

Supervisor's statement of a final thesis

Czech Technical University in Prague

Faculty of Information Technology

Student: Bc. Vladimír Kroupa
Supervisor: Mgr. et Bc. David Voňka
Thesis title: Rozšíření produktu Semanta o zpracování metadat platformy IBM Cognos BI
Branch of the study: Web and Software Engineering

Date: 18. 2. 2017

<p><i>Evaluation criterion:</i></p> <p>1. Difficulty and other comments on the 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> The candidate was given a rather broad specification of what needs to be done, specifically just the name of the source platform (IBM Cognos) and target platform (Semanta XF3) with a note that we are mostly interested in reports. Therefore he needed to make a number of high-level decisions himself.</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>Evaluation criterion:</i></p> <p>2. Fulfilment of the assignment</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 code and the thesis fulfill the specified criteria fully. The resulting set of XF3 application is close to what Semanta can put to the market. The thesis mentions a few situations, where information is not loaded, in from my point of view the candidate exceeded expectations as to how much metadata would be actually extracted from Cognos.</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>Evaluation criterion:</i></p> <p>3. Size of the main written part</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 text is very to the point, contains little unnecessary information. The student describes only directly relevant parts of Cognos and Semanta XF3. Still, it is a rather long work, much longer than the minimum required 50 pages.</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>Evaluation criterion:</i></p> <p>4. Factual and logical level of the thesis</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 thesis has a very clear structure, with 2 chapters about the possibilities of the relevant technologies (Cognos and XF3), a chapter on the actual work done to extract data from Cognos and one on the actual work done to display the extracted data in XF3.</p> <p>The text is clear and to the point within the chapters. Terminology is well defined and consistent. The student has taken care to name classes logically and added a number of explanatory UML diagrams.</p>	<p><i>The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).</i></p> <p>95 (A)</p>
<p><i>Evaluation criterion:</i></p> <p>5. Formal level of the thesis</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. 14/2015, Article 3.</p>	<p><i>The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).</i></p> <p>90 (A)</p>

Comments:

The level of Czech language is fine, the text is readable, not boring and written in a professional style. I'm not an academic myself, so I do not dare to assess if the writing is sufficiently academic. There are occasional problems with LaTeX typesetting, some schemas are too big for the page, text sometimes overflows.

Evaluation criterion:

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

6. Bibliography

70 (C)

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:

There is not much relevant literature the student could use. There is no official programmers documentation for Semanta XF3 (but the student knows it well, since he is one out the authors of the system) and the documentation of Cognos does not go very deep.

Evaluation criterion:

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

7. Evaluation of results, publication outputs and awards

99 (A)

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:

A thesis, even when written within a commercial company, only very rarely delivers a marketable product. A thesis is by its very nature work of a single person, but products typically require a team.

That said, I think the student came remarkably close to marketability. The solution works in all common situations and it is complete in the sense that we do not intend to add any other component to the commercial product. The only major problem is lack of rigorous testing, which really needs a team.

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:

As I already mentioned, the solution will be used as a basis for a commercial product. The remaining amount of work is remarkably small.

Evaluation criterion:

The evaluation scale: 1 to 5.

9. Activity and self-reliance of the student

9a:

1 = excellent activity,
2 = very good activity,
3 = average activity,
4 = weaker, but still sufficient activity,
5 = insufficient activity

9b:

1 = excellent self-reliance,
2 = very good self-reliance,
3 = average self-reliance,
4 = weaker, but still sufficient self-reliance,
5 = insufficient self-reliance.

Criteria description:

Review student's activity while working on this final thesis, student's punctuality when meeting the deadlines and consulting continuously and also, student's preparedness for these consultations. Furthermore, review student's independency.

Comments:

The student wrote both the code and the thesis itself independently. We had a number of meetings on the various chapters and discussed implementation strategy. As a practitioner, I was mostly interested in the outcome of the work from the future user's point of view, so the student had a free hand in choosing technologies like eXist.

Evaluation criterion:

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

10. The overall evaluation

95 (A)

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:

I think this is an excellent thesis, easily the best I led while working at Semanta. The code works and is reliable and the text is full of information, well structured and illustrated incredibly well with UML diagrams. The student also delivered the necessary infrastructure, like virtual machines with Cognos and batch files that compile and execute the code.

Signature of the supervisor: