



Diploma Thesis Evaluation Form

Author: **Natalia Viryasova**

Title: **Assessing the Effectiveness of the United Nations Security Council:
case of operations in the African countries**

Programme/year: MAIN/ 2020

Author of Evaluation (supervisor/external assessor): Mgr. Miroslava Kulkova

Criteria	Definition	Maximum	Points
Major Criteria			
	Research question, definition of objectives	10	9
	Theoretical/conceptua l framework	30	24
	Methodology, analysis, argument	40	35
<i>Total</i>		80	68
Minor Criteria			
	Sources	10	10
	Style	5	5
	Formal requirements	5	5
<i>Total</i>		20	20
TOTAL		100	88



Evaluation

Major criteria: Student clearly formulated her research question of how success of the PKO mission in Africa can be explained. She then developed solid theoretical framework based on existing literature, which she followed thoroughly in her analysis. I would only point out two things. 1) Clearer definition of what student understands as success. She mentioned lot of definition in the literature review, yet her stance was not so clearly stated. She wants to explain success of PKO's and develops 10 hypotheses what makes it more or less likely, yet at the same time it seems that those hypotheses are also her indicators of success. In final comparison she evaluates MONUC as the least successful, UNMIL - the most effective, and partially successful UNOCI - somewhere in between. I would like to know based on what did she asserted that? Based on simple number of indicators present? If so, difference between UNMIL and UNOCI is just one indicator. Or was it just her qualitative assessment? To be clear, I am not questioning correctness of her conclusion, I am only pointing on the lack of transparency of how this was decided.

2) What I also missed was a bit lengthier discussion on the case selection. Author only states that she has chosen three peace-keeping missions in Africa, but she does not explain why. Student rightly listed 31 PKO just in Africa, however the discussion over the criteria she used when choosing three particular case studies is missing.

Minor criteria: Occasional spelling mistakes were present. Overall, however, the thesis was written in a very sophisticated language.

Overall evaluation: Author worked with a rich database of primary sources and provided well-grounded literature review of current state of affairs. She picked an important topic with potential policy-relevant recommendations. What I sometimes found problematic was conflation of indicators of success with strategies contributing to it. Also, the case selection would need some explanation. Overall, this thesis represents a high-quality rigorous analysis with clear structure and rich sources.

Suggested grade: B

Signature: