

Report on Bachelor / Master Thesis

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

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| Student: | Nicholas Tyack |
| Advisor: | Mgr. Milan Ščasný, Ph.D. |
| Title of the thesis: | The Economic Value of Crop Diversity in the Czech Republic |

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

The thesis aims to estimate the willingness to pay for the crop diversity conservation in the Czech Republic using survey of more than 1100 respondents from the Czech Republic (organized by the author himself). The thesis focuses specifically on the conservation of hop, wine and fruit tree varieties, as well as on conservation of undefined general crop diversity. The author concludes that social benefits of the crop diversity conservation (quantified in the thesis) substantially exceed the costs for conservation.

The thesis is of a high quality, very well written, employing relevant methodological approaches to the problem analyzed. The willingness to pay for conservation of crop diversity has never been estimated for general population in the literature (only for farmers), hence, the thesis contributes to the current stream of literature and has relevant policy implications. The research topic has been even supported by the Grant Agency of the Charles University and the ECOCEP project.

I have only several comments or questions, most being minor. I would appreciate a methodological note on why the author adjusted bids according to the results from the pilot survey. Is it like that the pilot survey uncovered marginal rate of substitution between preservation of hops, wine and fruit varieties and relative prices should reflect it in optimum? Why is this important?

Looking at the negative coefficients of wine and hop varieties conservation, would you know think of a better way how to design the questions? Would not be the grading of alternatives more appropriate than just selecting the best alternative?

Are you perfectly sure that respondents understood that their contribution would be the one-time payment? It is not immediately clear to me from the questionnaire (*Byl(a) byste ochoten(na) přispět X Kč do veřejného fondu na sběr a uchování dalších Y druhů českých plodin po dobu následujících 30 let?*)

I would recommend: to add the reference to Annex I in the main text (it is missing now), to state explicitly that 4 choice cards (1 block) are answered by each respondent (did I understand it correctly?), to check that all the tables are entirely visible (significance signs are not sometimes visible, name of rows are shifted upwards in Table 5.3.1).

To conclude, this thesis is the excellent work, and I recommend the grading „výborně, excellent“.

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

| CATEGORY | POINTS |
|---|---------------|
| <i>Literature</i> (max. 20 points) | 20 |
| <i>Methods</i> (max. 30 points) | 29 |
| <i>Contribution</i> (max. 30 points) | 30 |
| <i>Manuscript Form</i> (max. 20 points) | 18 |
| TOTAL POINTS (max. 100 points) | 97 |
| GRADE (1 – 2 – 3 – 4) | 1 |

NAME OF THE REFEREE: PhDr. Lenka Šťastná, Ph.D.

DATE OF EVALUATION: September 5, 2016



Referee Signature