

IMESS DISSERTATION



Note: Please email the completed mark sheet to Year 2 coordinator

(cc Julia Korosteleva j.korosteleva@ucl.ac.uk and Marta Kotwas m.kotwas@ucl.ac.uk)

Please note that IMESS students are not required to use a particular set of methods (e.g. qualitative, quantitative, or comparative) in their dissertation.

Student:	Tianhao Tan
Dissertation title:	Sustainable Energy Development in Central Europe and East Asia: Different Scenarios and Options Evaluation

	Excellent	Satisfactory	Poor
Knowledge <i>Knowledge of problems involved, e.g. historical and social context, specialist literature on the topic. Evidence of capacity to gather information through a wide and appropriate range of reading, and to digest and process knowledge.</i>		X	
Analysis & Interpretation <i>Demonstrates a clear grasp of concepts. Application of appropriate methodology and understanding; willingness to apply an independent approach or interpretation recognition of alternative interpretations; Use of precise terminology and avoidance of ambiguity; avoidance of excessive generalisations or gross oversimplifications.</i>		X	
Structure & Argument <i>Demonstrates ability to structure work with clarity, relevance and coherence. Ability to argue a case; clear evidence of analysis and logical thought; recognition of an arguments limitation or alternative views; Ability to use other evidence to support arguments and structure appropriately.</i>			X
Presentation & Documentation <i>Accurate and consistently presented footnotes and bibliographic references; accuracy of grammar and spelling; correct and clear presentation of charts/graphs/tables or other data. Appropriate and correct referencing throughout. Correct and contextually correct handling of quotations.</i>			X

ECTS Mark:		UCL Mark:	64	Marker:	Raphael Espinoza
<i>Deducted for late submission:</i>				Signed:	
<i>Deducted for inadequate referencing:</i>				Date:	16/06/2016

MARKING GUIDELINES

A (UCL mark 70+): Note: marks of over 80 are given rarely and only for truly exceptional pieces of work.

Distinctively sophisticated and focused analysis, critical use of sources and insightful interpretation. Comprehensive understanding of techniques applicable to the chosen field of research, showing an ability to engage in sustained independent research.

B/C (UCL mark 60-69):

A high level of analysis, critical use of sources and insightful interpretation. Good understanding of techniques applicable to the chosen field of research, showing an ability to engage in sustained independent research. 65 or over equates to a B grade.

D/E (UCL mark 50-59):

Demonstration of a critical use of sources and ability to engage in systematic inquiry. An ability to engage in sustained research work, demonstrating methodological awareness. 55 or over equates to a D grade.

F (UCL mark less than 50):

Demonstrates failure to use sources and an inadequate ability to engage in systematic inquiry. Inadequate evidence of ability to engage in sustained research work and poor understanding of appropriate research techniques.

CONTINUES OVERLEAF
**PLEASE PROVIDE SUBSTANTIVE AND
 DETAILED FEEDBACK!**

Constructive comments, explaining strengths and weaknesses (at least 300 words):

The paper analyses the feasibility of sustainable energy in Central Europe and East Asia, using Multi-attribute value theory (MAVT) and an analytic hierarchy process (AHP).

The paper correctly presents the three requirements for sustainability: ecological, economic, and societal. The paper also presents the current state of play in energy production, in a well-documented section (section 3.1 ; the data sources mentioned are the right ones to use indeed) – but the section could have been made a bit shorter given that there is no new analysis here.

One of the main contribution of the paper resides in the application of the MAVT and AHP method (described p18), in the case study of China (section 4.1.2). The student seems to apply this quite seriously, though the presentation is not as clear as it should be in p18. I also don't understand why the indices are constructed this way (eg p.48) , but maybe it is a presentation issue? For instance, should size be the population multiplied by wind electricity consumption **per person** (p 49)?

I am also unclear in this section about the data sample, because the number of observations is not clarified: is it annual data between 2004-2014? With annual data the sample would be very small, which is a problem to interpret Table 4.2 (correlations) as well as Table 4.3 (regression with 3t o 5 RHS variables)

Similarly, in the other key contribution of the paper (Table 4.5 on biofuels), the presentation is unclear (the section mentions a panel but without specifying the exact coverage, and the number of observations does not appear in the regression Table).

Section 5.2 then presents the AHP analysis, is probably well done and yields reasonable weights for the policy instruments. However, there is not enough description of how exactly the data was used, eg panel, removing fixed effects or focusing on the cross-section, growth rates or levels, etc?

Overall, it is clear a lot of work was put into the paper, and a lot of interesting documentation on sustainable resource is now available in this dissertation. I think however that the dissertation should have focused more precisely on the MAVT model (and on table 4.3 and table 4.5), because this is where the original contribution would be, digging into this regressions, explaining better their implications, and ensuring these are robust models.

Specific questions you would like addressing at the oral defence (*at least 2 questions*):

What is exactly the data used for Table 4.2 and Table 4.3? How many observations did you have, and what did the units of observation represent (sector, firm, etc) ?