REPORT ON THE MASTER THESIS
GPS – Geopolitical Studies

Title of the thesis:	**The Implications of the Estonian E-Residency Project on Statehood and Territoriality**
Author of the thesis:	**Liis Peets**
Referee *(incl. titles)*:	**Mgr. et Mgr. Bohumil Doboš**

Remark: It is a standard at the FSV UK that the Referee's Report is at least 500 words long. In case you will assess the thesis as "non-defendable", please explain the concrete reasons for that in detail.

SUMMARY OF POINTS AWARDED *(for details, see below):*

CATEGORY	**POINTS**
Theoretical background (max. 20)	15
Contribution (max. 20)	18
Methods (max. 20)	18
Literature (max. 20)	13
Manuscript form (max. 20)	17
TOTAL POINTS *(max. 100)*	**81**
The proposed grade (1-2-3-4)	**1**

You can even use a decimal point (e.g. giving the grade of 2.5 for 60 points).

Comments of the referee on the thesis highlights and shortcomings (following the 5 numbered aspects of your assessment indicated below).

1) Theoretical background: Given the theoretical nature of the article, it would seem appropriate to discuss the two main concepts into larger detail. Nevertheless, the analysis is still sufficient for an exploration of the research questions.

2) Contribution: The concept of e-residency is in the non-Estonian environment under-researched and the presented thesis allows readers to better understand its implications and limitations of its impact on the future of territoriality and sovereignty in the post-modern part of the world. In the English-speaking environment the work brings rather large contribution.

3) Methods: Thesis has clearly stated and answered goals and uses appropriate methodology.

4) Literature: Given the nature of the work, it would be expected to use higher number of academic sources dealing with the theoretical and conceptual background of the work.

5) Manuscript form: The thesis is clearly written and the structure is appropriate. There are some minor technical defects (footnotes placed before punctual marks, etc.), as well as some minor language deficiencies that, however do not obstruct the understanding of the argument.

DATE OF EVALUATION: 19. 5. 2017

_____
Referee Signature

The referee should give comments to the following requirements:

1) THEORETICAL BACKGROUND: *Can you recognize that the thesis was guided by some* ***theoretical fundamentals*** *relevant for this thesis topic? Were some important theoretical concepts omitted? Was the theory used in the thesis consistently incorporated with the topic and hypotheses tested?*

Strong	*Average*	*Weak*	
20	*10*	*0*	*points*

2) CONTRIBUTION: *Evaluate if the author presents* ***original ideas*** *on the topic and aims at demonstrating* ***critical thinking*** *and ability to draw conclusions based on the knowledge of relevant theory and relevant empirical material. Is there a distinct* ***value added*** *of the thesis (relative to knowledge of a university-educated person interested in given topic)? Did the author explain* ***why*** *the observed phenomena occurred? Were the policy implications well founded?*

Strong	*Average*	*Weak*	
20	*10*	*0*	*points*

3) METHODS: *Are the* ***hypotheses*** *for this study clearly stated, allowing their further verification and testing? Are the theoretical explanations, empirical material and* ***analytical tools*** *used in the thesis relevant to the research question being investigated, and adequate to the aspiration level of the study? Is the thesis* ***topic comprehensively analyzed*** *and does the thesis not make trivial or irrelevant detours off the main body stated in the thesis proposal? More than 10 points signal an exceptional work,* ***which requires your explanation "why" it is so****).*

Strong	*Average*	*Weak*	
20	*10*	*0*	*points*

4) LITERATURE REVIEW: *The thesis demonstrates author's full understanding and* ***command of recent literature****. The author quotes relevant literature in a proper way and disposes with a representative bibliography. (Remark: references to Wikipedia, websites and newspaper articles are a sign of* ***poor research)****. If they dominate you cannot give more than 8 points. References to books published by prestigious publishers and articles in renowned journals give much better impression.*

Strong	*Average*	*Weak*	
20	*10*	*0*	*points*

5) MANUSCRIPT FORM: *The thesis is* ***clear and well structured****. The author uses appropriate language and style, including academic* ***format*** *for quotations, graphs and tables. The text effectively refers to graphs and tables, is easily readable and* ***stimulates thinking****.*

Strong	*Average*	*Weak*	
20	*10*	*0*	*points*

Overall grading scheme at FSV UK:

TOTAL POINTS	**GRADE**	Czech grading	US grading
81 – 100	**1**	= excellent	= A
61 – 80	**2**	= good	= B
51 – 60	**3**	= satisfactory	= C
41 – 50	**3**	= satisfactory	= D
0 – 40	**4**	= fail	= not recommended for defence