



IGU E-NEWSLETTER

Quarterly

URL: <http://www.homeofgeography.org/>

e-mail: g.bellezza@homeofgeography.org



New Series 8

October

2013

Editor: *Giuliano Bellezza*

This Newsletter is circulated to more than 1500 individuals and bodies. Announcements, information, calls for participation in scientific events, programmes and projects are welcome. Please send them to giuliano.bellezza@uniroma1.it



CONTENTS OF THIS ISSUE

- 1) **Remarks from IGU President Vladimir Kolosov**
 - 1.a) **Geography of the IGU**
 - 1.b) **San Francisco Declaration**

- 2) **Reports from Conferences and Meetings**
 - 2.a) **8th Japan-Korea-China joint Conference on Geography, Fukuoka, Kyushu University, July 31 to August 4, 2013**
 - 2.b) **IGU Regional Conference, Kyoto, 2-9 August 2013**
 - 2.b1) **English Version**
 - 2.b2) **Version Française par Yves Boquet**

 - 2.c) **EUGEO 2013, Rome, 4-6 September 2013**

- 3) **Canada Denies IGU President Visa**

- 4) **Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change: from the 5th Report**

5) New Springer Series on Geographical and Environmental Sciences

(Communication from R.B. Singh, IGU VP)

6) Forthcoming events

6.1) **Region-2013: Optimal Development Strategy: International Conference, Karkhiv, 6-8 November 2013**

6.2) **Eau: Resource, risque et développement durable, Fès (Maroc) 27-28 November**

6.3) **Global Congress on Intelligent Systems and Global Congress on Intelligent Systems Hong Kong, 3-4 December**

6.4) **ISPRS-IGU-ICA Workshop on Borderlands Modeling and Understanding for Global Sustainability, Beijing, 5-6 December**

6.5) **CISP-BMEI 2013, Hangzhou 16-18 December**

6.6) **12th International Asian Urbanization Conference, Varanasi, 28-30 December**

6.7) **L'Information Géographique et le Monde Changeant, Sfax, Faculté de Lettres, 27-28 Janvier 2014**



1) REMARKS FROM IGU PRESIDENT VLADIMIR KOLOSSOV

Dear Colleagues,

in the preceding IGU e-newsletter the draft minutes of our Regional Conference in Kyoto, have been published. KRG has been the major event in the activity of the international geographical community in 2013, so I like to express some comments. In my opinion, it was very successful: firstly, because the scientific programme was so interesting and diverse; it included sessions organized by 39 of the 40 IGU Commissions as well as meetings held on the initiative of separate groups, key lectures and special sessions devoted to the perspectives of our Union and to the main IGU interdisciplinary projects (*International Year of Global Understanding* and *Our Sustainable Cities*). The Conference proved again how important it is to build joint projects and to develop cooperation within and between IGU Commissions. As Claude Bernard once said, “Art means “I”, Science means “We”. So, in coming together at such large conferences, we become stronger, we realize how large is the global geographical community, how influential it can and should be. The Conference in Kyoto gathered about 1600 participants, and a great number of them came from the Asian-Pacific region, which justifies the very idea of regional conferences. Our days in the ancient Japanese capital were filled with an intense and rich dialogue - a dialogue between geographical sub-disciplines, human and physical geography, geography and other sciences, between researchers and practitioners, between different generations of geographers, between East and West, North and South and, perhaps, most importantly of all, a dialogue between colleagues and good friends.

Secondly, the August days in Kyoto showed that IGU, facing new challenges, was able to find new directions and forms of activity. I refer to new ideas approved at the meeting of Commissions' Chairs and the IGU Executive (see the minutes of the EC session in Kyoto

the preceding issue), the initiatives concerning a broader involvement of young scholars in IGU activities, particularly through the contacts with the association of Young Earth Scientists (YES), the preparation of the extraordinary International Geographical Congress on the occasion of the IGU centennial in 2022, the relations with ICSU, ISSC and other global scientific organizations. We also welcome new national geographical communities which have recently applied for membership in IGU or updated it.

The Conference marked a step in the promotion of geographical education in both secondary schools and universities. In many countries we observe an attempt to replace geography by “synthetic” courses of natural or social disciplines or simply to remove it from school curricula altogether. The declaration signed by IGU, Eugeo and Eurogeo in early September in Rome (*see below, in this newsletter*) is a direct result of our meetings in Kyoto.

I particularly appreciated the special session on the status of geographical journals, the issues of their ranking and open access. The presentation by Professors Christian Vandermotten, Mike Meadows and Ton Dietz at this session demonstrated that the abuse of citation indices by those who evaluate our activity is a serious threat to the future of geographical departments and can undermine the personal careers of many scholars. It was agreed that IGU should endorse the San Francisco Declaration (*see following point 1.b*) and that IGU should develop recommendations on the matter to national research and education governmental institutions.

Thirdly, and last but not at all the least, the Conference in Kyoto was so successful due to the exemplary work of its local organizing committee. We all noticed the rapid and efficient registration facilities, the tireless work of volunteers, always active, friendly and helpful, a user friendly programme handbook, a memorable opening ceremony and many more highlights. We would like to thank again our Japanese colleagues for having organized for us this wonderful geography ‘holiday’. We understand that these hot August days were the culmination of their long and hard work, that it was not easy to make everything run so smoothly, exactly on schedule, and how difficult it was to accommodate all our requests and interests. These tremendous efforts surely paid off.

Vladimir Kolosov

President of IGU

1.a) GEOGRAPHY OF THE IGU:

Distribution of the Steering Committees’ Chairs and members by countries

By mid-2013, IGU had 39 Commissions, and the number of their Steering Committees’ members made up 410. An analysis of their distribution by macro-regions and countries is of interest because it is a ground of the IGU ambitions to keep its status as truly global organization and because it shows the results of its efforts to involve geographers from low income countries to its activity.

Number of IGU Chairs*, by countries (number)


Germany	4
Italy	3
United States of America	3
China	2
Japan	2
Mexico	2
Switzerzerland	2
The Netherlands	2
United Kingdom	2
Argentina	1
Australia	1
Canada	1
Czech Republic	1
France	1
Georgia	1
Israel	1
New Zealand	1
Perú	1
Poland	1
Portugal	1
Russia	1
Singapore	1
Slovakia	1
Spain	1
Sweden	1
China-Taipei	1

In total, 72 national geographical communities were represented in the Steering Committees (SC). This figure is close to the number of IGU countries members. But, of course, the representation of different countries is very uneven. (*fig at left*). Only 16 countries could delegate 10 and more persons to the SCs. The top five countries are the US (32 members), the UK (28), Japan (22), Australia (21) and Germany (19). Other leading countries have 10 to 15 representatives. Interestingly, this distribution in general matches the annual fee paid by to IGU by national geographical associations, though there are the countries which seem to be “under-“ or “over-represented”. The Brazilian geographical community unfortunately does not contribute last years to the IGU budget but is relatively well represented in the SCs.

Europeans almost absolutely dominate among the members of the SCs: they account for 47.6% of them (the share of West, North, and South Europe makes up about 40%, East Europe – the remaining 7.6%).

There are very few African geographers in the SCs (5.1%), and most of them are from the South African Republic. Respectively, according to the

official UN classification, 74.4% of the SCs’ members live in developed countries, 21.5% - in developing ones, and he remaining 4.1% work in transition countries.



The general distribution of Commissions’ Chairs (including co-Chairs and associate Chairs) almost perfectly mirrors this picture (*fig. 2*): 53.8% of them are from Europe, 20.5% - from Asia and 18.8% from North America, no Africans. Almost exactly the same percentage as among the members represents developed (74%) and developing countries (21%), while the share of transition countries accounts for 5%. But the order of countries is different: four Chairs of 39 are from Germany; Italy and the US are represented by three Chairs each, China, Japan, Mexico, Switzerzerland, the Netherlands and the UK – by two Chairs each.

The conclusions from this simple analysis are clear: firstly, despite of the unequal representation of different countries, IGU is a global organization; secondly, a larger involvement of geographers from the so called developing countries remains one of its priorities.

The “old continent” is followed by Asia (21.2%) and North America (18.8%). The UN division of the world into regions is used.

1.b) SAN FRANCISCO DECLARATION ON RESEARCH ASSESSMENT

Putting Science int the assessment of research

There is a pressing need to improve the ways in which the output of scientific research is evaluated by funding agencies, academic institutions, and other parties.

To address this issue, a group of editors and publishers of scholarly journals met during the Annual Meeting of The American Society for Cell Biology (ASCB) in San Francisco, CA, on December 16, 2012. The group developed a set of recommendations, referred to as the *San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment*. We invite interested parties across all scientific disciplines to indicate their support by adding their names to this Declaration.

The outputs from scientific research are many and varied, including: research articles reporting new knowledge, data, reagents, and software; intellectual property; and highly trained young scientists. Funding agencies, institutions that employ scientists, and scientists themselves, all have a desire, and need, to assess the quality and impact of scientific outputs. It is thus imperative that scientific output is measured accurately and evaluated wisely.

The Journal Impact Factor is frequently used as the primary parameter with which to compare the scientific output of individuals and institutions. The Journal Impact Factor, as calculated by Thomson Reuters, was originally created as a tool to help librarians identify journals to purchase, not as a measure of the scientific quality of research in an article. With that in mind, it is critical to understand that the Journal Impact Factor has a number of well-documented deficiencies as a tool for research assessment. These limitations include: A) citation distributions within journals are highly skewed [1–3]; B) the properties of the Journal Impact Factor are field-specific: it is a composite of multiple, highly diverse article types, including primary research papers and reviews [1, 4]; C) Journal Impact Factors can be manipulated (or “gamed”) by editorial policy [5]; and D) data used to calculate the Journal Impact Factors are neither transparent nor openly available to the public [4, 6, 7].

Below we make a number of recommendations for improving the way in which the quality of research output is evaluated. Outputs other than research articles will grow in importance in assessing research effectiveness in the future, but the peer-reviewed research paper will remain a central research output that informs research assessment. Our recommendations therefore focus primarily on practices relating to research articles published in peer-reviewed journals but can and should be extended by recognizing additional products, such as datasets, as important research outputs. These recommendations are aimed at funding agencies, academic institutions, journals, organizations that supply metrics, and individual researchers.

A number of themes run through these recommendations:

- the need to eliminate the use of journal-based metrics, such as Journal Impact Factors, in funding, appointment, and promotion considerations;
- the need to assess research on its own merits rather than on the basis of the journal in which the research is published; and

- the need to capitalize on the opportunities provided by online publication (such as relaxing unnecessary limits on the number of words, figures, and references in articles, and exploring new indicators of significance and impact).

We recognize that many funding agencies, institutions, publishers, and researchers are already encouraging improved practices in research assessment. Such steps are beginning to increase the momentum toward more sophisticated and meaningful approaches to research evaluation that can now be built upon and adopted by all of the key constituencies involved.

The signatories of the *San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment* support the adoption of the following practices in research assessment.

General Recommendation

1. Do not use journal-based metrics, such as Journal Impact Factors, as a surrogate measure of the quality of individual research articles, to assess an individual scientist's contributions, or in hiring, promotion, or funding decisions.

For funding agencies

2. Be explicit about the criteria used in evaluating the scientific productivity of grant applicants and clearly highlight, especially for early-stage investigators, that the scientific content of a paper is much more important than publication metrics or the identity of the journal in which it was published.
3. For the purposes of research assessment, consider the value and impact of all research outputs (including datasets and software) in addition to research publications, and consider a broad range of impact measures including qualitative indicators of research impact, such as influence on policy and practice.

For institutions

4. Be explicit about the criteria used to reach hiring, tenure, and promotion decisions, clearly highlighting, especially for early-stage investigators, that the scientific content of a paper is much more important than publication metrics or the identity of the journal in which it was published.
5. For the purposes of research assessment, consider the value and impact of all research outputs (including datasets and software) in addition to research publications, and consider a broad range of impact measures including qualitative indicators of research impact, such as influence on policy and practice.

For publishers

6. Greatly reduce emphasis on the journal impact factor as a promotional tool, ideally by ceasing to promote the impact factor or by presenting the metric in the context of a variety of journal-based metrics (e.g., 5-year impact factor, EigenFactor [8], SCImago [9], *h*-index, editorial and publication times, etc.) that provide a richer view of journal performance.
7. Make available a range of article-level metrics to encourage a shift toward assessment based on the scientific content of an article rather than publication metrics of the journal in which it was published.
8. Encourage responsible authorship practices and the provision of information about the specific contributions of each author.
9. Whether a journal is open-access or subscription-based, remove all reuse limitations on reference lists in research articles and make them available under the Creative Commons Public Domain Dedication [10].
10. Remove or reduce the constraints on the number of references in research articles,

and, where appropriate, mandate the citation of primary literature in favor of reviews in order to give credit to the group(s) who first reported a finding.

For organizations that supply metrics

11. Be open and transparent by providing data and methods used to calculate all metrics.
12. Provide the data under a licence that allows unrestricted reuse, and provide computational access to data, where possible.
13. Be clear that inappropriate manipulation of metrics will not be tolerated; be explicit about what constitutes inappropriate manipulation and what measures will be taken to combat this.
14. Account for the variation in article types (e.g., reviews versus research articles), and in different subject areas when metrics are used, aggregated, or compared.

For researchers

15. When involved in committees making decisions about funding, hiring, tenure, or promotion, make assessments based on scientific content rather than publication metrics.
16. Wherever appropriate, cite primary literature in which observations are first reported rather than reviews in order to give credit where credit is due.
17. Use a range of article metrics and indicators on personal/supporting statements, as evidence of the impact of individual published articles and other research outputs [11].
18. Challenge research assessment practices that rely inappropriately on Journal Impact Factors and promote and teach best practice that focuses on the value and influence of specific research outputs.

References

1. Adler, R., Ewing, J., and Taylor, P. (2008) Citation statistics. A report from the International Mathematical Union, in www.mathunion.org/publications/report/citationstatistics0
2. Seglen, P.O. (1997) Why the impact factor of journals should not be used for evaluating research. *BMJ* 314, 498–502.
3. Editorial (2005). Not so deep impact. *Nature* 435, 1003–1004.
4. Vanclay, J.K. (2012) Impact Factor: Outdated artefact or stepping-stone to journal certification. *Scientometric* 92, 211–238.
5. The PLoS Medicine Editors (2006). The impact factor game. *PLoS Med* 3(6): e291 doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.0030291.
6. Rossner, M., Van Epps, H., Hill, E. (2007). Show me the data. *J. Cell Biol.* 179, 1091–1092.
7. Rossner M., Van Epps H., and Hill E. (2008). Irreproducible results: A response to Thomson Scientific. *J. Cell Biol.* 180, 254–255.
8. <http://www.eigenfactor.org/>
9. <http://www.scimagojr.com/>
10. <http://opencitations.wordpress.com/2013/01/03/open-letter-to-publishers>
11. <http://altmetrics.org/tools/>

The complete list of 155 Original Individual Signers and 78 Original Association Signers can be found in www.homeofgeography.org/news2013/June.



2) REPORTS FROM CONFERENCES AND MEETINGS

2a) 8TH JAPAN-KOREA-CHINA JOINT CONFERENCE ON GEOGRAPHY, KYUSHU UNIVERSITY, FUKUOKA, JULY 31 TO AUGUST 4, 2013

The Japan-Korea-China Joint Conference on Geography intends to provide Asian geographers, mainly young geographers from these three countries, with a venue for facilitating a lively discussion, and an opportunity to build and expand the network of scholars that will persist for the future. The Conference is held annually in Japan, Korea, or China.

The Conference of this year, which was held at Kyushu University from Wednesday, July 31, 2013 to Sunday, August 4, 2013, was the eighth Conference (hereinafter called the 8th Conference). The number of participants of this Conference was the highest ever, with 144 participants not only from Japan, Korea and China, but also from India, Austria and Vietnam (Photo 1). It indicates that the Conference represented diverse viewpoints existing within Asia more than ever.

The theme of the 8th Conference was “One Asia/Thousand Asias: Toward the Construction of New Crossroads.” The organizing committee put the following wishes into this theme. They are: to share a vision of Asia as a pursuer of the “crossroads” of interwoven diversity and cooperation, in contrast with globalizing economies and societies; and to contribute to the development of the various regions and societies coexisting in Asia.



Photo 1 Group photo in front of the main venue of the 8th Conference

The 8th Conference commenced on July 31, with a keynote speech entitled “Thinking from Japan beyond the Four “D”s, Concerning with Social Capital—Diversity, Disparity, Depopulation and Deprivation—” by TSUTSUMI Kenji (Osaka University).

On August 1 and 2, the participants delivered 63 oral and 25 poster presentations, which generated vigorous discussions. A couple of short trips were organized on August 1. One is a visit to the new campus of Kyushu University, and another is a tour to observe urban development in the center of Fukuoka City. After some presentations on August 2, closing ceremony was held to confer the “Young Geographer Awards” to the following young researchers whose presentations at the Conference were excellent: YIN Guanwen (graduate student, Kyushu University), SHIRAIISHI Natsuko (graduate student, Kyoto University) and WUZHATI Yeerken (graduate student, Chinese Academy of Sciences). The 8th Conference also launched the “Impressive Presentation Awards” to honor memorable and interesting oral or poster presentations. The following awardees were chosen by anonymous voting: PARK Sookyung (Sangmyung University), LI Gang (Northwest University) and LI Nana (graduate student, Nara Women’s University). The Conference also conferred “Welcome Awards” to two presenters who were not from Japan, Korea, or China.




Photo 2 A scene of the joint session at Kyoto RC

A field trip was conducted on August 3 to further understanding in industrial modernization and the post-industrial society in Fukuoka. The first destinations of the trip were Tagawa City Coal Mining Historical Museum and the site of Yahata Steelworks, followed by Kitakyushu Eco-town, which was observed from the wheel window. The final visit was to Mojiko Retro District. Those who were to join in the IGU 2013 Kyoto Regional Conference (Kyoto RC) spent the night traveling by ferry from Shin-Moji Port to Kobe Port through Seto Inland Sea. They visited Korea Town in Tsuruhashi District, Expo '70 Commemorative Park, and the National Museum of Ethnology in Osaka on August 4 before proceeding to Kyoto.

On August 5 at Kyoto RC, a joint session entitled “Regional diversity and a possibility of collaboration in East Asia – a contribution from young geographers –” was held jointly with the Kyoto RC organizer. The seven presenters were ENDO Nao (Kochi University), KONNO Ena (Tokyo University of Agriculture), CHOI Haeok (Tsinghua University), ZHANG Yan et al. (Beijing Union University), TSURUSHIMA Daiki (graduate student, Tohoku University),

KIENER Johannes (graduate student, Osaka City University), and LU Shan (Northeast Normal University). These young scholars from East Asia engaged in an active debate with the audience to explore the ways in which geographical studies should be conducted, including dimensions unique to juniors, such as urban-rural space, physical-human field, and micro-macro scale. The joint session gave us a chance to appeal our accomplishments over the past eight years to both domestic and international geographic communities.

The 9th Conference is scheduled from July 6 to 9, 2014 at Pusan National University, Korea.

KONNO Ena and NORITO Takashi

Secretaries-General of the 8th Conference Organizing Committee

2.b) IGU REGIONAL CONFERENCE, KYOTO, 5-9 AUGUST

2.b1) English Version

Report of Kyoto Regional Conference

The IGU Kyoto Regional Conference (KRC) held at the Kyoto International Conference Center (ICC Kyoto) August 4–9, 2013, was successfully concluded.

The conference was well attended: The total number of participants, including both pre-registration and on-site registration, but excluding those who did not come to the conference venue, was 1,431 persons from 61 countries/regions. Such an attendance is more than we had previously expected, and it seems fairly high for an IGU Regional Conference. We were very honored that so many participants attended the KRC. Moreover, the reputation of the KRC was on the whole very good; in particular, most participants rated the conference management as very effective. It was our great pleasure to receive such a favorable evaluation.



Kyoto International Conference Center - Centre International de Conférences (photo G.B.)

Since we have already submitted the more official, detailed report to the IGU Executive Committees, we will minimize repetitive description in this report and mainly touch on fresh

impressions rather than basic information such as invitation history, participant numbers, sessions and presentations, and opening/closing ceremonies.

The special exhibition “Traditional Wisdom and Modern Knowledge presented in Maps” was held in honor of the IGU Kyoto Regional Conference at the Kyoto University Museum from July 31 through September 1. Kyoto University is famous for its excellent collection of old maps. The KRC participants were able to enter at no cost by showing their official conference nametags at the museum entrance. The total number who entered the museum during this period amounted to 9,827 persons, although the exact number of entrants with the KRC nametag was not recorded.

A public lecture was held on August 4 at the Kyoto University Clock Tower Centennial Hall. This lecture was conducted in Japanese, since it aimed to disseminate geographical results to Japanese citizen in honor of the joint-hosting of the IGU Kyoto Regional Conference by the National Committee of Japan for IGU and the Science Council of Japan. The program also include a special lecture entitled “Geographical Environment and Language” by the well-known writer Yang Yi in the morning and lectures by six experts of Geoparks in Japan in the afternoon. The total number of participants was approximately 130 persons, and questions after the lectures tended to concentrate on how to gain approval of Geoparks.

A cocktail party was held at the banquet hall and the garden of the venue on the evening of August 5. To open the party, Professor Vladimir Kolossov, IGU President, made a short speech. The Organizing Committee offered the participants a special sake, which was produced in Kyoto’s Fushimi Ward, a leading sake production area in Japan. Some of the attendants enjoyed rather cool air outside due to the shower before the party.



Left: Professor Vladimir Kolossov, President of IGU, making a toast at the cocktail party

Right: Professor Jean-Robert Pitte giving a speech in a Plenary Session

Gauche, le professeur Vladimir Kolossov, président de l'UGI, prononçant un discours lors de la réception. Droite, le professeur Jean-Robert Pitte (France), conférence plénière du CRK

Although the Organizing Committee planned several social programs through the Japan Travel Bureau, there were not so many applications. Therefore, we decided to put together a tea ceremony at ICC Kyoto, since the venue has a beautiful Japanese tea ceremony house, called *Hosho-an*. Tea masters from *Urasenke*, the largest traditional tea ceremony school, presided over an authentic tea ceremony. We held a one-hour tea ceremony experience every hour on August 6 and 7. Although this was the first such experience for many of the participants, particularly those from overseas, approximately 160 persons enjoyed this event, and it got very favorable reviews.

In the afternoon of August 6, together with the KRC's Organizing Committee, Wiley held its first Geography Roundtable discussion, "Global Voices in Geography." This invitation-only event aimed to provide an intimate forum bringing together influential representatives from national, regional, and international geographical organizations to discuss shared areas of interest and opportunities to facilitate dialogue among scholars, practitioners and researchers around the world. The thirteen persons on behalf of various geographical associations or National Committees for IGU attended this interesting event and mainly talked about country-specific geographical issues. All of the participants acknowledged the significance of this event and engaged in quite active discussions; they shared the opinion that this event should continue in the future.

The Gala Dinner was held for approximately 300 participants at the Japanese restaurant *Ganko Nijoen Takasegawa*, whose location has a long and distinguished history in terms of the historical geography of Kyoto, on the evening of August 7. At the beginning, Professor Ronald Abler, the former IGU President, was recognized by the Tokyo Geographical Society. After giving a greeting, Professor Michio Nogami, President of the Society, gave Professor Abler the Tokyo Geographical Society Medal for his remarkable contributions to the development of geography. Furthermore, there was also an award ceremony conferring Honorary Membership in the Association of Japanese Geographers to Professor Abler during the closing ceremony. Professor Noritaka Yagasaki, President of the Association of Japanese Geographers, presented the certificate of merit to him.

At this conference, we gave special attention to supporting young researchers. Specifically, we not only set the registration fee for students lower than half that for standard participants but also prepared our own grants for 20 young researchers from developing countries. Moreover, four excellent poster presentations by young researchers registered as students were also recognized. The award ceremonies for IGU and KRC grant recipients as well as best poster presentation awardees were held during the closing ceremony. These ceremonies may be the first such event at an IGU's RC or IGC.



Award ceremony for best poster presentation awardees (left) and for the KRC grant awardees

We hope that every participant had a productive and enjoyable experience during this conference and enjoyed a pleasant stay in Kyoto, a city with a 1,200-year history. We are looking forward to seeing many of the KRC participants again in Kraków, Poland, in August 2014.

Yoshitaka Ishikawa

Chair, Organizing Committee of the KRC

Keiji Yano

Secretary-General, Organizing Committee of the KRC



*Left, sea tourism near the Tsuruga nuclear plant. Right, drums exhibition in the Opening Ceremony
Gauche, tourisme près du site nucléaire a Tsuruga. Droite, spectacle de tambourineurs (photos G.B.)*

Messages from the IGU Grant Awardees

Attending the International Geographical Union’s Regional conference was a great opportunity to meet geography researchers from all over the world. Furthermore it gave me new knowledge about geographical research in Asia, and especially Japan. Geography in itself is a field with great interdisciplinary potential, and a conference with so many different sub-disciplines represented is a fantastic platform for interdisciplinary discussion.

Lina Eklund, Sweden

Attending the Kyoto Regional Conference itself was also very beneficial to my position as a young scholar. It expanded my knowledge of geography and allowed me to gain valuable feedback and new perspectives, especially regarding my current research.

Minna Hsu, Taiwan

I also discovered some great techniques in the exhibition for preparing myself in GIS and RS skills. During the actual workshop I had the chance to practice my presentation skills and receive valuable feedback.

Hoang van Than, Vietnam

The quality of the oral presentations I found to be excellent. I particularly enjoyed and benefitted from the Health sessions which were most relevant to my area of research. These sessions exceeded my expectations from both a geography and epidemiological perspective. I plan to use some of the methods presented in my PhD studies and so it was very informative. Through discussion with other delegates I have also learned of research being carried out in other groups which I was not previously aware of, so this is extremely valuable to me. The networking opportunities at the conference were good and I feel I have established connections will be mutually beneficial in the future. Presenting my work to this audience was a positive experience, which I have gained from through questions and comments in the session and also through discussion it evoked over coffee.

Michelle Morris, United Kingdom

I must say, the conference has a direct impact in enhancing my teaching and research career and in turn will go a long way in promoting my teaching and research in the field of geography in general and social, population and gender geography in particular, in the state of Assam and India. To me, a conference as such, gives on a chance to locate one's own research in the broader world and truly feel a part of the International Geographical Union.

Madhushree Das, India



*Courtyard of the Science Council of Japan,
where the IGU EC was invited for a traditional Japanese dinner (photo G.B.)*

2.b2) Version Française par Yves Boquet

Rapport sur La Conférence régionale de Kyôto (CRK) de l'UGI

La Conférence qui s'est tenue au Centre International de Conférences de Kyôto (CICK) du 4 au 9 Août 2013, s'est achevée avec succès.



Kyoto International Conference Center - Centre International de Conférences de Kyôto

La conférence a été bien suivie : le nombre total de participants, pré-inscrits ou inscrits sur place, à l'exclusion de ceux qui ne sont pas venus sur le site de la conférence, s'est élevé à 1431 personnes de 61 pays ou régions. Une telle participation a dépassé nos prévisions, et apparaît assez élevée pour une Conférence Régionale de l'UGI . Nous avons été très honorés que tant de personnes aient participé à la CRK. En outre, l'impression donnée par la CRK a été dans l'ensemble très bonne; en particulier, la plupart des participants ont jugé très efficace la gestion de la conférence. Nous avons été ravis de recevoir une évaluation aussi positive.

Puisque nous avons déjà présenté un rapport détaillé plus officiel au Comité de Direction de l'UGI nous allons limiter les descriptions répétitives dans ce rapport et nous intéresser essentiellement à des impressions fraîches plutôt qu'aux données de base telles que l'historique de l'invitation, le nombre de participants, les sessions et présentations et les cérémonies d'ouverture ou de clôture.

L'exposition spéciale "Sagesse traditionnelle et connaissances modernes présentées dans les cartes" a été organisée, en l'honneur de la Conférence régionale de Kyôto de l'UGI, au Musée de l'Université de Kyôto du 31 Juillet au 1er Septembre. L'Université de Kyôto est célèbre pour son excellente collection de cartes anciennes. Les participants à la CRK ont pu entrer sans frais en montrant leurs badges officiels de la conférence à l'entrée du musée. Le nombre total de visiteurs du musée au cours de cette période s'élève à 9827 personnes, mais le nombre exact des participants à badge CRK n'a pas été enregistré.



Award ceremony for the former IUGG President Ronald Abler, who received the Tokyo Geographical Society Medal from Professor Michio Nogami, President of the Tokyo Geographical Society

Remise de prix pour l'ex-Président de l'UGI Ronald Abler, qui a reçu la Médaille de la Société Géographique de Tokyo des mains du professeur Michio Nogami, président de la Société Géographique de Tokyo.

Une conférence publique a eu lieu le 4 Août au “Clock Tower Centennial Hall” de l’Université de Kyôto. Cette conférence a été menée en japonais, car elle visait à diffuser les recherches géographiques aux citoyens japonais en l'honneur de l'accueil conjoint de la Conférence régionale de Kyôto de l’UGI par le Comité national UGI du Japon pour l’UGI et le Conseil des sciences du Japon. Le programme comprenait également une conférence spéciale intitulée “Environnement géographique et langage”, donnée par le célèbre écrivain Yang Yi dans la matinée, et des conférences données par six experts des Géoparcs au Japon, dans l'après-midi. Le nombre total de participants a été d'environ 130 personnes, et les questions après les conférences ont eu tendance à se concentrer sur la façon d'obtenir l'approbation des Géoparcs.

Un cocktail a eu lieu dans la salle de banquet et le jardin de la salle dans la soirée du 5 Août . Pour ouvrir les festivités, le professeur Vladimir Kolossov, Président de l’UGI, a prononcé un bref discours . Le comité organisateur a offert aux participants un saké spécial, fabriqué dans le district Fushimi de Kyôto, lieu majeur de production de saké au Japon. Certains des participants ont apprécié l’air plutôt frais à l'extérieur en raison de l’averse avant la réception.

Dans l'après-midi du 6 Août, en collaboration avec le Comité d'organisation de la CRK, la maison d’édition Wiley a tenu sa première table ronde de la géographie, “ Voix du monde en géographie”. Cet événement – sur invitation seulement – avait pour but de réunir un nombre réduit de représentants influents au niveau national, régional et des organisations géographiques internationales pour discuter des domaines d'intérêt communs et des possibilités de faciliter le

dialogue entre universitaires, praticiens et chercheurs du monde entier. Treize personnes, pour le compte de diverses associations géographiques ou comités nationaux de l'UGI, ont assisté à cet événement intéressant et surtout parlé des questions géographiques spécifiques à chaque pays. Tous les participants ont reconnu l'importance de cet événement et ont engagé des discussions très actives ; ils ont partagé l'opinion que cet événement devrait se poursuivre à l'avenir.



La cérémonie du thé comme programme social - Tea ceremony as a social program

Le dîner de gala a été organisé pour environ 300 participants au restaurant japonais Ganko Nijoen Takasegawa, dont l'emplacement a une histoire longue et distinguée en termes de géographie historique de Kyôto, dans la soirée du 7 Août. Au début de la soirée, le professeur Ronald Abler, ancien président de l'UGI, a été honoré par la Société géographique de Tokyo. Après avoir délivré un message d'accueil, le professeur Michio Nogami, président de la Société, a remis au professeur Abler la médaille de la Société géographique de Tokyo pour ses contributions remarquables au développement de la géographie. En outre, il y eut aussi une cérémonie conférant au professeur Abler le titre de membre honoraire de l'Association des Géographes Japonais, lors de la session de clôture. Le professeur Noritaka Yagasaki, président de l'Association des Géographes Japonais lui a remis le certificat.

Nous espérons que chaque participant aura eu une expérience productive lors de cette conférence et aura apprécié un agréable séjour à Kyôto, une ville avec une histoire de 1200 ans. Nous espérons revoir de nombreux participants du CRK à Cracovie, en Pologne, en Août 2014.

Yoshitaka Ishikawa

Président du Comité d'organisation du CRK

Keiji Yano

Secrétaire général du Comité d'organisation du CRK

2c) IV EUGEO CONFERENCE, ROME, 4-6 SEPTEMBER 2013

The IV Eugeo Conference started the night of 4th September, with a nice surprise for the invited key-note speakers: a visit in the center part of the City, animated by a jazz band (and this was a real amusement) on a normal tram, along normal tram-lines .

The real, scientific, Program started on 5th September, with several Parallel Sessions in the classrooms of the Faculty of Humanities of the University of Roma “La Sapienza”, from 10,30 to 17,00. Soon after the participants have been taken to the Sala della Protomoteca (Hall of bronze and marble busts) in the Capitol, where the Opening Ceremony took place, Chaired by Henk Ottens, President of EUGEO and Scientific Committee Member (SCM), with a Welcome Address of Franco Salvatori, former President of SGI and SCM. The first Plenary Session immediately followed, chaired by Sergio Conti, President of SGI. Keynote Speakers were (*photo at right*): Vladimir Kolossov, IGU President, ***Sovereignty, “Stateness” and Contested Borders in the Contemporary Geopolitical Context***, and Anne Buttimer, Former President, ***Changing Practices of Geography and Challenges of Century XXI***. The Ceremony closed with a welcome cocktail.



On 6th September the Parallel Session occurred from 8,30 to 13, when the 2nd Plenary took place, chaired by Gino De Vecchis (President of the Italian Association of Geography Teachers and SCM): keynote speakers were Ron Boschma (***Empirical Research in Evolutionary Economic Geography***) and Petros Petsimmaris (***Urban transformations in Europe and urban transformation of Europe***) (*photo at right*).



Parallel Sessions again took place, until 16,50, in time for the 3rd Plenary Session, Chaired by Franco Farinelli (President of the Association of Italian Geographers and SCM): keynotes speakers have been Armando Montanari (***International comparative research: experiences and outlooks for European geography***) and Ad De Roo (***Changing Water Futures in Europe: which role can geographers play?***). Once again all the participants could enjoy a bus transfer, this time for a visit and a brief symphonic concert in the wonderful seat of the Società Geografica Italiana, followed by the Social Dinner.

Parallel Sessions began at 8,30 on 7th September also, until 13,10, when the 4th Plenary Session took place, chaired by Lidia Scarpelli, President of the Italia Society for Geographical Studies and SCM: keynote speakers have been Peter Mehlbye, ***The European territory: New evidence, dynamics and prospects*** and Gyula Horváth, ***The regional structure and decentralization of science in Central and Eastern Europe***.

The last slots of Parallel Session occurred until 18,30, when Henk Ottens, EUGEO President, chaired the Closing Ceremony, with a farewell speech.

By 10th November 2013 the Congress Program, the Abstracts and the keynotes speeches videos will be available at www.eugeo2013.com.

(Newsletter editor personal comment:

The really rich and articulated program went on smoothly, with perfect respect of timing, thanks to the coordination of the Organising Committee, directed by Massimiliano Tabusi (EUGEO Secretary General) and composed also by Filippo Celata, Sandra Leonardi, Marco Maggioli, Filippo Randelli, Alessandro Ricci, Andrea Riggio, Claudia Robiglio. An efficient group of more than 50 other young volunteer helpers was a kind and valuable support for all the participants.

To be stressed that, thank to the unlimited fantasy of the Committee, if the key-note speakers had the surprise of the musical-tram-excursion, the participants could enjoy an incredible and very unusual selection of nice proposals: an Italian wines or foods tasting, in the renewed exhibition building called Eataly, and a choice of very unusual guided excursion, walking, biking, on the river and in underground Rome (attention: I don't mean the subway). The efficient group of volunteer helpers has been the outcome of an initiative of this exceptional Organising Committee: one of the members, teacher in a Technical School for Tourism, gathered all of her students, and the School recognised this practical experience as part of the compulsory apprenticeship).



*Left: the highly appreciated Tram-jazz-band;
right, the volunteers of the High School for Tourism.*



The established atmosphere was so friendly that IGU President Vladimir Kolossov and VP Giuliano Bellezza had no worry at all to realize the wish of the Executive Committee (*see IGU Newsletter, NS 7, IGU ED Meeting draft report, Cooperations and Outreaches*), that is an always growing cooperative attitude of EUGEO and EUROGEO. Both Association were willing to co-

operate during the 3 Sessions of the Geographical Education Commission, with the help of the Conference Coordinator. Eventually, all has been formalised as follows:

The representatives of the Italian Association of Geography Teachers (AIIG), the Association of Geographical Societies in Europe (EUGEO), the European Association of Geographers (EUROGEO) and the International Geographical Union (IGU), gathered for the congress session “Geography education’s challenges in response to changing geographies”. In this declaration, we underline clearly and strongly that the teaching of Geography in schools is fundamental for the future of Europe.

Rome Declaration on Geographical Education in Europe IV EUGEO Congress 2013

Geographical education provides students with essential capabilities and competences needed to know and understand the world. Responsible and effective uses of geographical information are vital for the future of Europe. Therefore, all European citizens need to understand how to deal with it. Geographical education provides them with the knowledge and skills to do this. For example, an appropriate use of geospatial data and technologies is necessary to help analyse and address problems related to water, climate, energy, sustainable development, natural hazards, globalisation and urban growth. Most of these big issues also have a distinct European dimension. Geography also deals with the daily living environment of citizens where issues such as housing, employment, transportation, provision of services and green spaces are important. These must all be addressed but in an integrated way, which only the study of Geography provides. Geographical knowledge is indispensable for well informed citizens, successful businessmen and policy makers.

The representatives of the Italian Association of Geography Teachers (AIIG), the Association of Geographical Societies in Europe (EUGEO), the European Association of Geographers (EUROGEO) and the International Geographical Union (IGU), gathered for the congress session “Geography education’s challenges in response to changing geographies”. In this declaration, we underline clearly and strongly that the teaching of Geography in schools is fundamental for the future of Europe.

With this firm conviction, we are committed to take initiatives in the countries of Europe and with the relevant European institutions to provide standards and guidelines that will help authorities develop relevant syllabuses and school curricula, methods and approaches in Geography that:

- apply geographical knowledge, skills and understanding to the main issues linked with processes of change in society, nature and environment at local, national, European and global levels; and
- highlight the educational values and the role of geographical education in a changing world.

We urge those responsible in European governments and educational systems:

- to recognise the educational value afforded by the study of Geography as an essential school subject; and
- to acknowledge its strategic role for realising active citizenship and balanced social, economic and environmental development.

We therefore request that:

- sufficient time for the teaching of Geography is allocated in curricula for primary and secondary schools;

- the teaching of Geography is limited to teachers with a qualified training in Geography and Geography Education.

Gino De Vecchis, President of the Italian Association of Geography Teachers (AIIG)

Karl Donert, President of the European Association of Geographers (EUROGEO)

Vladimir Kolossov, President of the International Geographic Union (IGU)

Henk Ottens, President of the Association of Geographical Societies in Europe (EUGEO)

Joop van der Schee, Co-chair of the Commission on Geographical Education of the International Geographic Union (IGU-CGE).

Rome, September 5th 2013



The signatories, left to right: Henk Ottens, Joop Van der Schee, Vladimir Kolossov, Karl Donert, Gino De Vecchis



3) CANADA DENIES IGU PRESIDENT VISA

International Geographical Union President Vladimir Kolossov was denied a visa to enter Canada to participate in the 10-12 October 2013 General Assembly of the International Social Science Council (ISSC) in Montréal. Knowing that visa application processing was lengthy (six weeks), Kolossov applied for the visa well in advance of his planned journey to Canada. In addition to the payment of a nonrefundable application fee of €125.00, Kolossov was interviewed at the Embassy after waiting outside in a lengthy queue for more than two hours.

Kolossov was informed on 2 September that his application was denied. The reason given by the Embassy for the denial was an alleged lack of evidence that Kolossov would leave Canada at the

end of his visit, a conclusion allegedly supported by his failure to provide evidence of employment in Russia and of possessing financial resources sufficient for his expenses in Canada. I have personally examined the papers Kolossov submitted with his application. They include a document from the Russian Academy of Sciences (translated into French as required) certifying Kolossov's employment and salary, and a letter from IGU Secretary General Michael Meadows certifying that IGU would pay Kolossov's expenses in Canada. The letter and reasons for refusing the visa are wholly at odds with the contents of Kolossov's application.

The IGU and the ISSC mounted a vigorous protest over the visa denial with the assistance and support of colleagues in Canada, some of whom enlisted the help of their respective members of Parliament. The only response of the Canadian Foreign Service was to suggest that Kolossov re-apply for the visa, a response that came much too late to be feasible, given the time needed to obtain a visa in Moscow. Hence the IGU was represented at the ISSC General Assembly by former IGU Vice President Ruth Fincher, a member of the ISSC Executive Committee, the IGU having withdrawn from the meeting in protest against the Canadian action. The ISSC General Assembly passed a resolution protesting the denial of a visa for Kolossov that will be transmitted to Canadian authorities and to other international scientific organizations.

The free exchange of scientists among countries of the world is a fundamental principle subscribed to by all international scientific organizations, especially the ISSC and the International Council for Science (ICSU). The IGU has brought this egregious example of the violation of that principle to the attention of the ICSU Committee on Freedom and Responsibility in the Conduct of Science (CRFS), in hopes that similar arbitrary and unreasonable denials of free scientific exchange will not recur. The case will also be widely publicized among other member organizations of ICSU and ISSC.

The IGU is grateful for the energetic assistance of scientists in Canada and elsewhere in protesting the denial of a visa to Kolossov, and especially the support of Professor Gordon McBean of the University of Western Ontario, President-Elect of the International Council for Science. We regret that their efforts appear to have had little or no effect on the Foreign Service of Canada, but their collegial solidarity in the cause of the open and free exchange of scientists and of IGU President Kolossov is deeply appreciated.

Ronald F. Abler, Past President, IGU



4) INTERGOVERNAMENTAL PANEL ON CLIMATE CHANGE, 5TH REPORT

IGU VP Qin Dahe is member of the Working Group I of the International Panel on Climate Change, and as such he is one of the writers of the Group to the IPCC Fifth Assessment

Report. The whole Document, equipped with a set of figures, data, graph, tables and figures, is downloadable from www.pcc.ch. Here is only a short sketch of the arguments dealt with.

Working Group I Contribution to the IPCC Fifth Assessment Report
Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis
Summary for Policymakers

A. Introduction

The Working Group I contribution to the IPCC's Fifth Assessment Report (AR5) considers new evidence of climate change based on many independent scientific analyses from observations of the climate system, paleoclimate archives, theoretical studies of climate processes and simulations using climate models. It builds upon the Working Group I contribution to the IPCC's Fourth Assessment Report (AR4), and incorporates subsequent new findings of research. As a component of the fifth assessment cycle, the IPCC Special Report on Managing the Risks of Extreme Events to Advance Climate Change Adaptation (SREX) is an important basis for information on changing weather and climate extremes.

This Summary for Policymakers (SPM) follows the structure of the Working Group I report. The narrative is supported by a series of overarching highlighted conclusions which, taken together, provide a concise summary. Main sections are introduced with a brief paragraph in italics which outlines the methodological basis of the assessment.

The degree of certainty in key findings in this assessment is based on the author teams' evaluations of underlying scientific understanding and is expressed as a qualitative level of confidence (from *very low* to *very high*) and, when possible, probabilistically with a quantified likelihood (from *exceptionally unlikely* to *virtually certain*). Confidence in the validity of a finding is based on the type, amount, quality, and consistency of evidence (e.g., data, mechanistic understanding, theory, models, expert judgment) and the degree of agreement¹. Probabilistic estimates of quantified measures of uncertainty in a finding are based on statistical analysis of observations or model results, or both, and expert judgment². Where appropriate, findings are also formulated as statements of fact without using uncertainty qualifiers. (See Chapter 1 and Box TS.1 for more details about the specific language the IPCC uses to communicate uncertainty).

The basis for substantive paragraphs in this Summary for Policymakers can be found in the chapter sections of the underlying report and in the Technical Summary. These references are given in curly brackets.

B. Observed Changes in the Climate System

Observations of the climate system are based on direct measurements and remote sensing from satellites and other platforms. Global-scale observations from the instrumental era began in the mid-19th century for temperature and other variables, with more comprehensive and diverse sets of observations available for the period 1950 onwards. Paleoclimate reconstructions extend some records back hundreds to millions of years. Together, they provide a comprehensive view of the variability and long-term changes in the atmosphere, the ocean, the cryosphere, and the land surface.

B.1 Atmosphere

B.2 Ocean

B.3 Cryosphere

B.4 Sea Level

B.5 Carbon and Other Biogeochemical Cycles

C. Drivers of Climate Change

Natural and anthropogenic substances and processes that alter the Earth's energy budget are drivers of climate change. Radiative forcing¹⁴ (RF) quantifies the change in energy fluxes caused by changes in these drivers for 2011 relative to 1750, unless otherwise indicated. Positive RF leads to surface warming, negative RF leads to surface cooling. RF is estimated based on in-situ and remote observations, properties of greenhouse gases and aerosols, and calculations using numerical models representing observed processes. Some emitted compounds affect the atmospheric concentration of other substances. The RF can be reported based on the concentration changes of each substance¹⁵. Alternatively, the emission-based RF of a compound can be reported, which provides a more direct link to human activities. It includes contributions from all substances affected by that emission. The total anthropogenic RF of the two approaches are identical when considering all drivers. Though both approaches are used in this Summary emission-based RFs are emphasized.

D. Understanding the Climate System and its Recent Changes

Understanding recent changes in the climate system results from combining observations, studies of feedback processes, and model simulations. Evaluation of the ability of climate models to simulate recent changes requires consideration of the state of all modelled climate system components at the start of the simulation and the natural and anthropogenic forcing used to drive the models. Compared to AR4, more detailed and longer observations and improved climate models now enable the attribution of a human contribution to detected changes in more climate system components.

D.1 Evaluation of Climate Models

D.2 Quantification of Climate System Responses

D.3 Detection and Attribution of Climate Change

E. Future Global and Regional Climate Change

Projections of changes in the climate system are made using a hierarchy of climate models ranging from simple climate models, to models of intermediate complexity, to comprehensive climate models, and Earth System Models. These models simulate changes based on a set of scenarios of anthropogenic forcings. A new set of scenarios, the Representative Concentration Pathways (RCPs), was used for the new climate model simulations carried out under the framework of the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project Phase 5 (CMIP5) of the World Climate Research Programme. In all RCPs, atmospheric CO₂ concentrations are higher in 2100 relative to present day as a result of a further increase of cumulative emissions of CO₂ to the atmosphere during the 21st century (see Box SPM.1). Projections in this Summary for Policymakers are for the end of the 21st century (2081–2100) given relative to 1986–2005, unless otherwise stated. To place such projections in historical context, it is necessary to consider observed changes between different periods. Based on the longest global surface temperature dataset available, the observed change between the average of the period 1850–1900 and of the AR5 reference period is 0.61 [0.55 to 0.67] °C. However, warming has occurred beyond the average of the AR5 reference period. Hence this is not an estimate of historical warming to present (see Chapter 2).

E.1 Atmosphere: Temperature

E.2 Atmosphere: Water Cycle

E.3 Atmosphere: Air Quality

E.4 Ocean

E.5 Cryosphere

E.6 Sea Level

E.7 Carbon and Other Biogeochemical Cycles

E.8 Climate Stabilization, Climate Change Commitment and Irreversibility



5) NEW SPRINGER SERIES ON GEOGRAPHICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES

(Communication from R.B. Singh, IGU VP)



the language of science

Springer's new book series editor R.B. Singh invites proposals from the IGU Commission Chair, Chair of the IGU National Committees, geographers, environmental scientists and organisers of the related international conference/seminars for negotiating a volume under Springer special book series on Advances in Geographical and Environmental Sciences. The volume will consist of original contributions in the form of 20 to 25 selected papers covering different areas of the geographical sciences and geography-environment interactive themes. The series aims at synthesizing dynamic earth and human environment systems, emphasising challenging research areas relating to land-ocean-atmosphere interactions. It will include Space-borne monitoring, Land Use/ Land Cover Change (LUCC), problems concerning Urbanization and Megacities, Climate and Environmental Change, Food Security, Ecohydrology, Forests and Biodiversity, and Natural Hazards and Disasters in order to contribute towards a sustainable future for the earth. The contributions will range from traditional field techniques, conventional data collection, use of modern remote sensing & Geographical Information Systems to computer-aided techniques and advanced geostatistical and dynamic modelling.

The series integrates attributes relating to the past, present and future of our environment, based broadly on biophysical and human dimensions in spatio-temporal perspectives. In the context of a rapidly changing global environment, the spaceborne monitoring and mitigation of natural hazards and climate change impacts are considered to be a vital component, especially in the observation and prediction of climate and water-induced disasters, global warming, urban risks and human geoscience. Human geoscience also has the responsibility to not confine itself to addressing current problems but to also develop a framework to address future issues. In order to create a 'Future Earth Model' for understanding and predicting the functioning of the climatic system as a whole, collaboration of experts in the traditional earth disciplines as well as in ecology, space technology, geoinformatics and human geoscience is essential, through initiatives sparked by geographers and environmental scientists. It is important to communicate the

advances in geographical and environmental sciences to improve the resilience of society through capacity building to mitigate the impacts of natural and anthropogenic hazards and disasters. The sustainability of human society depends heavily on the homeostatic earth environment, and thus the development of geo-spatial technology is critical for a better understanding of our living environment. As such, the outcomes of the series will promote key policy perspectives for contributing towards sustainability/survivability science, together with future earth initiatives around the world.

Volumes under Review:

- Livelihood Security in North-western Himalaya
- Climate Change and Biodiversity: Proceedings of IGU Rohtak Conference Vol.1
- Landscape Ecology and Water Management: Proceedings of IGU Rohtak Conference Vol.2
- Urban Development Challenges, Risks and Resilience in Asian Mega Cities

SERIES EDITOR

R.B. Singh, Vice President, IGU

Head, Department of Geography, Delhi School of Economics,
University of Delhi, Delhi – 110007 (INDIA)
(rbsgeo@hotmail.com / rbsgeo2@gmail.com)



6) FORTHCOMING EVENTS

(more information in the Home of Geography website, Events 2013)

- 6.1) **REGION-2013: OPTIMAL DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY: INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE, KARKHIV, 7-8 NOVEMBER 2013**
- 6.2) **EAU: RESOURCE, RISQUE ET DÉVELOPPEMENT DURABLE, FÈS (MAROC) 27-28 NOVEMBER 2013**
- 6.3) **GLOBAL CONGRESS ON INTELLIGENT SYSTEMS AND GLOBAL CONGRESS ON INTELLIGENT SYSTEMS HONG KONG, 3-4 DECEMBER**
- 6.4) **ISPRS-IGU-ICA WORKSHOP ON BORDERLANDS MODELING AND UNDERSTANDING FOR GLOBAL SUSTAINABILITY, BEIJING, 5-6 DECEMBER**
- 6.5) **CISP-BMEI 2013, HANGZHOU 16-18 DECEMBER**
- 6.6) **12TH INTERNATIONAL ASIAN URBANIZATION CONFERENCE, VARANASI, 28-30 DECEMBER**
- 6.7) **L'INFORMATION GÉOGRAPHIQUE ET LE MONDE CHANGEANT, SFAX, FACULTÉ DE LETTRES, 27-28 JANVIER 2014**

