

# Critical review on Group 3, by Group 8.

## Positive feedback

- It is easy to follow the flow and overview the study
- They use academic English
- The study is well structured
- It contains the necessary main points
- Illustrations are used in an intuitive way.
- They talking about and examine the shortcomings
- Handle the allocation problems
- It's good that they use the survey to specify the data for the functional unit
- Well used references
- Well analyse the obtained results from SimaPro
- Results seem sufficiently documented, although the conclusion could have been better structured.
- The discussion and the conclusion are good and straightforward as well
- They approached the problem from different sides, like social and financial (not just environmental)
- We also find that you have answered the aim and the objectives.
- In the sensitivity analysis you decide to elaborate an unanswered question further. Great job, and well spotted.
- The choice of topic is very interesting and relevant.

## Constructive feedback

- It would have been interesting to know about your expectations (elaborate below).
- The choice of city could have been explained further (considering the different transportation alternatives).
- In chapter 1.5 you present your meeting at Atlas Copco. Doing a field study is great, and is perhaps something that should have done as well. However, we would like to know more about your other methods (e.g. literature review). As a discussion point, do you think that the available information was sufficient, and why did you contact Atlas Copco? Apart for this, we think you have done a very well structured reports, which follows the LCA guidelines.

## Remarks in the report

### Abstract

"However, there is no real conclusion about whether flying have smaller impacts than train travel for this particular case."

Isn't one conclusion that it depends on the impact categories?

### Table of content, and the report

The structure of the report was respected. Some parts have even been added such as

"Previous study" which were really interesting and increase the understanding of your topic.

Great that you have chapter 1,2 early in the report.

## Background

"In this report we are going to compare the environmental impacts of having **three** kinds of meeting: a video meeting or a physical meeting where the participants has travelled either by train or by airplane."

Isn't it two kinds of meeting, and two ways of getting one of these meetings?

Great that you use Eurostat as a reference.

"To **model build** a **model** for a video conference in SimaPro"

"The functional unit in this report is 25 meetings, each 4 hours long and with 4 people attending. This equals 100 hours of meeting time."

1. Suggestion: This equals to 100 hours of meeting time per person, and a total of 400 hours of meeting time in total.
2. Is it 25 meetings per month, quarter, or year?

Page 9: Great that you mention that there is no allocation problem regarding train and flying.

## Life Cycle Interpretation

Page 19: Great that you have elaborated explanations for e.g. toxicity and fossil fuel.

## Uncertainty and sensitivity analysis

Page 23: In general a very good chapter. We like that you take another scenario into account, and that you relate these result to the previous result.

## Conclusion

In general it feels a bit short, and the last two sentence are slightly confusing. Perhaps also mention the results from the sensitivity analysis. Maybe move the last two sentences to discussion, and elaborate further. Why is it easier to "improve those connected to train"?

## Other general remarks

Why do you even consider traveling by train? This is not a situation that reflects the reality for a company located in Sweden. Perhaps it would be interesting to change the functional unit, and have it reflect "something" per km. Then it would also be interesting to know what would happen if you compare train and flight to both Copenhagen and London.

You start by presenting previous work, which we consider very good. However, what are you recommendations for further research? Have you found any weak spots in your own results where you think further research is needed?

As you also discuss in the report, the experience from having an online meeting or a physical meeting is quite big. Do you think it is important to have a Social Life Cycle Assessment that focuses on explaining the pros and cons between an online meeting and a physical meeting?

Are you results and conclusions inline with your expectations? Did you expect that air travel would have a significant higher impact compared to train?