REVIEW

by research supervisor of the graduate qualification paper submitted by the second-year student of the 'International Relations' master's program at SPbSU

Mikhail Porunkov

(first name, last name of the student)

titled A sui generis nature of EU in promoting its collective energy security

(title)

1. Assessment of the paper:

No.	Assessment Criteria	Grade:	Reviewer's Comments
	(codes of competences according to	• excellent, A (5.0)	(mandatory for those criteria on which the paper is
	curriculum)	• good, B (4.5)	assessed critically or downgraded)
		• good, C (4.0)	
		• satisfactory, D (3.5)	
		• satisfactory, E (3.0)	
		• unsatisfactory, $F(0.0)^1$	
1.	Academic relevance of	good, B (4.5)	The EU's nature as an actor has been long debated
	the research problem		but still presents complexities as to the assessment
	(ОПК-4, ПКА-5)		and forecast of its ability to act and efficiently
			achieve the results
2.	Scholarly contribution	satisfactory, D (3.5)	The contribution itself is not very clear due to the
	by the author		discrepancy among different parts of the study
	(ОПК-4, ПКА-2, ПКА-3, ПКА-3, ПКА- 6, ПКП-9)		and to the insufficient correlation between the
			theoretical part, the method and the empirical
2	Annuanziatanass of the	rand C(4.0)	The research objective is set correctly; the
5.	research objective	good, C (4.0)	research tasks are ok but they have not fully
	cohorence of research		determined the sequence of the research and the
	objective and research		logics of the study
	tasks		logies of the study
	(ОПК-4, ПКА-2, ПКА-5, ПКА-6,		
4	ПКА-10, ПКП-9)	$\mathbf{D}(2,5)$	The law seeds to a characterized sector of the DI Law
4.	Quality of the empirical	satisfactory, $D(3.5)$	The knowledge about energy policy of the EU are
	scope and of the		Moreover, the analysis of sui generic nature of the
	(ПКА-2, ПКА-7, ПКП-4)		FU is not applied consistently to all examined
			initiatives
			initiati ves.
5.	Comprehensiveness of	satisfactory. D (3.5)	Rather patchy, in my view, with bits and pieces
_	secondary sources		not connected in a single logics of the research.
	(academic literature)		I.e. the relevance of David Hume is not
	employed by the author		demonstrated while the works of A. Wendt are not
	(ПКА-2, ПКА-7)		really applied. There are plenty of studies of the
			EU's energy policy which have not been used.
6.	Adequacy of chosen	satisfactory, D (3.5)	The relevance of the data envelop analysis is
	research methods to the		questionable; while it might show the efficiency
	stated research objective		of the policies examined, it does not demonstrate
	and research tasks		whether this efficiency is achieved due to the sui
	(IIKA-2, IIKA-ð, IIKA-10)		generis nature or any other factor (i.e. external
			threat).
			The methods are also not very adequate for

¹ If the paper is assessed as "unsatisfactory" based on one of the criteria, the overall recommended grade for the paper is to be "unsatisfactory", in which case a reviewer presents his/her detailed arguments in the Comments section as well as in the Conclusion/Recommendations section.

			constructivism, which was cited as one research guideline.
7.	Correspondence of empirical results to the stated research objective	satisfactory, D (3.5)	See point 6 above
	and research tasks (ОПК-7, ПКА-2, ПКА-3, ПКА-5, ПКА- 6, ПКП-4, ПКП-9)		
8.	Text formatting and editing (OПК-7, ПКА-7)	excellent, A (5.0)	excellent
9.	Diligence, consistency, and responsibility demonstrated by the student when writing the paper (OIIK-7, YK-6)	good, C (4.0)	Most of the work done in the last moment, which critically limited possibilities to rectify the deficiencies of the work.
	Average grade:		good, C (4.0)

2. Conclusion/Recommendations for the evaluation commission: the work is line with basic requirements that are set for these works; it deserves a good mark while its author deserves that the MA degree is awarded to him.

3. Recommended grade (in ECTS): good, C (4.0)

02.06.2023

Associate Professor Department of European Studies

CAM

Tatiana Romanova