GLODEP

Funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

MASTER THESIS REVIEW

Author: Sipiwe Zulu
Thesis: A Comparative Study of Environmental Policies: A Case of the Kyrgyz Republic and Zambia
Reviewer: **Jiri Preis**

Content

Please comment on: aims, structure, methods; depth and quality of analysis.
Aims: The author analyzes and compares two different countries related to their environmental policies – Zambia and Kyrgyzstan. The main goal is to just compare similarities/differences of case countries policies. The aims are then specified by three objectives. Objective No1 ("to gain understanding of the policy formulation process") is not adequate for the Master Thesis, as the understanding of the process should be part of literature/document research, which should then be applied into the analysis itself. Aims/objectives are set quite generally, which means, that their fulfillment also be very general.

Methods/depth and quality of analysis:
The analysis is based only on a few official documents, that are examined by the WPR (What's the problem represented to be?) approach, that is usually intended to critically cross-examine public policies. This evaluation has, however, a tendency to be too much subjective, especially when only one author examines it. I miss a combination of various other methods, that can help understand texts of the documents more profoundly, such as some focus groups discussions or interviews with experts. Thus, the evaluation of texts could be more relevant and/or "objective".

The other comment is about the depth of analysis: due to the fact, that only one key document for each country is examined. There is not much clear, how did the author look for the relevant documents? Is she sure, these ones are the only ones and there were no others? I would expect more sophisticated approach to decide, which documents should be used for the analysis. Did author consult it with some local experts or was it decided only based on information, that were online accessible?

Lastly, if the environmental policies are discussed, the author did not explain well why three criteria (energy, water, agriculture) have been chosen. She just mentioned, that due to data in App B, these three were chosen, and not the others. Besides that, I would expect some situational analysis describing environmental hazards of countries, visualized in some simple picture/map of the territories, so that the relevant environmental policies could be linked with the areas/regions facing particular hazards.

Literature and references

Please comment on: literature used and references.

Author quotes sources relatively relevantly, she combines however quoting in the text and simple references on websites. The websites should be quoted according to certain norm (e.g. APA). She deals with a good portion of international sources.

Formal requirements

Please comment on: language style, consistency, graphic layout, tables and figures etc.
I miss some author's original graphical outputs, graphs or pictures, which would graphically visualize the results or comparative materials. Especially, when two countries were analyzed, for the reader would be much more convenient to observe same indicators put "next to each other" in a chart, that long paragraphs of texts.

Chapter about goals and objectives goes after introducing the case countries, which is not a typical. Certain thoughts and paragraphs are repeating in the text the same idea, only with different words.
Chapters with only one sentence look strange, chapters are sometimes too much fragmented and should be merged.
There are certain mistakes in spelling or grammar in the text.

Topics for discussion

Mention questions that may be discussed during the defense. Delete the whole section if you do not have any questions.
Would you please explain more profoundly the selection process of the criteria Energy, Water, Agriculture, that were finally chosen as the indicators for final comparison?
Have not you thought about using other methodological approaches to combine WPR method and thus make your analysis more "objective".
Would you please explain the process, how the key official documents, were looked for, discovered and selected for analysis? Are you sure, that there were no other ones available?
What is a potential of both case countries for using renewable energy sources? Are they similar or rather different?
How does the geographical position (landlocked country) influence the accessibility of those sources?

Overall evaluation and proposed grade

Please comment on your overall evaluation of the thesis. This section should end with a separate sentence (if you do not recommend the thesis for defense, add "not" in the sentence; then the proposed grade must be F):

Despite the above-mentioned comments, the thesis meets the criteria for a "master thesis".

I do recommend the thesis for defense with grade D.

Date: 08.06.2022 **Signature:**