

REVIEW OF THE BACHELOR'S THESIS SUPERVISOR

Student's name: Martin Stastny

Thesis title: THE REBOUND EFFECT: MAGNITUDES AND

MITIGATION POLICY

Name of the thesis supervisor: Silvester van Koten.....

	1	2	3	4
Assessment of the topic itself (irrespectively of the student):				
1.1 To what extent is the topic current and significant?	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.2 How challenging is the topic in respect of theoretical knowledge?	<input type="checkbox"/>	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.3 How challenging it in respect of practical experience or fieldwork?	<input type="checkbox"/>	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.4 How difficult is it to get background materials?	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Verbal assessment (several sentences), in particular:

Subsection 1.1: The topic is highly relevant and much discussed in the light of the global (and EU) decarbonization efforts. In addition, the topic is often not well understood in the media and in political discussion. Moreover, much uncertainty exists about the exact magnitude of the problem and how to address it.

Other (as appropriate):

2. Evaluation of the thesis structure and logical cohesion:

2.1 To what extent is the thesis structure logical and transparent?	<input type="checkbox"/>	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.2 To what extent does the author use current / suitable sources?	<input type="checkbox"/>	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.3 How properly did the author select methods in respect of the topic?	<input type="checkbox"/>	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.4 How sufficiently and functionally did the author use in the thesis original charts, tables, data, annexes, etc.?	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.5 What is the compatibility level for the thesis basic line elements: topic – thesis assignment – objective – structure - conclusions?	<input type="checkbox"/>	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Verbal assessment (several sentences), in particular:

Subsection 2.1: The thesis is built up logically.

Subsection 2.5: This is all very well in order.

Other (as appropriate):

3. Assessment of the thesis text quality:

3.1 How well – in terms of depth and quality – did the author analyze the topic?	<input type="checkbox"/>	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.2 Did the author formulate the thesis objective clearly and with logical				

Instructions for the review: Author of the review must provide verbal assessment for the specified subsections, which are pivotal for the thesis assessment, particularly for the defense; therefore, the assessment must have reasonable explanatory power.

Note: Classification method: 1 = exceptional, 2 = very good, 3 = good, 4 = failed.

structure?	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.3 Did the author fulfill the defined thesis objective and approved assignment of the thesis that contains the objective?	<input type="checkbox"/>	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.4 How well – in terms of depth and quality – did the author cover the theoretical part of the thesis?	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.5 How well – in terms of depth and quality – did the author cover the practical / analytical part of the thesis?	<input type="checkbox"/>	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.6 To what extent are the thesis conclusions logically structured and show quality, and what is their added value?	<input type="checkbox"/>	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Verbal assessment (several sentences), in particular:

Subsection 3.2: The objective is clearly formulated and addressed using a logical structure

Subsection 3.3: Yes

Subsection 3.4: For a Bc thesis the – difficult – issue of rebound is well addressed, analyzed and discussed

Subsection 3.5: The debt and quality were more than sufficient

Subsection 3.6: The conclusions add a perspective that is often lacking in many of the discussions in policy and media circles.

Other (as appropriate):

4. Assessment of the thesis form and style:

4.1 What is the formal layout of the thesis?	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.2 What is the quality of citations and references? Are sources identifiable?	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.3 What is the stylistic level of the thesis, particularly the use of correct economic terminology?	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Verbal assessment (several sentences), in particular:

Subsection 4.2: I don't see any mistakes in this – otherwise formalistic – criterion.

Other (as appropriate):

5. Overall assessment (*It is necessary to state, whether the thesis meets the requirements of the Methodology of the Faculty of Economics in terms of the quality of contents, scope and formal requirements, whether the thesis is/is not recommended for defense. It may also be nominated for a special award, etc.):*

The paper addresses an interesting and rather complex topic, and gives an interesting account of the rebound effect that results from the policy measures of performance standards and discusses the effect and the policy measures together with the (other) possible policy measures such as the (Pigovian) tax and cap-and-trade. A few elements could be improved. The paper could have been written more clearly and without some of the ungrammatical and sometimes somewhat illogical sentences. The structure is quite good, but could have been a bit more tight. The application on the topic of "Transportation in Germany" is a well-chosen example, but I think this part could have been somewhat more elaborated.

6. Questions and remarks to the defense:

- What other sectors than transportation can likely see a rebound effect?
- On p.43 you write: " Furthermore wrong incentives are set by providing emission permits for free to companies. If companies know that they get an amount of permits

Instructions for the review: Author of the review must provide verbal assessment for the specified subsections, which are pivotal for the thesis assessment, particularly for the defense; therefore, the assessment must have reasonable explanatory power.

Note: Classification method: 1 = exceptional, 2 = very good, 3 = good, 4 = failed.

for free which at the same time would be sufficient to cover emissions from production processes firms would not change their behavior"

What is exactly the logic behind this result? The first intuition would be that the opportunity costs are important, so that it doesn't matter if the permits are paid or for free. So why would it make a difference?

- What is your view now on the EU and UN climate policy and how important do you think the role of the rebound effect will be?

Proposed grade: 2

Date: 2016.06.09



.....
Signature of the Thesis Supervisor