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**1. Mention two things (at least) about the project that was particularly**

**good/inspiring/creative.**

The first thing that our group found interesting/inspiring was that the plastic bag actually could be the “winner” of the comparative LCA study (meaning that it has a lower environmental impact). It is apparently a preconceived notion that paper generally is the preferable choice when compared to plastics.

A second thought is that the study felt very up-to-date, due to the environmental impacts that are known to be associated with plastics, such as littering oceans, change of land use and fossil fuel consumption (and so forth).

In general, the project was well mapped out and very thought out - with a clear structure and systems approach.

**2. Suggest two things (at least) that could be improved in the project.**

We thought that the accuracy of the study would increase if only Swedish data was used for the average use of plastic bags in the households - since the geographical boundary was limited to Sweden. Now they have collected this data from UK, which they extrapolate to match the Swedish bags - they differ in both composition and in size. We assume that using direct Swedish data for this would bring more certainty.

We also suggest that the group should update the flowcharts, which were not complete - they need to add emissions and energy flows, and take away/cut off those areas not being assessed in their LCA.

Another suggestion is that they could add natural land transformation to their list of “focus-impact categories” - since they already had listed a few that they already now thought would be most important.

Furthermore we pointed out that they could check which pulping process that is commonly used in sweden for making paper bags, since chemical pulping(which they now use in their study-kraft pulping) in general has a higher environmental impact than mechanical pulping - and mechanical pulping is common in sweden.

**3. Mention two things (at least) that you will improve in your own project, as a result of what you learned from others during the pre-seminar.**

The most important suggestion that we took with us, and already have changed, is our functional unit. They pointed out that we lacked a motivation to our choice - and suggested that we could consider the lifespan of the ceramic cup as reference. So we did, and it resulted in a change from 900 servings to 1000 instead.

Another suggestion was to check whether we needed to count in/estimate transportation from the wholesaler - if the paper cups might require more than one transportation-occasion during the 1000 servings.

A third suggestion was to clarify the intended audience - which is organisations and institutions - offices that offer coffee to their employers.

Finally we were suggested to investigate if there are any allocation issues connected with the raw material extraction for the paper cup manufacturing and to decide if longterm emissions should be counted in.