

Bachelor's thesis evaluation by the opponent

Title of the Bachelor's thesis:

Smart Greenhouse Production Business Plan

Author of the Bachelor's thesis:

Anastasia Eremeeva

Objectives of the Bachelor's thesis:

The goal of the thesis is to develop a business plan for a production of smart greenhouses.

EVALUATION OF THE BACHELOR'S THESIS	
Criteria (max. 10 points per category)	Points awarded
1. The objectives of the thesis are evident and accomplished	4
2. Demands on the acquisition of additional knowledge or skills	4
3. Adequacy and the way of the methods used	4
4. Depth and relevance of the analysis in relation to objectives	3
5. Making use of literature/other resources, citing	3
6. The thesis is a well-organised logical whole	5
7. Linguistic and terminological level	6
8. Formal layout and requirements, extent	5
9. Originality, i.e. it is produced by the student	4
10. Practical/theoretical relevance/applicability	4
Total score in points (max 100)	42
Final grading	Failed (4)

Overall evaluation and questions to be answered in the course of the defense:

This is a third version of the thesis, where the author has aimed to develop a business plan for the production of smart greenhouses. Some issues have been corrected. Nevertheless, even the third version still lacks important aspects of academic work, and the quality of the business plan is insufficient. Therefore, I do not recommend the thesis for defence, and I do not think that the thesis should be defended in its current form. I see main sources of problems in the following issues:

- 1) The technical solution is quite descriptive, and it takes about one-third of the thesis (again without any citations). It is very unclear where did the author collect this very specific knowledge to such a detail, which is described in Appendix A. What is, for example, Fan Maico EZG 30/4 B? There are no references to producers/companies or technical engineers. Could the author of the thesis defend her technical expertise in front of the committee? At any point without citing sources, the prices and technical calculations are not reliable.
- 2) Author's way of working with the academic literature has improved, however only partially. There are still whole pages lacking references and citations. If I comment on the keeping of the rules only (without discussing the quality of the sources), for example, whole section 16.1 contains many numbers related to the Czech economy which are not cited. What are the sources of the data? Where did the author obtain the figures and numbers?
- 3) I am also still not convinced about the quality of the proposed solution and its feasibility. It is very nice that the author mentions the companies operating on the market. However we do not know what products they offer, and for which prices. Without comparing their products, prices, quality and without demonstrating the added value of own solution, we cannot assess feasibility of the new product. The proposed business plan does not provide sufficient value for the potential founders who might be interesting in starting such a business.
- 4) The author has also not explained the sources of information (logic) for the construction of the financial plan?

Name of the Bachelor's thesis opponent:

Ing. Ondřej Dvouletý, Ph.D., MSc.

Occupation of the Bachelor's thesis opponent:

Department of Entrepreneurship, Faculty of Business Administration, University of Economics, Prague

I honestly declare that I am not in any allied relationship with the author of this Bachelor's thesis.

December 14, 2018

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'D. Paul', is positioned above a horizontal line.

Signature of the Bachelor's thesis opponent