Review report of a final thesis

Student: Vít Pekárek

Reviewer: Ing. Alexandru Moucha, Ph.D.

Thesis title: Správa IP adres ve středně velké síti

Branch of the study: Computer Security and Information technology

Date: 26. 5. 2019

Evaluation criterion:	The evaluation scale: 1 to 4.
1. Fulfilment of the assignment	***1 = assignment fulfilled,*** *2 = assignment fulfilled with minor objections,* *3 = assignment fulfilled with major objections,* *4 = assignment not fulfilled*

Criteria description:
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.

Comments:
The requirement (analysis, installation and testing for open-source DHCP, DNS and IPAM) is fulfilled.

Evaluation criterion:	The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).
2. Main written part	*89 (B)*

Criteria description:
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.

Comments:
The report is very well written, easy to read and understand. I would do 4 (four) remarks:
1. English abstract: "internet network" is improperly used. Correctly is just "internet" as the internet is a collection of networks (an internetwork) and not a network.
2. In 4.1 a diagram would have been perfect.
3. I would not include code (e.g. 4.2.1, 4.2.2, etc) in the report. I would explain it in words in the report and include it in appendices.
4. It took me some time to decipher image 4.2 - maybe it could have been presented more clearly (just a thought).

Evaluation criterion:	The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).
3. Non-written part, attachments	*89 (B)*

Criteria description:
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.

Comments:
I think the work is very good and I hope it will be useful in FEL CVUT for the easier management of the network infrastructure.

Evaluation criterion:	The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).
4. Evaluation of results, publication outputs and awards	*70 (C)*

Criteria description:
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.

Comments:
The results - as they are now - are incomplete without using them in the production network of FEL. There is no publishing potential for the results though they may very well improve the FEL CVUT internetwork.

Evaluation criterion:	No evaluation scale.
5. Questions for the defence	

Criteria description:
Formulate questions that the student should answer during the Presentation and defence of the FT in front of the SFE Committee (use a bullet list).

Questions:

No questions.

Evaluation criterion:	The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).
6. The overall evaluation	*89 (B)*

Criteria description:
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.

Comments:

I consider that the work is very good and grade it accordingly. The difference between a very good work and an excellent work is the fact that this particular work does not contain anything impressive - it is a straight-forward implementation, testing and documentation work.

Signature of the reviewer: