

Pre-Seminar Summary and Reflection

Group 12

Peer review on: Group 5

Group 5 has gave a clear and fluent presentation on their LCA study, of which the goal is to conduct a comparative analysis on reading literatures between using computers and printing them on papers. Our reflections are based barely on information provided by their presentation.

1. Mention at least two things about the project that was particularly good/inspiring/creative

- 1) The group has chosen an interesting topic that commonly arises in our daily study life. Based on the functional unit - reading 100 pages of documents, two flowcharts are of digital reading and paper-reading systems are clearly specified. Both foreground and background data are labeled accordingly. They chose functional unit based on the estimation on average literature required for one subject. It is quite logical.
- 2) The group has made several good assumptions, for example that the speed of reading will keep constant while reading both on paper and on a laptop. To make assumptions resembles the real life; they made a thorough study on the reading speed of different groups. Their efforts made to set reasonable assumptions are much appreciated.
- 3) The slides were designed simple but clear, and the presentation was well structured. Group mates had a good cooperation between each other. Everyone was not only well prepared for each own part, but also was clear about the whole picture of the project.

2. Suggest at least two things that could be improved

- 1) Many simplifications have made in the project. We suggest that some parts could be further developed and analyzed. For example, they only considered paper printed in black and white, but printing in colors could also be analyzed as a sensitivity analysis.
- 2) The group will use models of printer and computer that are already existed in Simapro database, which are outdated information from 2002. We suggest the group to do more works in LCIA and modeling, for instance, to edit the models using some new data. Otherwise, the project will be quite simplified and the results will not be relievable to be applied in the status quo.
- 3) We recommend the group to discuss more on how other properties may influence the choice, such as conformability for eyes, accessibility, economic values etc. Based on results from LCA and other properties assessed, the group could suggest a better way for reading materials.

3. Mention at least two things that could be improved in your own project, as a result of what you learned from others during the pre-seminar

- 1) Other groups had very well defined goal and scope, and the reasons for carrying out the study were clearly explained. But in our study, because the goal of study had switched several times, the reasons for our project are not as straightforward as others. We need to clarify the goal and scope more clearly and present why this project is of importance to stakeholders and authorities.
- 2) We need to be more careful with assumptions and limitations because our project is based on a real case. The modeling may become complicated if we include more and more information in the project. So we need a good control on the level of simplification and agree on the extent of details.
- 3) Our presentation exceeded the time limitations because too detailed information was presented. We should bear the requirements on presentation in mind and present a

broad picture with important information pointed out, rather than giving too many details to audiences.

- 4) Our group mates had not prepared the presentation so well that one slide was lacking of presenter. It means we lack a good communication and cooperation among teammates, and this is something that we need to improve in further phases of the project.