



Supervisor's statement of a final thesis

Supervisor: Ing. Martin Kolárik
Student: Viktor Tyúkos
Thesis title: Security analysis of Globalping probes
Branch / specialization: Information Security 2021
Created on: 11 June 2024

Evaluation criteria

1. Fulfillment of the assignment

- ▶ [1] assignment fulfilled
- [2] assignment fulfilled with minor objections
- [3] assignment fulfilled with major objections
- [4] assignment not fulfilled

2. Main written part 85 /100 (B)

The text is well-structured and easy to read but contains occasional typos and punctuation issues. I feel there is some room to go into a bit more detail, especially in chapters five and six, but overall, the whole testing process is sufficiently covered. There are a few factual discrepancies (e.g., checking for a new probe version uses GitHub API, not Globalping API), but nothing that would significantly impact the results. The sources include documentation of the mentioned projects and the used methodologies, and are properly cited.

3. Non-written part, attachments 90 /100 (A)

The non-written part contains only the analyzed source code, which is mostly in accordance with the assignment and the chosen approach. I would have liked to see the captured communication related to the finding in section 6.4 included as well, but that is only a minor complaint, as the finding is still clear.

4. Evaluation of results, publication outputs and awards 90 /100 (A)

The thesis is useful both to the project developers (for fixing the issues found) and the project users (for understanding the security aspects of running their own probes).

5. Activity of the student

- ▶ [1] excellent activity
- [2] very good activity
- [3] average activity
- [4] weaker, but still sufficient activity
- [5] insufficient activity

6. Self-reliance of the student

- ▶ [1] excellent self-reliance
- [2] very good self-reliance
- [3] average self-reliance
- [4] weaker, but still sufficient self-reliance
- [5] insufficient self-reliance

The student was able to do most of the work independently, with only brief consultations.

The overall evaluation

90 /100 (A)

The student performed a security analysis in line with the assignment, and I have no complaints about the technical side. The written report would benefit from more thorough proofreading, but overall, I think the work still deserves a rating of A - excellent.

Instructions

Fulfillment of the assignment

Assess whether the submitted FT defines the objectives sufficiently and in line with the assignment; whether the objectives are formulated correctly and fulfilled sufficiently. In the comment, specify the points of the assignment that have not been met, assess the severity, impact, and, if appropriate, also the cause of the deficiencies. If the assignment differs substantially from the standards for the FT or if the student has developed the FT beyond the assignment, describe the way it got reflected on the quality of the assignment's fulfilment and the way it affected your final evaluation.

Main written part

Evaluate whether the extent of the FT is adequate to its content and scope: are all the parts of the FT contentful and necessary? Next, consider whether the submitted FT is actually correct – are there factual errors or inaccuracies?

Evaluate the logical structure of the FT, the thematic flow between chapters and whether the text is comprehensible to the reader. Assess whether the formal notations in the FT are used correctly. Assess the typographic and language aspects of the FT, follow the Dean's Directive No. 52/2021, Art. 3.

Evaluate whether the relevant sources are properly used, quoted and cited. Verify that all quotes are properly distinguished from the results achieved in the FT, thus, that the citation ethics has not been violated and that the citations are complete and in accordance with citation practices and standards. Finally, evaluate whether the software and other copyrighted works have been used in accordance with their license terms.

Non-written part, attachments

Depending on the nature of the FT, comment on the non-written part of the thesis. For example: SW work – the overall quality of the program. Is the technology used (from the development to deployment) suitable and adequate? HW – functional sample. Evaluate the technology and tools used. Research and experimental work – repeatability of the experiment.

Evaluation of results, publication outputs and awards

Depending on the nature of the thesis, estimate whether the thesis results could be deployed in practice; alternatively, evaluate whether the results of the FT extend the already published/known results or whether they bring in completely new findings.

Activity of the student

From your experience with the course of the work on the thesis and its outcome, review the student's activity while working on the thesis, his/her punctuality when meeting the deadlines and whether he/she consulted you as he/she went along and also, whether he/she was well prepared for these consultations.

Self-reliance of the student

From your experience with the course of the work on the thesis and its outcome, assess the student's ability to develop independent creative work.

The overall evaluation

Summarize which of the aspects of the FT affected your grading process the most. The overall grade does not need to be an arithmetic mean (or other value) calculated from the evaluation in the previous criteria. Generally, a well-fulfilled assignment is assessed by grade A.