Name of the student:	Karolina Horajno
Title of the thesis:	Does war accelerate green energy transitions? Examining the impacts of the Ukraine war in 2022 on the German energy transition
Reviewer:	Marcin Zubek

1. KNOWLEDGE AND CONNECTION TO THE FIELD
(relevance of the research question, research objective, literature review):

The topic of the thesis is no doubt relevant and very much up to date, perhaps even too much. The war in Ukraine has been going on for about 3-4 months, outcome is still uncertain, so researching its consequences can be a bit premature. Nonetheless, the energy issue has been a crucial one in this conflict and many important political decisions have been made in connection to it, making it a reasonable subject for analysis.

The Research Question posed is a bit problematic. Firstly because it is not clearly asked in the thesis. It is in the title, and (in a different form) in the section 2.4, but is never indicated as the leading question in the thesis, which makes it difficult for the reader to be sure what the actual question is. The hypotheses on p. 15 make it clearer, although the division between H2 and H3 is a baffling, as one excludes the other, so perhaps it would only make sense leave H1 and H3.

Lastly, the title of the thesis suggests that the author would measure an "impact" of RU-UA war on German energy transition. What however seems to be the case is that the author is measuring is not the actual impact, but perhaps visions and justifications of the German decision-makers. These may translate into an impact eventually, but due to the on-going crisis it would be difficult to tell (especially in the long run). The author mentions this in her discussion, but the title remains a bit misleading.

2. ANALYSIS
(methodology, argument, theoretical backing, appropriate work with sources):

In the discussion section on p. 23, the author states that "*This work did not intend to pursue a multilevel debate but developed an analysis on the grounds of the national debate as the scope of this thesis is a national energy transition.*" This however does not seem to be the case, as the analysis covers only the press releases from the BMWK. It does not capture the national debate, it captures the decisions by the ministry and assesses their possible consequences vis-à-vis long/short term goals of the green energy transition. This is fine, but the author does not seem to be sure about what she is actually researching.

The theoretical backing could have perhaps be more nuanced in the sense that it mainly took the incremental approach v. the "political shoch" approach. The work could have benefited more from the IR theories, such as realism (and energy security approach that would come with it), or constructivism (that would perhaps reveal more regarding the public opinion attitudes).

What definitely needs to praised is author's approach towards the method. She is very clear and rigorous about data collection, categorisation and coding. Oftentimes those who perform content analysis are tempted to simply report what they have read, whereas Karolina, has made a very good effort to do her analysis scrupulously.

3. CONCLUSIONS

(persuasiveness, link between data and conclusions, achievement of research objectives):

Conclusions are a bit disappointing. The author does not give a clear answer the questions she posed (which is not a big surprise taking into account the active phase of the UA-RU war). I also miss a section, in which the hypotheses would be proven or disproven.

4. FORMAL ASPECTS AND LANGUAGE
(appropriate language, adherence to academic standards, citation style, layout):

The language is appropriate and adheres to academic standards. There are some slips though, eg. on p. 16: "*These press releases represent must most likely from the best informed platform for collecting the most recent information available*".

5. SUMMARY ASSESSMENT
(strong and weak point of the dissertation, other issues)

The author asks very interesting and timely questions in her thesis. She is also quite brave and ambitious to tackle the issue, which is still very much ongoing. In doing so, she seems to promise a little bit too much and therefore failed to deliver convincing conclusions. Surely, the strong point of the thesis is also the methodological rigour. The thesis is also informative as to the measures taken by the Federal Republic to tackle the energy problem caused by the RU-UA war and in showing that its consequences can have different trajectories regarding the energy transition.

Grade (A-F):	C (7,9)
Date:	Signature:
05.07.2022	Marcin Zubek

classification scheme

Percentile	Prague		Krakow		Leiden		Barcelona	
A (91-100)	91-100 %	8,5%	5	6,7%	8,5-10	5,3%	9-10	5,5 %
B (81-90)	81-90 %	16,3%	4,5	11,7%	7.5-8.4	16.4%	8-8.9	11,0 %
C (71-80)	71-80 %	16,3%	4	20%	6,5-7,4	36,2%	7-7.9	18,4 %
D (61-70)	61-70 %	24%	3,5	28,3%			6-6,9	35,2 %
E (51-60)	51-60 %	34,9%	3	33,4 %	6-6,4	42,1 %	5-5,9	30,1 %

Assessment criteria:

Excellent (A): 'Outstanding performance with only minor errors';
Very good (B): 'Above the average standard but with some errors';
Good (C): 'Generally sound work but with a number of notable errors';
Satisfactory (D): 'Fair but with significant shortcomings';
Sufficient (E): 'Performance meets the minimum criteria';
Fail: 'Some/considerable more work required before the credit can be awarded'.