

IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

Student Matriculation No.	Glasgow 2570159A DCU 20109563 Charles 56059873 Trento
Dissertation Title	Institutional Organization of the European Space Program: Ensuring the Security of the Union

INDIVIDUAL INSTITUTION GRADING

Reviewer 1 Initial Grade	Reviewer 2 Initial Grade	Late Submission Penalty No penalty
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: 20.868 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: A3 [20] **After Penalty:** not applicable

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>	Very good
• <i>Appropriate methodology and evidence of effective organisation of work</i>	Excellent
• <i>Logically structured argument and flow of ideas reflecting research questions</i>	Excellent
• <i>Application of theory and/or concepts</i>	Very good
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

IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

• <i>Accurate spelling, grammar and punctuation</i>	Very good
• <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>	Yes
• <i>Appropriate word count</i>	Yes

ADDITIONAL WRITTEN COMMENTS

Reviewer 1

The thesis covers a very up-to-date topic crucial for the European security. The institutional setting of the European space programme is overly complex and confusing, placing clear limitations on the ability of Europe to achieve strategic independence. It is also very dynamic as was lastly witnessed by the development of EUSPA. The presented thesis develops a set of recommendations based on the literature review and, importantly, set of expert interviews that allow to develop clear recommendations for the future development in the domain. It presents a very valuable input into the professional as well as academic debate on the topic.

Reviewer 2

The dissertation addresses a very interesting and relevant topic – the operational organisation of European Space Policy, however, the student needs to be cautious not to frame the dissertation more broadly as a general policy paper and it would have been good to have used the introduction and conclusion to reinforce the relevance for security as alluded to in the title – this would have emphasised the relevance for the programme more clearly. The use of strategic autonomy as a framework was welcome and provided for an interesting analysis. I also appreciated the two-part approach which confirmed the contested nature of space as well as how EU strategic autonomy informs space policy. There is a lot of merit to the dissertation and the engagement with the literature was very strong, the primary source documents were well explored, with a balance of description and where relevant critical reflection, although at times I felt that this critical analysis could have been bolder. Areas where improvements could have been made include the methodology section, where the limitations of the methods could have been outlined – for example, the challenges faced with doing the interviews. It would have been useful to understand a bit more how the interview analysis was undertaken as this was not immediately obvious when reading the dissertation. Also, when undertaking the interview reporting, the information could have been balanced with some of the data you gathered from other sources. In other words, how might you have introduced some triangulation of the data? Overall, I found the findings convincing with a good range of recommendations. The recognition of inequality or rather non-equitable nature of the Euro-Space industry funding allocation was a nice finding. The only other things I would encourage you to consider as an aspect of feedforward would be to reconsider how you present the interview data. While I appreciate you include the transcripts in the annex, within the main text, it wasn't clear which sections were quotes or did you only paraphrase and if so why? Also please be careful with your general grammar. You had problems with how tenses were used and on occasion some of the text was not clear. For example on page 50 you write "The French are the ones who did not specifically not accept..." This is a double negative and doesn't really make much sense. Finally when discussing the scope of the dissertation research, this doesn't need to reflect the length or the deadline (although these are factors), but rather you should have emphasised the issues related to depth and breath of the research. Overall though this is a strong dissertation that shows clear engagement with the literature, identification and analysis of primary sources and includes some relevant interviews all of which contributes to relevant and convincing recommendations.

IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

Question for Viva – beyond the policy aspects of the topic, how does the development of EU space policy support improved security for the Union and its partners? Please elaborate and identify where in the thesis you address this. I.e – in the conclusion you emphasize the relevant for addressing competitors like Russia or China – are there more reasons?