**Pre-seminar reflection, 22 nov**

By group 3: Amanda Sievers, Dongyi Ou, Maja Reichard, Timmy Rosendal

**Comments on the work done by group 11**

The LCA subject is really interesting, and the presentation was good. Since the group had changed their project because of data gaps, it was relevant to show the progression to show the project development. They presented both project concepts all the way through, with the different goals, scope and so on. It’s good that they identified that the initial data gaps were insurmountable and changed the project design.

Another thing that we appreciated was their flow charts. They were really nice and easy to follow. An easy flow chart makes it so much easier to follow the thoughts about the project and how they thought about different parts of the project. We will use their flowchart software recommendations for our own project.

One thing that we think that the group could look over is the functional unit. It didn’t felt like the group had that much background information to motivate that the functional unit was the most appropriate option. The type of functional unit is good, but the exact numbers used could be motivated a bit more thoroughly. Another group in our seminar had t-shirts as well, and discussing this with them could be one idea. Another thing to potentially look into, that we might have misunderstood, is whether the data gaps where all solved by switching the product focus, or if there are more data gaps that are likely to appear further on in the modeling. Data gaps are hard to predict, but it could be good to make sure that the new project direction is viable.

**Improvements on our own project**

The first thing that we are going to do is to take inspiration from group 11 for our flowcharts by using the yEd software. Additionally, we think that we could improve the sensitivity analysis. In the feedback discussion, we talked about the length of the meeting and the number of people attending. While we have a method for deciding this, a survey done on AtlasCopco, varying these numbers can be a good sensitivity analysis. We also need to do sensitivity analysis on Internet and Skype, but we are not sure which assumptions we need to make yet and as such we don’t know what to vary yet.

Another issue that we must consider is to define the start- and endpoints for the travel. If the points are the airports, only the flight is included. However, it might be more realistic to assume that the traveler takes a taxi between the airport and the city center at both ends.

Other things that we should define is the function of a meeting, and which impact categories to consider. These are some of the things we need to look closer at and improve.