

# **Diploma Thesis Evaluation Form**

Author: Kristýna Musilová

Title: Countering Hybrid Threats (Public-Private Cooperation in Norway

and the Czech Republic)

Programme/year: Mezinárodní vztahy / 2022

Author of Evaluation: Dr. Ondrej Ditrych

Criteria	Definition	Max.	Points
Major Criteria			
	Research question, definition of objectives	10	10
	Theoretical/conceptual framework	30	25
	Methodology, analysis, argument	40	37
Total		80	72
Minor Criteria			
	Sources	10	7
	Style	5	4
	Formal requirements	5	4
Total		20	15
TOTAL		100	87



#### **Evaluation**

## Major criteria:

The thesis seeks to present policy recommendations for more cooperation of the public and the private sector in countering hybrid operations, and in facing cyber threats in particular. In that respect, its scope, ambition and design are unabashedly driven by a policy focus. It is a result of a hard and concentrated work, and the recommendations it puts forward are relevant, specific and sensible, drawing on careful identification of the areas in which the Czech system of countering cyber – rather than *hybrid* – operations is currently designed and which good practices from Norway could inspire its further development, taking into account the specific scoping conditions that impact on their transferability, such as cultural determinants and historical experience that facilitate a whole-of-society approach and inspire more public trust, necessitating less direct regulation.

The thesis features no methodology in terms of the social scientific research as it is, fundamentally, a policy study. However, the author explains the choice of the case from which the good practice is distilled, she describes the sources, mentions triangulation as a method to work through data of various provenience, or the manner in which the survey for semistructured interviews was prepared and the latter conducted. The basic criterion of transparency in method is thus met.



Literature review captures the essentials, but could be better organised, developed further and focused more on the partnership between public and private sectors rather than a considerable set of concepts that are less relevant to the immediate subject matter. There is an apparent drive for stabilisation and removal of ambiguity in the key concepts, which however is inscribed in the hybrid threats discourse – perhaps endowing the central concept with a certain charm that explains why it is that while it experiences much criticism in academic debates, it thrives in the policy ones. The focus shifts more toward cyber security than hybrid threats both here and in the rest of the thesis, however, the basic integrity is successfully maintained through the concept of societal resilience which however is presented, and the literature review as a whole is permeated, with the use of policy and national administration documents. This includes the presentation of the basic categories of societal resilience that are subsequently used as a structuring device for description ana analysis of the Czech and Norwegian models.

This description and analysis in the following chapters is executed well, in a detailed and organised matter. The next chapter synthesises the findings and distills concrete good practices that are linked to practical policy recommendations. The latter are analytically anchored, detailed, relevant and sensible.

### Minor criteria:

The thesis written rather well, with only occasional small imperfections in terms of language and style. In several cases more referencing would be desirable. Even the (theoretical) literature review encompasses a number of policy documents, which reflects the general focus of the thesis. In terms of sources, it must be commended that the author has executed 18 semistructured interviews both in Norway and the Czech Republic.



## Overall evaluation:

The thesis seeks to explore what good practices and instruments to futher cooperation between the public and the private to increase resilience in facing hybrid / cyber threats can be identified from the Norway case and translated in the Czech system. It both benefits and suffers from the strong policy focus. It lacks more theoretical and methodological anchoring; yet the argument is formulated in a disciplined, coherent and meticulous manner, and the set of good practices and recommendations that the author arrives at is relevant, practical and sensible. This is no mean feat. I suggest the author considers publishing her findings in the form of actual policy paper and/or an article e.g. in *Mezinárodní politika*.

Suggested grade:

A/B

Signature: