

IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

Student Matriculation No.	Glasgow 2451335 DCU 19108443 Charles 19515135
Dissertation Title	Securitisation in critical infrastructure identification: from cyber to elections and pandemics

INDIVIDUAL INSTITUTION GRADING

Reviewer 1 Initial Grade Select from drop down list	Reviewer 2 Initial Grade Select from drop down list	Late Submission Penalty Select from drop down list
Word Count Penalty (1-15% over/under = 1gr point; 15-20% over/under = 2 gr points; 20-25% over/under = 3 gr points; more than 25% over/under = 0 fail)		
Word Count: 22664 Suggested Penalty: no penalty		

JOINT GRADING (subject to agreement of the external examiner and approval at Joint Exam Board)

Final Agreed Mark. (Following correspondence reviewers should list the agreed final internal grade taking before and after any penalties to be applied). Before Penalty: A5 [18] After Penalty: A5 [18]

DISSERTATION FEEDBACK

Assessment Criteria	Rating
A. Structure and Development of Answer	
This refers to your organisational skills and ability to construct an argument in a coherent and original manner	
• <i>Originality of topic</i>	Excellent
• <i>Coherent set of research questions and/or hypothesis identified</i>	Excellent
• <i>Appropriate methodology and evidence of effective organisation of work</i>	Very Good
• <i>Logically structured argument and flow of ideas reflecting research questions</i>	Excellent
• <i>Application of theory and/or concepts</i>	Excellent
B. Use of Source Material	
This refers to your skills to select and use relevant information and data in a correct manner	
• <i>Evidence of reading and review of published literature</i>	Excellent
• <i>Selection of relevant primary and/or secondary evidence to support argument</i>	Excellent
• <i>Critical analysis and evaluation of evidence</i>	Excellent
• <i>Accuracy of factual data</i>	Excellent
C. Academic Style	
This refers to your ability to write in a formal academic manner	
• <i>Appropriate formal and clear writing style</i>	Excellent
• <i>Accurate spelling, grammar and punctuation</i>	Excellent
• <i>Consistent and accurate referencing (including complete bibliography)</i>	Excellent
• <i>Is the dissertation free from plagiarism?</i>	Yes
• <i>Evidence of ethics approval included (if required based on methodology)</i>	Not required

IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

- *Appropriate word count*

Yes

ADDITIONAL WRITTEN COMMENTS

Reviewer 1

The dissertation intends to analyze how securitization affects the EU member states' identification of critical infrastructure (CI) elements. The goal of understanding the processes of CI risk assessment is all-important, because from the policy point view, this area is clearly crucial yet the EU policy to a large extent fails. Although the research aim is laudable, it is noteworthy that it is highly ambitious at the same due to the lack of data allowing comparisons between the member states. That being said, it is clear that the author grew aware of this limitation and found the optimal workaround strategy. My main point for the discussion is the following. It likely that the risk assessment processes are not based exclusively on securitization, since there are other factors, such institutional factors, path dependency, etc., to consider. As a result, the analyzed phenomenon is highly confounded, and the lack of usable data prevents the research from uncovering the relevant confounders. Even if there are limitations, the dissertation is valuable in two regards. First, the topic is timely and deserves analytical attention. Second, any attempt to open the black box of what is usually considered as determined by securitization should be much appreciated, because the reality seems to be much more complex. Therefore, although the analysis remains undermined by the lack of empirical sources, it represents a solid and valuable research effort.

Reviewer 2

This was an intelligent and comprehensive dissertation. I felt that the problem was outlined skilfully and you were able to outline why this is an important topic, and how your dissertation was filling gaps in the extant debates.

Overall, much of the dissertation was excellent. However, there were a few areas that could have improved the thesis even more. While the case studies were undoubtedly well chosen and useful, I did find some of the information a little hard to digest. Covering each case study in turn was difficult to read a somewhat descriptive. I personally would have preferred to have seen this data presented more thematically – for example, noting general trends across the cases. As it stood, I was eager for this section to end so that we could get to the more analytical material.

I also wanted to know more about the documents that were selected from each case study. In the methodology, we only learn some rather vague details about the documents and statements that you were using for the analysis. It would have been nice to have seen more concrete details here.

Fortunately, once I had got past the rather descriptive sections on each case study, the analysis became clear. I felt that you were able to provide excellent insights using securitisation theory and the available data. Throughout the dissertation, you demonstrated superb knowledge of the existing debates. Importantly, the thesis offered a fresh insight into an area of critical importance.