

Review report of a final thesis

Czech Technical University in Prague

Faculty of Information Technology

Student: Dmitry Vanyagin
Reviewer: MgA. Kryštof Pešek
Thesis title: Adobe Premiere Pro Plugin for NARRA
Branch of the study: Software Engineering (Bachelor)

Date: 8. 6. 2015

<p><i>Evaluation criterion:</i></p> <p>1. Difficulty and other comments on the assignment</p>	<p><i>The evaluation scale: 1 to 5.</i></p> <p>1 = extremely challenging assignment, 2 = rather difficult assignment, 3 = assignment of average difficulty, 4 = easier, but still sufficient assignment, 5 = insufficient assignment</p>
<p><i>Criteria description:</i> Characterize this final thesis in detail and its relationships to previous or current projects. Comment what is difficult about this thesis (in case of a more difficult thesis, you may overlook some shortcomings that you would not in case of an easy assignment, and on the contrary, with an easy assignment those shortcomings should be evaluated more strictly.)</p> <p><i>Comments:</i> Create an Adobe Premiere Pro plug-in providing direct access to the NARRA system. Get familiar with the NARRA JSON API and all its features.</p>	
<p><i>Evaluation criterion:</i></p> <p>2. Fulfilment of the assignment</p>	<p><i>The evaluation scale: 1 to 4.</i></p> <p>1 = assignment fulfilled, 2 = assignment fulfilled with minor objections, 3 = assignment fulfilled with major objections, 4 = assignment not fulfilled</p>
<p><i>Criteria description:</i> Assess whether the thesis meets the assignment statement. In Comments indicate parts of the assignment that have not been fulfilled, completely or partially, or extensions of the thesis beyond the original assignment. If the assignment was not completely fulfilled, try to assess the importance, impact, and possibly also the reason of the insufficiencies.</p> <p><i>Comments:</i> The objective was to create working plugin using Adobe Premiere Pro SDK, the final solution slightly detoured by using recent version of Adobe Premiere 2014 CC.</p>	
<p><i>Evaluation criterion:</i></p> <p>3. Size of the main written part</p>	<p><i>The evaluation scale: 1 to 4.</i></p> <p>1 = meets the criteria, 2 = meets the criteria with minor objections, 3 = meets the criteria with major objections, 4 = does not meet the criteria</p>
<p><i>Criteria description:</i> Evaluate the adequacy of the extent of the final thesis, considering its content and the size of the written part, i.e. that all parts of the thesis are rich on information and the text does not contain unnecessary parts.</p> <p><i>Comments:</i> The size of the written part meets criteria and fulfils requirements.</p>	
<p><i>Evaluation criterion:</i></p> <p>4. Factual and logical level of the thesis</p>	<p><i>The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).</i></p> <p>80 (B)</p>
<p><i>Criteria description:</i> Assess whether the thesis is correct as to the facts or if there are factual errors and inaccuracies. Evaluate further the logical structure of the thesis, links among the chapters, and the comprehensibility of the text for a reader.</p> <p><i>Comments:</i> The work contains all factual informations required for thesis evaluation. Thesis can be divided into two parts a study of NARRA infrastructure and a solution for Adobe Premiere plug-in. I found problematic use of ExtendScript that has limited compatibility with main project development branch. The problematics of third-party software and its development policy is out of scope in this evaluation. The goal of development is to bring comfortable solution for audiovisual editors and to bridge it with NARRA system. The wide use of corporate software in this field is problematic in long-term and has no simple solution right now.</p>	
<p><i>Evaluation criterion:</i></p> <p>5. Formal level of the thesis</p>	<p><i>The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).</i></p> <p>80 (B)</p>
<p><i>Criteria description:</i> Assess the correctness of formalisms used in the thesis, the typographical and linguistic aspects, see Dean's Directive No. 12/2014, Article 3.</p> <p><i>Comments:</i> The work could be evaluated as formally correct.</p>	
<p><i>Evaluation criterion:</i></p> <p>6. Bibliography</p>	<p><i>The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).</i></p> <p>70 (C)</p>

Criteria description:
Evaluate the student's activity in acquisition and use of studying materials in his thesis. Characterize the choice of the sources. Discuss whether the student used all relevant sources, or whether he tried to solve problems that were already solved. Verify that all elements taken from other sources are properly differentiated from his own results and contributions. Comment if there was a possible violation of the citation ethics and if the bibliographical references are complete and in compliance with citation standards.

Comments:

Bibliography contains some web resources and quotations which could be unreachable in the future.

Evaluation criterion:

The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).

7. Evaluation of results, publication outputs and awards

70 (C)

Criteria description:

Comment on the achieved level of major results of the thesis and indicate whether the main results of the thesis extend published state-of-the-art results and/or bring completely new findings. Assess the quality and functionality of hardware or software solutions. Alternatively, evaluate whether the software or source code that was not created by the student himself was used in accordance with the license terms and copyright. Comment on possible publication output or awards related to the thesis.

Comments:

Achieved results of this work could be evaluated as fulfilled. Student developed certain solution for connecting Adobe Premiere Pro CC with NARRA-core software. The connection for multiple audiovisual softwares are critical for project to ensure communication between cinematographers editors and developers. Import and export capabilities are necessary for further collaboration in project. The choice of particular version of Adobe product is rather questionable.

Evaluation criterion:

No evaluation scale.

8. Applicability of the results

Criteria description:

Indicate the potential of using the results of the thesis in practice.

Comments:

Current state of plug-in allows user to import and export project into and from editing software. User is able to use this plug-in for feeding media data into NARRA database. I am afraid that the chosen solution is not very suitable for everyday practical use. It could be perceived as a study for the whole problematics. The testing of plug-in should be discussed more with its users to ensure that its state of this module is usable enough.

Evaluation criterion:

No evaluation scale.

9. Questions for the defence

Criteria description:

Formulate any question(s) that the student should answer to the committee during the defence (use a bullet list).

Questions:

Please describe technology used for creating this plug-in, its limitations and advantages.
What is preferred way of workflow using this plugin.

Evaluation criterion:

The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).

10. The overall evaluation

70 (C)

Criteria description:

Summarize the parts of the thesis that had major impact on your evaluation. The overall evaluation **does not** have to be the arithmetic mean or any other formula with the values from the previous evaluation criteria 1 to 9.

Comments:

Resulting work can be evaluated as successful, although a slight diversion from original objective was made. The work itself bring working solution for connecting NARRA software with proprietary Adobe System and it is with some minor modifications usable for deployment.

The design of user interface could be discussed more with its final users to ensure its fluent usability.

Signature of the reviewer: