

# Report on Bachelor / Master Thesis

Institute of Economic Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University in Prague

<b>Student:</b>	<b>Amália Počarovská</b>
<b>Advisor:</b>	Ph.Dr. Mgr. Jana Gutiérrez Chvalková
<b>Title of the thesis:</b>	<b>The Aspects of Collaborative Procurement: Centralization, Scope and Different Market Structures</b>

## **OVERALL ASSESSMENT** (provided in English, Czech, or Slovak):

Please provide your assessment of each of the following four categories, summary and suggested questions for the discussion. The minimum length of the report is 300 words.

### **Contribution**

Thesis deals with important policy topic of centralised procurement. It well lays out the literature and sets good theoretical background – in particular I appreciate quite original interpretation of auction theory in this very specific setting. The empirical part comes to several interesting conclusions, though I would expect more stress on fundamental trade-off between economies of information and economies of scale outlined in 1.2, that is fundamental to debate on efficiency of centralised public procurement.

### **Methods**

The methods used for the thesis are appropriate. Because of apparent data quality issues (which were overcome with quite an effort of author), the thesis stands a bit more on theoretical findings and literature. I have two minor remarks:

1. In several places (such as 2.4) author seems too biased towards the Czech setup of centralized purchases, presuming lengthy coordination of multiple buyers prior to tender. As author is possibly well aware, this does not need to be the case – in Austria or Italy, such phase is almost completely skipped.
2. Missing tender size as independent variable in empirical part. Intuitively – larger tenders are only available to less firms, though smaller competition might be expected. Further on, I would expect the independent variable on centralised purchases to be correlated with size (centralised tenders are typically bigger) thus omitted variable might cause a wrong conclusion on the synergy effect. To put it bluntly – centralised tenders might not attract lower competition because they are centralised, but simply due to their size.

### **Literature**

Thesis uses appropriate literature relevant to the topic. Author is well familiar with its contents – apparently she read more than just abstracts of many cited works.

### **Manuscript form**

Overallly thesis is well written and understandable. I would prefer slightly more coherence between the chapters – see further two minor comments.

The thesis contains several shorter chapters (Framework agreements, transaction costs) with contents with little relevance for overall findings – though their discussion is a part of overall topic. I would not make these separate chapters, due to lesser importance compared to other chapters.

„Framework agreement hypothesis“ is formulated but never addressed. The result is implicitly present in results, however not commented at all. Similarly I would also expect a bit more attention towards other hypotheses in the empirical part.

# Report on Bachelor / Master Thesis

Institute of Economic Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University in Prague

<b>Student:</b>	<b>Amália Počarovská</b>
<b>Advisor:</b>	Ph.Dr. Mgr. Jana Gutiérrez Chvalková
<b>Title of the thesis:</b>	<b>The Aspects of Collaborative Procurement: Centralization, Scope and Different Market Structures</b>

## Summary and suggested questions for the discussion during the defense

Questions: with respect to table 1.1 – is the market concentration really a necessary sign of central purchases? How can this effect be remedied, at least partially?

In section 2.1.3 you discuss various auction setups as defined by auction theory, somehow concluding that FPA seems the most popular. When proceeding further to description of public procurement processes, I see no linkage to the theory. Which of the auction types are actually used, are there some legal limitations to that?

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

<b>CATEGORY</b>	<b>POINTS</b>
<i>Contribution (max. 30 points)</i>	20
<i>Methods (max. 30 points)</i>	25
<i>Literature (max. 20 points)</i>	20
<i>Manuscript Form (max. 20 points)</i>	16
<b>TOTAL POINTS (max. 100 points)</b>	<b>81</b>
<b>GRADE (A – B – C – D – E – F)</b>	<b>B</b>

**NAME OF THE REFEREE: PhDr. Ing. Jiří Skuhrovec PhD.**

**DATE OF EVALUATION: 28.1.2018**

---

**Referee Signature**

**EXPLANATION OF CATEGORIES AND SCALE:**

**CONTRIBUTION:** *The author presents original ideas on the topic demonstrating critical thinking and ability to draw conclusions based on the knowledge of relevant theory and empirics. There is a distinct value added of the thesis.*

<i>Strong</i>	<i>Average</i>	<i>Weak</i>
30	15	0

**METHODS:** *The tools used are relevant to the research question being investigated, and adequate to the author's level of studies. The thesis topic is comprehensively analyzed.*

<i>Strong</i>	<i>Average</i>	<i>Weak</i>
30	15	0

**LITERATURE REVIEW:** *The thesis demonstrates author's full understanding and command of recent literature. The author quotes relevant literature in a proper way.*

<i>Strong</i>	<i>Average</i>	<i>Weak</i>
20	10	0

**MANUSCRIPT FORM:** *The thesis is well structured. The student uses appropriate language and style, including academic format for graphs and tables. The text effectively refers to graphs and tables and disposes with a complete bibliography.*

<i>Strong</i>	<i>Average</i>	<i>Weak</i>
20	10	0

**Overall grading:**

TOTAL	GRADE
91 – 100	A
81 - 90	B
71 - 80	C
61 – 70	D
51 – 60	E
0 – 50	F