

Name of the student:	Tamar Tkemaladze
Title of the thesis:	Europeanization of Gas Sector in Georgia: towards Integration?
Reviewer:	Karel Svoboda

### 1. KNOWLEDGE AND CONNECTION TO THE FIELD

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

The research question is more than relevant, especially today. I would suggest not using the question type “what are the mechanisms”, which leads to a description rather than anything else. However, the author was able to avoid such a trap. The author is also aware of the study's limitations and clearly defines the thesis. What I was missing more was the reflection of the newest literature on the Eastern Neighborhood countries’ energy transformations, especially when the thesis covers the period 2014-2023.

### 2. ANALYSIS

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

The author clearly defined the method used to analyze the text (qualitative content analysis). My only remark goes to the analysis of the situation in the Georgian market (Chapter III – pages 26-31). The author should use some recent academic sources analyses. The latest sources used were published in 2017 (if I am correct), limiting the understanding of the actual situation. Mainly today’s situation, with problems reported in the political sphere, would be crucial for understanding the successes and failures of Europeanization in energy, as well as other spheres.

### 3. CONCLUSIONS

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

The thesis is coherent, with appropriate data used, and the conclusions are persuasive. Therefore, I have no remarks in this context.

### 4. FORMAL ASPECTS AND LANGUAGE

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

True, some misprints may be found (outcomes of Europeanization in Georgia’s gas sector – page 32), but their number does not exceed a “normal” value. Concerning citations, they are made according to academic standards. Therefore, I have no remarks in his respect.

### 5. SUMMARY ASSESSMENT

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

Generally, the thesis demonstrates the ability of the author to conduct well-defined research using acceptable methods and persuasive conclusions. In my opinion, this is a high-quality thesis.

<b>Grade (A-F):</b>	A (5)
Date:	Signature:

classification scheme

Percentile	Prague		Krakow		Leiden		Barcelona	
	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'.