

## I. IDENTIFICATION DATA

<b>Thesis name:</b>	<b>Technology of iBeacon and its application for people with special needs</b>
<b>Author's name:</b>	<b>Bc. Dmytro Kochkurov</b>
<b>Type of thesis :</b>	master
<b>Faculty/Institute:</b>	Faculty of Transportation Sciences (FTS)
<b>Department:</b>	Department of Applied Informatics in Transportation
<b>Thesis supervisor:</b>	Ing. Jan Krčál, Ph.D.
<b>Supervisor's department:</b>	Department of Applied Informatics in Transportation

## II. EVALUATION OF INDIVIDUAL CRITERIA

<b>Assignment</b>	<b>challenging</b>
<i>Evaluation of thesis difficulty.</i>	
Familiarize oneself with iBeacon technology and propose information system for using iBeacon technology by blind and visually impaired people could be a challenge for the student.	

<b>Satisfaction of assignment</b>	<b>fulfilled with major objections</b>
<i>Assess that the handed-in thesis meets assignment. Present points of assignment that fell short or were exceeded. Try to assess importance, impact or cause of each shortcoming.</i>	
Points that needed to be worked on were clearly defined in the assignment. Requirements for the theoretical part were fulfilled, however, I can see great deficiencies in the practical part. I would expect much more detailed proposal of the information system with detailed description of the individual parts. The proposal of the information system was supposed to contain both the general description and a specific proposal of a system, including the description of the application, which would be used to demonstrate functioning of the system subsequent evaluation / analysis of such a proposal. I miss all of this in the work. The solution is mentioned only superficially, which I consider insufficient.	

<b>Activity and independence when creating final thesis</b>	<b>D - satisfactory.</b>
<i>Assess that student had positive approach, time limits were met, conception was regularly consulted and was well prepared for consultations. Assess student's ability to work independently.</i>	
Consultations with the supervisor were conducted by e-mail, there were very few personal consultations. The student has worked on his thesis independently, he himself was not very proactive and did not follow the advice of the supervisor.	

<b>Technical level</b>	<b>D - satisfactory.</b>
<i>Assess level of thesis specialty, use of knowledge gained by study and by expert literature, use of sources and data gained by experience.</i>	
The work is elaborated very superficially without deeper focus on detail. It is very often limited to brief description in a figure. I am not able to evaluate, whether the student used the knowledge gained from the studies or from the practise.	

<b>Formal and language level, scope of thesis</b>	<b>D - satisfactory.</b>
<i>Assess correctness of usage of formal notation. Assess typographical and language arrangement of thesis.</i>	
There are not many references to figures/tables in the paragraphs. Formally and from the point of view of language, the level of this work is standard but sometimes we can see bad typographical characters. For example, it looks very bad in the chapter title. The scope of his thesis is on a lower value (number of pages), but fulfils the assignment.	

### Selection of sources, citation correctness

**B - very good.**

*Present your opinion to student's activity when obtaining and using study materials for thesis creation. Characterize selection of sources. Assess that student used all relevant sources. Verify that all used elements are correctly distinguished from own results and thoughts. Assess that citation ethics has not been breached and that all bibliographic citations are complete and in accordance with citation convention and standards.*

It seems that all bibliographic citations are in most cases complete and in accordance with citation convention and standards. I think that in the chapter 3.6 the citations are missing. The selection of the sources is on a standard level.

### Additional commentary and evaluation

*Present your opinion to achieved primary goals of thesis, e.g. level of theoretical results, level and functionality of technical or software conception, publication performance, experimental dexterity etc.*

According to my opinion, the primary goals of thesis were not fully achieved. The code of some applications can be download from the KOS system but it is not mentioned in the work, nor are there respective pictures and descriptions.

### III. OVERALL EVALUATION, QUESTIONS FOR DEFENSE, CLASSIFICATION SUGGESTION

*Summarize thesis aspects that swayed your final evaluation.*

*The theme of the diploma thesis was very interesting and the student could have shown his knowledge, invention and capability in creative thinking. Unfortunately this potential was not utilized by the student. Advice of the supervisor was not fully accepted, in spite of several notices and clearly communicated requirements. I have a major objection towards the practical part of diploma thesis, where I miss a detail description of a proposal of the information system, which is shown in figure 15 in the work.*

*I have expected a more detailed description of functioning of individual parts, their mutual connection, which type of data and in which form are transmitted, which type of data and where are they stored, what are the benefits or disadvantages of the proposed solution, how does the graphical interface of the mobile application look etc.*

*I further miss the description of the mobile application code and its screen. I do not mean creation of a complete mobile application, but only of a part where we could see the function of an application core. The work mentions indoor navigation, but there is no mention of its mechanism. Everything is described very superficially, if at all. I have a great difficulty finding the student's own contribution in the thesis. I mentioned all these objections to the student several times, unfortunately, without any result.*

I evaluate the handed-in thesis with classification grade **D - satisfactory**.

Date: **7.1.2019**

Signature: