Report on Bachelor / Master Thesis

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

Student:	**Hana Bečičková**
Advisor:	**PhDr. Pavel Streblov MSc**
Title of the thesis:	**Vztah mezi evropskou soutěžní politikou ve smyslu antitrust a národními soutěžními úřady**

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

Hana Bečičková has presented a highly topical bachelor thesis focusing on harmonization of competition policies and their institutional framework across the EU. The thesis has a very clear research objective and its findings are presented in a well-structured manner. Even more importantly, the author has not shied away from the tedious work of collecting primary data from individual countries and jurisdictions and has compiled them in an original and conclusive way, even constructing author's own elaborate index comparing the level of institutional harmonization.

The first three sections of the thesis provide a descriptive background to competition policy and the EU framework. The analytical core of the thesis is contained in the subsequent three sections that deal with the differences between the individual countries. The author focuses on level of harmonization among EU member states and compares them with a controlling set of two non-EU countries – Turkey and Switzerland. The antitrust competition policies are compared on the basis of institutional framework, level of imposed fees and the resources available to the individual national competition authorities. The author finds that despite a high level of harmonization between the EU countries, the hypothesis of the EU-effect can not be clearly determined as in the case of the non-EU controlling group a significant level of harmonization with the EU structures and policies was achieved as well.

I believe that the author has succeeded in finding an efficient and elegant tool of comparing the institutional and legal framework in individual countries by constructing and index spanning over areas such as institutional setup, antitrust rules and international cooperation. Besides, the author has provided some interesting statistics on the costs of running the competition offices in individual countries together with statistics on imposed fines. For example, the author's finding that the Greek competition authority is comparably the most expensive one and at the same time does not provide statistics on imposed fees speaks for itself. I highly appreciate the inclusion of a relevant controlling set of non-EU countries that put the results into a broader perspective – something that even academic publications assessing effects of europeanization often lack. The author might have been more explicit in explaining the weighting of the individual categories in the constructed index and in the justification of inclusion of certain parameters – i.e. justification of the relatively high weight of competition authorities' membership in international competition networks.

One of the strengths of the thesis is the fact, that despite the thesis not being numerical or model-based *per se*, the author has adopted a fairly rigorous framework to compare the individual countries. In addition, I highly appreciate the effort that the author has put into collecting the required information including review of reports by the individual national competition authorities and into getting in contact with the relevant authorities where additional information was necessary. On the other hand, the author might have chosen a simpler and clearer title for the thesis.

In light of the above, I recommend this thesis to be graded as A ("výborně") and propose to award the author with a special honour of the dean.

Report on Bachelor / Master Thesis

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

Student:	**Hana Bečičková**
Advisor:	**PhDr. Pavel Streblov MSc**
Title of the thesis:	**Vztah mezi evropskou soutěžní politikou ve smyslu antitrust a národními soutěžními úřady**

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

CATEGORY		**POINTS**
Literature	*(max. 20 points)*	19
Methods	*(max. 30 points)*	25
Contribution	*(max. 30 points)*	30
Manuscript Form	*(max. 20 points)*	20
TOTAL POINTS	*(max. 100 points)*	**94**
GRADE	**(1 – 2 – 3 – 4)**	**1**

NAME OF THE REFEREE: Pavel Streblov

DATE OF EVALUATION: 10.6.2010

Referee Signature

EXPLANATION OF CATEGORIES AND SCALE:

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

Strong	*Average*	*Weak*
20	*10*	*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.*

Strong	*Average*	*Weak*
30	*15*	*0*

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.*

Strong	*Average*	*Weak*
30	*15*	*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.*

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

Overall grading:

TOTAL POINTS	**GRADE**		
81 – 100	**1**	= excellent	= výborně
61 – 80	**2**	= good	= velmi dobře
41 – 60	**3**	= satisfactory	= dobře
0 – 40	**4**	= fail	= nedoporučuji k obhajobě