

REPORT ON THE MASTER THESIS

IEPS – International Economic and Political Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University

Title of the thesis:	EXTENDED PRODUCER RESPONSIBILITY: POTENTIAL AND LIMITS. An Analysis of EPR in Theory and Practice
Author of the thesis:	James King
Referee (incl. titles):	Mgr. et PhDr. Kryštof Kozák, PhD.

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
<i>Theoretical background (max. 20)</i>	10
<i>Contribution (max. 20)</i>	15
<i>Methods (max. 20)</i>	10
<i>Literature (max. 20)</i>	12
<i>Manuscript form (max. 20)</i>	7
TOTAL POINTS (max. 100)	54
The proposed grade (1-2-3-4)	3

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:

The thesis includes some theoretical background of the Extended Producer Responsibility concept, but falls short of incorporating it into larger debates about the role of the state in the economy. The role of public-private partnerships could have been developed in greater detail. Also, the theory is rather vague and would become more pointed if applied to specific industrial sectors.

2) Contribution:

The thesis is on an original and important topic, which is in itself a great contribution to current debates about smart environmental solutions. The author is clearly an original thinker and is able to address the present issues with critical perspective. The biggest contribution is in its detailed analysis of specific case studies. However, the economic as well as political consequences could have been even more developed.

3) Methods:

The author is a keen observer and is able to draw relevant conclusions from primary as well as secondary sources. At the same time, the structure of the thesis is at times unbalanced and could benefit from more rigorous use of analytical tools. His main hypothesis is fairly vague, which is reflected also in the concluding section.

4) Literature:

The author has sufficient command of the literature related to his field of study and is able to use it productively to prove his main points. The thesis would benefit from more extensive use of conceptual literature which focuses on merits of the extended producer responsibility. Political

aspects of the problem could have been included as well. The role of big multinational corporations as opposed to small businesses is relevant for the thesis as a whole.

5) Manuscript form:

The thesis would benefit from more careful editorial work, at times it seems certain paragraphs were written in a hurry. However, the thesis is written in an easily approachable style which makes the thesis enjoyable to read.

DATE OF EVALUATION: June 17th, 2014

Krystof Kozak

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