

I. IDENTIFICATION DATA

Thesis title:	Study of Organization and Management of Automotive Partnership projects
Author's name:	Hicham KASRAOUI
Type of thesis :	master
Faculty/Institute:	Faculty of Mechanical Engineering (FME)
Department:	Department of Automotive, Combustion Engine and Railway Engineering
Thesis reviewer:	Ing. Miroslav Žilka, Ph.D.
Reviewer's department:	Department of Management and Economics

II. EVALUATION OF INDIVIDUAL CRITERIA

Assignment	challenging
<i>How demanding was the assigned project?</i>	
Definition of organization and management mechanisms for a big automotive partnership project can be considered as a challenging goal.	

Fulfilment of assignment	fulfilled
<i>How well does the thesis fulfil the assigned task? Have the primary goals been achieved? Which assigned tasks have been incompletely covered, and which parts of the thesis are overextended? Justify your answer.</i>	
All the main goals and tasks were fulfilled.	

Methodology	correct
<i>Comment on the correctness of the approach and/or the solution methods.</i>	
The student approached the work actively and independently. The thesis structure needed only partial corrections by the supervisor. Its preparation was continuously consulted. The only problem I had with insufficient time for commenting of the final version of the thesis. The thesis consists of relevant parts addressing set goals and tasks.	

Technical level	B - very good.
<i>Is the thesis technically sound? How well did the student employ expertise in the field of his/her field of study? Does the student explain clearly what he/she has done?</i>	
The thesis consists of three main parts. It starts with the description of key theoretical areas associated with the topic of project and innovation management. It contains compilation of relevant information and it is logically arranged. I evaluate this part as very well processed. The second part describes the managing and organization mechanisms within the partnership project and its individual phases. The description in this section clear but the orientation is sometimes quite difficult due to use of a large amount of internal terms and abbreviations. Last part is focused on a practical case study dealing with various aspects of powertrain dilemma. In this chapter, the student's own contribution is most evident. It is a pity that it is not more extensive in comparison with other parts. I would appreciate more detailed comments and descriptions to the methodology of multi-criteria evaluation of powertrain variants and to its economic characterization.	

Formal and language level, scope of thesis	B - very good.
<i>Are formalisms and notations used properly? Is the thesis organized in a logical way? Is the thesis sufficiently extensive? Is the thesis well-presented? Is the language clear and understandable? Is the English satisfactory?</i>	
The thesis is written clearly and the English level is also very good. It is arranged logically. Orientation in the structure is sometimes complicated due to missing multi-level chapter numbering. I would also appreciate a list of abbreviations.	

Selection of sources, citation correctness	C - good.
<i>Does the thesis make adequate reference to earlier work on the topic? Was the selection of sources adequate? Is the student's original work clearly distinguished from earlier work in the field? Do the bibliographic citations meet the standards?</i>	

A sufficiently wide range of internal and external information sources was used in the thesis. I consider the inconsistency of the formatting of bibliographic citations and the non-compliance with citation standards as a shortcoming.

Additional commentary and evaluation (optional)

Comment on the overall quality of the thesis, its novelty and its impact on the field, its strengths and weaknesses, the utility of the solution that is presented, the theoretical/formal level, the student's skillfulness, etc.

Please insert your comments here.

III. OVERALL EVALUATION, QUESTIONS FOR THE PRESENTATION AND DEFENSE OF THE THESIS, SUGGESTED GRADE

Summarize your opinion on the thesis and explain your final grading.

As the strength of evaluated thesis I consider the comprehensive characterization of the theoretical background and organizational and managerial mechanisms used within the large automotive partnership project. As the main weakness I would point out the fact that it is very complicated to distinguish what is information taken from Renault a what is the student's own contribution. Another weakness is insufficient description of multi-criteria decision making methodology. Taking into account all the positives and negatives of the thesis, I evaluate it as very good.

The grade that I award for the thesis is **B - very good**.

Complementary question:

The table on page 68 shows the economic parameters of the powertrain variants in the first rows. Can you explain what are the main components of the costs (ET: D&D, ET: CAPEX, Average extra TDC (cost))? Can you identify the main cost items in which the individual variants mainly differ?

Date: **28.8.2019**

Signature:

