the programme to meet Standard 9 in a convincing manner. The quality assurance culture is strong, responsive and clearly embedded within the consortium, even if several processes rely substantially on informal collaboration and personal commitment. The programme demonstrates a clear capacity for reflection and improvement and responds actively to student and stakeholder feedback. While further formalisation of certain procedures, stronger strategic use of alumni and more robust safeguarding of continuity would strengthen the system further, the overall judgement of the panel is positive and confident regarding the programme's quality assurance arrangements.

Annex 1: Agenda site visit

The panel undertook an online site visit on May 4, 2026, as part of the external assessment procedure regarding the Advanced Master in Energy Law offered jointly by the University of Groningen, University of Aberdeen, University of Copenhagen, and University of Oslo.

08.30–09.00	Document study	Panel only (closed session)
09.00–09.45	Session 1. Management of the institutions Management/staff responsible for the joint programme	Members Management Board, from Groningen, Aberdeen, Copenhagen and Oslo; Administrative Coordinator NSELP, Groningen; Coordinator International Office, Groningen
09.45–10.05	Deliberations	Panel only
10.05–11.00	Session 2. Teaching staff	Teaching staff members from Aberdeen, Groningen, Copenhagen and Oslo; Professor, Groningen
11.00–11.20	Deliberations	Panel only
11.20–12.00	Session 3. Students enrolled in the joint programme	Second year student, The Netherlands, enrolled per June 2024 First year student, Taiwan, enrolled per September 2025, PC member First year student, India, enrolled per September 2025, PC member First year student, Norway, enrolled per September 2025, PC member
12.00–12.15	Deliberations	Panel only
12.15–13.00	Session 4. Staff responsible for the quality assurance (Joint) Board of Examiners (joint) Programme Committee Staff of student support service	Chair Board of Examiners, Groningen (not attending due to medical issues) Deputy chair Board of Examiners, Aberdeen Member Programme Committee, Oslo Member Programme Committee, Copenhagen Administrative Coordinator NSELP, Groningen Member Admissions Board, Groningen
13.00–13.45	Deliberations, lunch break	Panel only
13.45–14.30	Session 5. Professional field representatives/ alumni	Alumna, Namibia Alumnus and former PC member, South Africa Alumna and former PC member, , Canada Alumnus and member Advisory Board, The Netherlands Retired judge and member Advisory Board, Denmark
14.30–15.00	Session 6. (optional) – extra session with attention to matters that require further explanation	<i>Not applicable</i>
15.00–17.00	Deliberations	Panel only
17.00–17.15	Presentation of the main findings by the panel chair	

Annex 2: Documents reviewed

Documents presented by the institutions

Accreditation decision Advanced LLM in Energy Law 2020
Accreditation documents partner universities
Admission criteria
Admission Regulation 2023/2025
Advisory Board Regulation 2023/2025
Agreement on a Joint Degree Master in Law, the Advanced LLM in Energy Law
Allocation of staff
Assessment forms assignments and Master's thesis
Assignments guidelines
Assignment samples (three of each): i. two-page bullet-point paper and PowerPoint presentation (10–15 minute presentation); ii. a short paper (2–3 pages) and presentation (10–15 minutes) during the two-week teaching period; iii. a long paper (4,000 words) submitted after the two-week teaching period
Brightspace, the digital learning environment for students
Comparison learning outcomes/Dublin descriptors
Critical reflection Advanced Master in Energy Law
Examination Regulation 2023/2025
Examples programme module (Oslo, October 2024)
Intake figures
Learning outcomes Advanced LLM in Energy Law (joint degree)
Links learning outcomes Advanced LLM in Energy Law
List of lecturers
Management Board, Board of Examiners, Programmes Committee, Admissions Board and Advisory Board
Measures taken in response to the re-accreditation 2020
Overview Master's theses: all 14 theses are reviewed by the panel
Partner Institutions
Programme Committee Regulation 2023/2025
Structure of the modules and teaching periods
Teaching and Examination Regulation (TER) 2023/2025
Thesis Guide
Thesis Regulation 2023/2025

Documents made available during the panel visit

Not applicable

Annex 3: Abbreviations

AI	Artificial Intelligence
DEQAR	Database of External Quality Assurance Results
ECTS	European Credits
EHEA	European Higher Education Area
EQF	European Qualifications Framework
ESG	Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area
FQ-EHEA	Framework for Qualifications of the European Higher Education Area
GenAI	Generative Artificial Intelligence
NLSEP	North Sea Energy Law Partnership
NVAO	Accreditation Organisation of the Netherlands and Flanders
PC	Programme committee

