

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:	Luis Ortiz-Gervasi

1. KNOWLEDGE AND CONNECTION TO THE FIELD

(relevance of the research question, research objective, literature review):

The research question certainly suffers from the necessary lack of perspective, due to the very recent nature of the crisis that has triggered the policy dilemma Karolina is exploring, but, from a political point of view, it is hugely relevant. I am sure it constitutes an interesting line of research to explore and develop in the future, in case Karolina Horajno wants to get deeper into it.

Besides its political interest, the question may be theoretically interesting. Along the supervision process, I have seen how this research question has become increasingly detached from its more empirical aspect and progressively connected with a suitable theoretical debate.

The dilemma posed for energy green transition in Germany by the recent invasion of Ukraine by Russian forces fits well with Peter Hall's concept of policy paradigm shift as a result of exogeneous shocks that shake institutionally entrenched interests.

The concepts of energy transition and renewable energy are well developed. The literature review is sound. But it falls short of a clear, theoretically relevant research question. What could we learn from the current energy crisis derived from the war in Ukraine for the debate about the speed and depth of policy change? What contribution does this situation makes to that academic debate? These questions are not clearly answered in the first part of the paper.

I do not believe that incrementalism (Lindbloom) and paradigm shift (Hall) are strictly incompatible. They are actually complementary. What may be theoretically enriching is to determine in which circumstances one of the two concepts better explain policy change than the other; in other words, under what circumstances policy change moves from incrementalism to paradigm shift. That's what the energy crisis produced by the war in Ukraine could have been used for in the argument.

2. ANALYSIS

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

Due to the closeness in time of the phenomenon of study, I understand that it is very difficult to rely on statistical data to test the hypotheses formulated in the paper. An answer to the research question (necessarily tentative) should be made after the analysis of qualitative evidence, coming from press reports, documents, etc. But this does not mean that the paper should have less analytical power.

How to distinguish short from long-term effects? The limit between both looks very arbitrary, not very convincing.

Some hypotheses need to be better substantiated. Why the energy crises derived from the war in Ukraine should mean that the results are negative for the green transition in the short-run? I know that the author of the paper claims that is economically not feasible, from a market-based point of view. Is it more feasible in the long-run? Why so? The difference in the effect between the short- and long-run could have been better explained.

Karolina creates two categories to be able to ascertain in the government's efforts are going in the line of favouring green transition or not. This is very promising. But we need to know how governmental measures are going to be allocated to these categories. That's very important, in order to be sure that the hypotheses can be rejected or accepted. For instance, a "national call asking the public to save energy" is treated by Karolina as a "measure not favouring the energy green transition". I am not totally sure that it is a fair way of categorising this measure. A project in Lower Saxony "initiated to expand the LNG and 'GreenGas import infrastructure' is also treated in the section on "measures not favouring the energy

green transition” ... but ‘green’ is in the very label of the measure.

Second, governmental effort may not be merely measured by the issuance of legislation but also but the budget allocated to the measures that constitute each category. Money matters. At some point, Karolina argues that “the current governmental support for LNG Terminals [in order to cope with immediate energy scarcity derived from the war] is likely the most significant obstacle to the expansion of renewable energies, *as public spending flows into the urgent provision of oil and gas instead of investments in green energies*” This is a very important argument. I wonder if budgetary decisions of this kind could not have been added as evidence in the paper (see below, in ‘Conclusions’)

Finally, in order to answer the hypotheses, changes in both legislation and resources should be clearly associated with the outbreak of the crisis (war in Ukraine). There should be a time component in the analysis, which is not very clearly specified in the methodology.

3. CONCLUSIONS

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

The ambitiousness of paper possibly precludes the possibility of arriving to a full answer of the research question. The hypotheses may not be considered fully tested, but, at the same time they constitute a very good starting point for future research. Karolina has made a very valuable analytical work and established the beginning of a promising research endeavour possibly leading to that answer.

The reason why short-term measures may go against green transition and long-term ones may go in favour is quite interesting and may be more theoretically substantiated, linking it to the theoretical debate in a more convincing manner. I believe the idea is really interesting and persuasive, but it needs to be more credibly developed. What Karolina is pointing at is the dilemma between urgency and structural change. There should be more theoretical work into this dilemma in policy-making literature (why urgency may preclude structural change)

In this respect, the sentence I have quoted in the previous section of this evaluation possibly cast the light upon future research developments that Karolina may want to consider. It would be interesting to establish what budgetary measures may be regarded as pro- and against green transition, and study the changes over time in public expenditure that are related to them. This would be a promising complement to the impressive work that Karolina has made so far.

4. FORMAL ASPECTS AND LANGUAGE

(appropriate language, adherence to academic standards, citation style, layout):

The paper is well written and carefully presented. The language is appropriate, the style accords to academic standards,

There are some structural elements that, in my view, could have been improved. The presentation of the case of study should come after the formulation of hypotheses, not before. These structural inconsistencies may reveal some confusion regarding how to properly design a research. In fact, hypotheses arrive almost by surprise. They sound artificial. These hypotheses would have been better understood if they had been formulated at the end of section 3.1., immediately before data collection.

5. SUMMARY ASSESSMENT

(strong and weak point of the dissertation, other issues)

One of the strengths of Karolina’s MA thesis is the progressive improvement in relation to the initial draft. Karolina has demonstrated her ability to receive feedback and improve her work as a result. For instance, the conceptual development mentioned before is the result of requests explicitly made by me. This is quite encouraging.

Another strength of the paper is the table of “efforts favouring the green energy transition” at the end of the paper. This table is impressive. It is the result of a good analytical exercise that could yield more results in the future. The table reveals the analytical exercise carried out by Karolina.

The strongest part of the paper lies in the deep revision of the literature made by Karolina, and the very deep knowledge of her case of study.

As regards the weaknesses of the paper, the MA thesis has more descriptive than analytical value. It somehow fails to deliver what it promises. If we consider the hypothesis formulated at mid paper, it is

difficult to accept that they are fully tested. In other words, it is difficult to arrive to the conclusions that were initially expected, possibly because the goal is more ambitious and would require more work.

Grade (A-F):	B (8,2)
Date:	Signature:
05.07.2022	

classification scheme

Percentile	Prague		Krakow		Leiden		Barcelona	
	Range	%	Score	%	Range	%	Range	%
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'.