



Supervisor's statement of a final thesis

Supervisor: doc. Dr. André Sopczak
Student: Jakub Weisl
Thesis title: Analysis of data security from online data-taking to publication in ATLAS at CERN
Branch / specialization: Computer Security and Information technology
Created on: 7 June 2021

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

Most of the thesis tasks are well completed. For some objectives a more in depth analysis would be desirable. For example, chapter 5.2, the access to the LHC Computing grid is nicely addressed, but the suggestions seem not completely worked out.

2. Main written part 80 /100 (B)

The thesis is adequate in contents and scope. The addressed aspects are relevant and correct. Some more explanations would be desirable. Perhaps, using more research time before the thesis defence would have allowed to address further aspects, or the given aspects could have been addressed in more depth.

3. Non-written part, attachments 85 /100 (B)

The overall quality of the research work is good. In the course of the thesis research, a thesis draft was made available to a CERN computer security specialist, receiving very positive comments and suggestions. The addressed aspects are suitable and relevant and have the potential to be deployed. Jakub Weisl implemented well the suggestions. The tools and explained theory are adequate,

4. Evaluation of results, publication outputs and awards

90 /100 (A)

The thesis results can be deployed and are useful additions with novel ideas. The suggested solutions can mitigate shortcoming in the current data security. They are realistic.

5. Activity of the student

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

Jakub Weisl has been very active and well on time for meetings. He was always well prepared for consultations.

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

He was able to understand quickly the challenges of the ATLAS/CERN data security and worked efficiently with the provided material. Jakub Weisl did also work on additional material, which he researched.

The overall evaluation

85 /100 (B)

The thesis is well written and addresses important aspects. Some aspects could be worked out further.

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. 26/2017, 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.