

Report development dialogue

The first point raised by the chair (John Paterson) was the issue of extensions of deadlines; there has been an unprecedented number of requests for extensions. Although the management team recognises that the group of students consists of professionals with commitments, the number of requests is a growing concern. The management team would be very eager to hear any ideas the panel may have on how to deal with this issue.

The panel indicated that it is also very important to hear the 'why' of the request for extension. Aileen McHarg suggested a cut-off date for module assignments, e.g. before the next module starts. It is also relevant to know how long students have to complete assignments. Martha Roggenkamp responded that the students currently have 6 to 8 weeks to complete their final assignments in each module. Normally extension requests would be for one or two days, but currently the periods of extensions requested are longer and there are more extension requests in general. Catherine Banet indicated that e.g. one student asked for a two-week extension and then asked for even more. This was not granted and the student also accepted that. All agree that there should be a reasoned argument for an extension. Catherine Banet indicated that usually the reasons for the extension requests lie in the workload at that moment in their jobs and/or changes of position within the company. Terence Daintith mentioned that the longer you postpone writing about the topic you were taught in the module, the more you will lose that particular knowledge when producing the paper. For this reason, he would not favour extensions. He did indicate that the deterrent of losing marks could be an option. Martha Roggenkamp mentioned a student who is not responding at all at the moment and it was discussed to give him a fail if he has not handed in his assignment by Monday; on Monday the preparations for the new module start. Willem van Genugten asked if this was sufficiently announced beforehand. Jaap Waverijn explained that all dates and deadlines for the entire programme are posted on the webpage from the outset, so all students can take this in their planning.

Aileen McHarg wondered if fail grades would not lead to new complications. Martha Roggenkamp agreed that it would be complicated to then set a date/period for a resit. Aileen McHarg said that it would be more problematic if it e.g. would block the progress to the next module. Martha Roggenkamp explained that it currently does not; but that there might be good reasons to say that a resit would be offered at the end of the programme to avoid the resit to take time away from the preparations of the new module.

Willem van Genugten mentioned that granted extensions usually worsen the situation and leads to more planning issues. Terence Daintith suggested granting no extensions beyond a certain date and if nothing has been handed in at that time, you could fail a student. Aileen McHarg mentioned a hardship clause for e.g. illness. Such a hardship clause is already taken up in the Teaching and Examination Regulations, so this option exists.

The general suggestion is that the rule could be that the assignments of one block need to be completed before the next module starts.

The second topic discussed deals with the title of the programme and the state of constant flux that the energy law field is in. The panel is asked if they have pointers for issues to keep track of, in addition to the issues already indicated earlier today by the management team. This also relates then to the title of the programme, because it would be better to choose a future-proof title. Aileen McHarg asked how much is covered in the programme outside the European context. This because the panel had concerns that if the programme is called International and Comparative Energy Law, the comparison of legal systems is very important and would be expected to be offered more extensively than currently is the case; in addition the name international would possibly be too broad for the main focus of the

programme. Therefore, a name like Energy and Development might be an option, but she wondered if that would be feasible content-wise. Changing of the title might require the management team to think about what student would expect from the programme based on that new title.

Martha Roggenkamp wondered what was meant with the term 'transnational'. Terence Daintith said that the programme does not offer a lot of comparison, but offers a lot of information above the level of individual systems and teaches about the key issues as seen by lawyers. The professional field was also very enthusiastic about this approach and mentioned that this was a great added value of this programme. They indicated that the interconnections were marvellous. The programme is unique in covering the entire energy chain. This getting above national systems, which would be transnational, is an important marker of the programme and perfectly links to what the professional field said. Willem van Genugten mentioned that the energy system is rapidly changing and national legal systems are not all on top of that; if you would then compare legal systems, you would be behind the current events in the field. He did reiterate that he is critical about the word comparison in general, because it is all quite limited when you look at the many jurisdictions around the world. Martha Roggenkamp added that each module has a comparison session, but all agreed it might not warrant the word 'comparative' to be added to the title. The management team fears that the name transnational energy law will confuse students. Aileen McHarg indicated that one of her colleagues, who is working in the field of environmental law, always talks about global environmental law. Therefore, a name like Global Energy Law might be an option.

Meg van Bogaert can write the recommendation with regard to the name change in such a way that they agree to a name change, but maybe not the particular proposal.

John Paterson asked if it would be possible to be called an Advanced LLM Energy Law. Aileen McHarg agreed that this would be a good name, because it does not specify the jurisdictions. The term 'executive master' was also discussed, but all agree that this would be more easily linked to MBA-type of programmes. Jaap Waverijn remembered the programme was marketed as an executive master at the start, but the prospective students did not get this term. It currently is being marketed as a part-time LLM for professionals. 'Advanced LLM Energy Law' would be a good alternative.

John Paterson asked if the panel is of the opinion that 'Energy transition' maybe should be added to the title. This is a topic that is discussed a lot in Aberdeen now; it is a term that is used a lot at present. Terence Daintith said that adding this to the name would severely restrict the perspective of the programme; it feels like a company or start-up if you add this to the title. It might therefore be less interesting. Willem van Genugten agreed and Aileen McHarg indicated that this would very likely mean that in a decade the name of the programme would have to be changed again.

It is agreed that the name is under advisement for the Management Team. Meg van Bogaert will check if we can use the term 'Advanced LLM'; considering the fact that we are a post-initial master, it might be possible. If we can decide on the name in about two or three weeks, she can take the new name even in in her report.