Lesson FS5 Balancing Act Article Chart Analysis Handout- Ambassadors 2017

Fill in the following chart using the article, “The Great Balancing Act”. Complete the highlighted menu items assigned to your group.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Course | Menu | Which of the 5 identified stakeholders from before would be impacted by this particular menu item? | Would they be impacted in a positive or negative way? | How would they be impacted (justifying your answer)? | Looking at the dots on the side of the menu item and state whether you agree with the dots or not. Justify your answer. | What is the overall impact to food availability and GHG emissions? | Do you agree that it will have that impact on food availability and GHG emissions? Justify your answer. |
| Hold Down Consumption | Reduce food loss and waste | Environment | Positively | Food waste harms the environment because it removes nutrients without replacing them. | I agree with all of their choices because reducing waste we are reducing the amount of food people need to buy & amount we need to produce. | Increasing availability and reducing emissions | Increasing food availability by not using as much, reducing greenhouse emissions by not making as much |
| Reduce Obesity | Urban citizens in developing countries | Positively | Urban environments typically have a high obesity rate and by reducing the number of obese individuals it would affect urban life and the citizens. | I don’t agree with this because I don’t think there is a correlation between obesity and gender. | If by reducing overweight people they mean restricting their diet it would positively help the environment by reducing use of electricity, water, and any emissions. | I don’t think it will have an impact of food availability because that would mean all overweight individuals just eat which isn’t really true. But like I said before reducing food use would reduce emissions. |
| Eat fewer animal products. | Small farmers in developing countries | Both depending on what they grow/farm | Animal farmers would be negatively impacted; other farmers positively | Agree w all. Meat costs more → reducing poverty; this indirectly helps women; meat production harms the environment | Increased food availability; reduced greenhouse emissions | Animals eat a lot of our grain produced → more food available if less meat; methane emissions reduced |
| Shift meat consumption away from beef. | Environment | Positively | Less GHG emissions, since the demand for cows would go down and farmers would hypothetically stop forcing cows to grow? Cows also need a lot of water compared the amount of meat they may have. | Agree w/ poverty b/c it would allow the water and feed usually used to feed cows would be able to be redistributed to other places.  I disagree with gender b/c I don’t think it affects gender at all. | It’s negative for both. | I agree b/c since cows need a lot of water compared to the amount of meat they give it would be more efficient to redistribute the water to other crops. This would allow the water to be used more efficiently and more food available. This would also bring down GHG’s b/c cows release a lot of methane which is a GHG. W/ the demand of beef low, ranchers would not have more cows. |
| Achieve replacement fertility rates. | Urban citizens in developing countries | Positively | Less overcrowding | Agree w all. Less people → less wealth to be distributed; women don’t have to spend as much time w childcare; less people →less environmental impact | Increasing food availability; reducing greenhouse emissions | Fewer people → fewer mouths to feed; less people to pollute |
| Reduce biofuel demand for food crops. | Agricultural supply |  |  |  |  |  |
| Course | Menu | Which of the 5 identified stakeholders from before would be impacted by this particular menu item? | Would they be impacted in a positive or negative way? | How would they be impacted (justifying your answer)? | Looking at the dots on the side of the menu item and state whether you agree with the dots or not. Justify your answer. | What is the overall impact to food availability and GHG emissions? | Do you agree that it will have that impact on food availability and GHG emissions? Justify your answer. |
| Produce more food without land expansion | Boost yields through attentive crop and animal breeding | Rep. Agri. Supply | Negative | The farmer doesn't need to buy fertilizer because they're making their own. | yes i thought with the natural fertilizer that everything else will stay the same(neutral) | Increase in food and decrease in GHG | I Agree, with their homemade natural fertilizer they are not releasing GHG. |
| “Leave no farmer behind” | Small farmers | Positive | They would receive the same standard farming efficiency levels | Yes, better conditions better results + less work | MORE FOOD LESS GHGE | Agree, more efficient farms can produce more food while reducing GHGE |
| Plant existing cropland more frequently | Small farmers | Positive | More than one crop rotation per year would increase the food produced and their income | No, more rotations, more work | MORE FOOD LESS GHGE | Yes, crop rotation reduces use of fertilizer and produces more food |
| Improve soil and water management | Water Supply | Positive | They want to help Conserve the water supply | Yes while helping conserve the water their helping the ecosystems water | More FOod  Less GHG | The food will stay the same and the GHG will decrease due to the less run off by saving the water |
| Expand onto low- carbon degraded lands | The environment | Negative | Expanding onto “degraded lands”. Those can grow back into forests | No, ecosystems are being destroyed | More food, less GHG | No, although it does produce more food, the production of crops still causes GHGE |
| Increase productivity of pasture and grazing lands | Environment | Positive | More |  |  |  |
| Reduce then stabilize wild fish catch | Small farmers in developing countries | Negative | They would catch less fish and make less profit | Disagree b/c it also affect the profit. | Increase food availability and decrease GHG emissions | Disagree b/c there is a reduction of fish caught which means less food will be available |
| Increase productivity of aquaculture | The Environment | Negative | Increase aquaculture production while increasing resource ( feed, land, water, energy,) efficiency. | Disagree b/c we need to increase GHG | Increase food availability and increase GHG. | Agree, b/c increasing food production, will need to increase the use of energy. |
| Course | Menu | Which of the 5 identified stakeholders from before would be impacted by this particular menu item? | Would they be impacted in a positive or negative way? | How would they be impacted (justifying your answer)? | Looking at the dots on the side of the menu item and state whether you agree with the dots or not. Justify your answer. | What is the overall impact to food availability and GHG emissions? | Do you agree that it will have that impact on food availability and GHG emissions? Justify your answer. |
| Reduce Emissions and other impacts from other agriculture activities | Improve the feed efficiency of ruminant livestock | Small farmers in developing countries | + | More food would be produced and the quality of livestock would be improved | Agree b/c less methane emissions are better for the environment. | Decrease food availability and decrease GHG emissions | Agree b/c more food would be fed to livestock which means food for human consumption would decrease. Improving livestock feed efficiency requires the use of fossil fuels. |
| Make fertilization more efficient | The environment | + | Fertilizer negatively impacts the environment so reducing the amount would be beneficial to the soil and plants | Agree b/c more food would be produced which is good for poverty alleviation. Ecosystems, climate, and water would improve too b/c less fossil fuels would be used and fertilizers wouldn't contaminate the water | Decrease food availability and increase GHG emissions | Disagree because the plant absorption of fertilizer would increase which means more food might be produced. Fertilizers require fossil fuels to be made so reducing fertilizers reduces GHG emissions. |
| Manage rice paddies to reduce emissions | The environment | + | Methane emissions would be reduced | Agree b/c methane emissions are reduced, water and soil management are improved which positively impacts ecosystems, climate, and water. | Food availability decreases and GHG emissions decreases | It depends for food availability because some countries don’t value rice as an important crop. Rice paddies don’t use up a lot of GHG emissions compared to other types of crops |