Summary of the 3rd World Sustainability Forum Mailing List

Date: Fri, 01 Nov 2013

Dear Colleagues,

We are pleased to announce that The Third World Sustainability Forum (WSF3) is now opened at http://www.wsforum.org until 30 November 2013.

You are able to interact with other conference participants via this mailing list wsf3@mdpi.org or by commenting on articles directly at the conference website (if you received this message you are already subscribed).

Selected papers of the conference will later be considered for possible publication in the open access journal *Sustainability* (ISSN 1999-923, http://www.mdpi.com/journal/sustainability). *Sustainability* is now covered by the Science Citation Index Expanded (SCIE) and the Social Sciences Citation Index (SSCI) and available in Web of Science.

Conference Chair:
The 3rd World Sustainability Forum is chaired by
Professor Dr. Marc A. Rosen from University of Ontario
Institute of Technology, Oshawa, Canada.

Scientific Committee:
See http://www.sciforum.net/conference/wsf3/page/organizers

(Please kindly share this message among your peers).

We are looking forward to exciting discussions!

On behalf of the Conference Chair and the Scientific Committee:

Herzliche Grüsse, Kind regards
Samanta La Russa

--

MDPI AG - Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute
Klybeckstrasse 64
CH-4005 Basel, Switzerland
Tel. +41 61 683 77 34
Fax +41 61 302 89 18
E-mail: larussa at mdpi.com
www.mdpi.com

Date: Tue, 5 Nov 2013

Dear Colleagues and Friends,

I am delighted that the Third World Sustainability Forum (WSF3) is now running, at http://www.wsforum.org.

As Conference Chair, I am most impressed by the range of papers that have been submitted, as well as the insights they provide and, in many instance, the questions they raise.

I wonder - as a read through the WSF3 papers and note their breadth - are we nearer to a common and universally acceptable definition of "sustainability"? If so, what might it be?

I encourage you to interact with conference participants by commenting on articles directly at the conference website, as well as through this mailing list wsf3@mdpi.org (as I just did now).

Also, please let me know if you have recommendations regarding conference papers that are particularly noteworthy or ground-breaking, so that they should be considered for publication in the open access journal Sustainability (ISSN 1999-923, http://www.mdpi.com/journal/sustainability).

Best wishes for a productive and enjoyable e-Forum!

Professor Dr. Marc A. Rosen
Chair, 3rd World Sustainability Forum, and Editor-in-Chief, Sustainability
University of Ontario Institute of Technology, Oshawa, Canada

Date: Thu, 7 Nov 2013

Dear WSF3 participants,

I have developed a short questionnaire on the importance of various factors to sustainability that I would appreciate your input on. Please click on the link below to access the questionnaire. I can assure you that your responses will be kept confidential and used only for the purposes of this study.

https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/9KJB28Z

Thanks and enjoy the conference!

Kevork Hacatoglu
PhD Candidate
Faculty of Engineering and Applied Science
University of Ontario Institute of Technology (UOIT)
Oshawa, Ontario
Canada
L1H 7K4

Date: Sat, 9 Nov 2013

Dear Colleagues,

I am glad to be among the participants in the 3rd World Sustainability Forum, and I would like to kindly thank the organizers for creating this beautiful Forum for the scholars worldwide.

Professor Marc Rosen launched the great enquiry “are we nearer to a common and universally acceptable definition of ‘sustainability’? If so, what might it be?” and I thank him for doing this.

I read many of the papers submitted to WSF3 and I consider that all of them are driven by the willingness for environmental stewardship. I think this is an important pillar of sustainability, whatever is the definition we agree with. In fact, I assume that it cannot be ascertained a universally accepted definition of sustainability, since this concept is related to everyone way of thinking and acting. I agree that sustainability is related to the capacity to endure, or to the potential for long-term maintenance of well-being, with the ecological, cultural and economic dimensions. Still, I couldn’t accept that sustainability is just a matrix coined to describe the long-lived and healthy expectations of humankind.

My belief regarding the sustainability definition is starting from a poetry published in the volume "Poems of Light" by Lucian Blaga (a towering polyvalence personality in Romania, born in 1895 and who reached the universality as a philosopher, poet and academician)

> ***Do not destroy the corolla of world' wonders***
>
> *This wisdom does not define entirely the meaning of sustainability that is not a contemplative process.*
>
> *Taking care of all life forms is the destination of sustainability, and on our way we will realize the self-becoming.*
>
> *So, achieving sustainability could be related to everyone willingness in applying our knowledge about the Universe for enhancing the miracles of the world.*
>
> *For instance by using the amazing clean energies of the Earth and achieving the reconciliation of humankind with the Nature.*

Thank you very much

Best Regards,
Cornelia Aida Bulucea

Ph.D., Assoc. Professor
Faculty of Electrical Engineering, University of Craiova
Romania

Date: Sat, 9 Nov 2013

After thinking about the keynote presentation of Professor Rosen for some time, I think it is essential to consider carefully the nature of his formulation, solidly grounded in the need for society to become increasingly more efficient and

David Barkin
Profesor de Economía
Universidad Autonoma Metropolitana-Xochimilco
Calzada del Hueso 1100, Villa Quietud
04960 Coyoacan, DF MEXICO

Date: Sun, 10 Nov 2013

Dear Colleagues,

In response to Professor Rosen's question I am moved to quote/paraphrase Steve Goldfinger: A sustainable society is one that converts resources into trash no faster than their ecological support structures can convert trash into resources.

While this definition leaves out many ramifications and corollaries, I believe that it captures the central idea.

Best wishes,
Alex Lautensach

Alexander Lautensach
Dipl.Biol. MSc. BEd. MScT. PhD.

Assistant Professor, School of Education
University of Northern British Columbia
4837 Keith Ave, Terrace BC, V8G 1K7 Canada
Associate Editor, Journal of Human Security
Deputy Director, Human Security Institute (Canada)
http://www.hsihumansecurityinstitute.com<http://www.hsihumansecurityinstitute.com/

Date: Sun, 10 Nov 2013

To the Participants in the Third Sustainability Forum:

After thinking about the keynote presentation of Professor Rosen for some time, I believe it is essential to (re)consider carefully the nature of his formulation, solidly grounded in the need for society to become increasingly more efficient and more mindful of its consumption patterns. His presentation offers a well-developed argument based on material considerations in production and consumption, with his explicit focus on the energy nexus. Absent from this frame of reference is any mention of the hierarchical structure of society, the nature of the productive structure that is based upon promoting an intensive pattern of consumption, creating new needs and 'planned Obsolescence', and the process of control of capital that leads to the corporate control over natural resources worldwide as well as economic and political power; all of these characteristics of present day society are features that impede our current system from evolving towards the types of dynamics that Professor Rosen would like to see develop.

Although this presentation might be considered to be an appropriate introduction to this 'Forum' on sustainability, echoing as it does the modern contributions of Nicholas Georgescu-Roegen in 1971 based on the importance of the 2nd Law of Thermodynamics (which in turn revived similar concerns that were central of XIX century analyses), it falls woefully short by not attending the structural features that will systematically prevent the transformation of technical advances into meaningful gains in reducing the global social pressures on the planetary system. I might mention just a few weighty considerations that are intensifying pressures against ecosystems and heightening social polarization: land and water "grabbing" that lead to the global extension of monocropping and deny access to water to poor communities in the most deprived societies of the world; the global expansion of mining that is displacing people, destroying their environment, and poisoning aquifers while often entrapping people in labor conditions that are close to slavery; and global sourcing of food production for consumption patterns with large carbon, land, and water footprints.

I fear that the bias on technical analyses of problems related to the sustainability of the WHOLE earth system will not be easily overcome. Ten of the 41 papers in this collection are on 'Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Sources', while many others focus on the technical issues related to present production and consumption systems. It is clear that many improvements can be made in the way in which present patterns of social organization and consumption are implemented, but greater gains can come from changing these very patterns. In examining the overall impact of this forum, I would urge the participants to consider the underlying structural correlates of the technical approaches that are being discussed and evaluating the potential for confronting our present challenges through more thorough-going changes in our societies.

David Barkin
Distinguished Professor
Universidad Autonoma Metropolitana-Xochimilco
Mexico City, MEXICO

Date: Sun, 10 Nov 2013

Dear Prof. Bulucea,

Thank you for such a nice definition. My name is Saroj and I am currently a fellow at the NFG Group in Berlin working on water management. By work I am a green entrepreneur. I am really interested in reading the poem by “Do not destroy the corolla of world' wonders” by Lucian Blaga. I cannot find it in Google. I was wondering if you would kindly send me a word version. I would really love to read it.

Regarding, Professor Marc Rosen launched the great enquiry, “are we nearer to a common and universally acceptable definition of ‘sustainability’”? I would like to make few points from entrepreneurs’ point of view.

Sustainability should take into account of the nexus between “four core areas” of life which is vital for everyone: air, water, food, shelter.

The economics behind each of these issues need to be addressed, so there is opportunity for green entrepreneurs to *make healthy and inclusive profit “while ensuring that” “workers’ rights” are fully respected in the process. The intersection between “capital, labor and technology” is driving our economic process. I think it is time to think how “each of these factors” can be made more environmentally friendly. This also means “’change management’” in the current lifestyle.
How to achieve that is perhaps an important question?

Thank you very much,

Saroj Dhakal

Date: Sun, 10 Nov 2013

Dear Doctor Saroj Dhakal

Thank you kindly for writing this nice letter to WSF3.

I am delighted you read my lines, and I am deeply impressed by your great thinking regarding the four core areas of life that we should take into consideration when we define Sustainability.

Thank you for carrying a green entrepreneur activity, it is wonderful to know that Sustainability is not just a vision, but there are also marvelous achievements of brilliant minds that make us looking forward in faith.

I wish you Good Luck for all your thoughts, and I would like to send you in attachment the Word file of the poetry “Do not destroy the corolla of world' wonders” by Lucian Blaga.

Thank you very much

Best Regards,
Cornelia Aida Bulucea

Ph.D., Assoc. Professor
Faculty of Electrical Engineering, University of Craiova
Romania

Summary of the 3rd World Sustainability Forum Mailing List

Date: Mon, 18 Nov 2013

Dear WSF3 participants,

Thank you for responding to my questionnaire distributed earlier. Your input thus far has led to good results that we hope to make available at some point (with complete confidentiality, of course). To make the results of the questionnaire more valuable, I would like to extend an opportunity to those who have not had a chance to respond yet. It's a short questionnaire, the results of which will be kept confidential.

https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/9KJB28Z

Thanks again for your assistance. Enjoy the rest of the conference!

Best regards,

Kevork Hacatoglu
PhD Candidate
Faculty of Engineering and Applied Science
University of Ontario Institute of Technology (UOIT)
Oshawa, Ontario
Canada
L1H 7K4

Date: Tue, 19 Nov 2013

Dear Colleagues, dear Participants of the 3rd World Sustainability Forum (WSF),

Adding to the former comments, I agree with those whose think on the sustainability of systems in a holistic way. Sustainability means for me that during the life cycle(s) of production we must take into consideration the thermodynamic questions as well, when we are examining the alternative energy systems.

The primary biomass energy production competes for crop fields so the main question is: is it worth to increase the share of primary biomass energy production, based on concentrated power station(s)? What can be / is the role of logistic and the territorial extent (distances) in answering the above mentioned question.

Applying logistics principles within production technologies is not an objective or not even a magic potion. It is a tool for getting and maintaining some competitive advantage. This is true in the case of production technology of arboreal biomass for heating purposes too. The produce is not only to compete with other arable land outputs (food or forage), but the energy gained through burning it should be competitive compared to energy coming from other sources. The competitiveness of actors in the economic sphere is significantly determined by the effectiveness of their provisioning chain. The optimal solution to these tasks is provided by that combination of apparatus wherein both the 'time factor' (JIT) and the efforts to minimize costs are realized. In optimizing the energy production systems the embodied energy content of materials and equipment also must be take into consideration.
The competitiveness of woody biomass depends on two factors. It should be competitive with the crops and forage produced on arable land on the one hand, and should also compete with heat and electricity deriving from fossil energy resources, on the other hand.
Theoretically cooperation in the sustainable energetic cluster can result in optimal harvesting and transporting connections. Based on our former calculations we carried out (under Hungarian

conditions) that it can be realized a significant decrease of 10-15 % in the costs of transportation and warehousing in an energy cluster, when the participants share their equipment, services (and knowledge).

But no one knows how it will work in the practice (do we trust each other?).

Please, share your thoughts, comments with me,

Katalin Takács-György

p.s. I liked the poem of Lucian Blaga

Dr. Takácsné dr. habil György Katalin
egyetemi tanár
Károly Róbert Főiskola
H-3200 Gyöngyös Mátrai u. 36. Magyarország

Dr. Hab. Takács-György Katalin Ph.D.
Professor
Károly Róbert College
H-3200 Gyöngyös Mátrai u. 36.
HUNGARY

Date: Tue, 19 Nov 2013

I read with growing concern the note from Katalin Takács-György

Is biomass only to be evaluated in terms of its profitability with regard to field crops as our commentator would have it?? (modified for lower transport costs and depending on cooperation among participants)...? Then what about the impact of producing biomass for energy on soils, on food costs, on water availability and quality?? In the US right now the environmental movement has come to the position that ethanol is occasioning more harm than good because millions of hectares have been removed from the conservation reserves while pastures are being transformed.... Even worse, the release of CO2 as the earth is churned by the plows is also remarkably important (Of course, the fossil energy industry is also supporting the limits to ethanol use in gasoline).

I could go on -- but the point is that a holistic view obliges us to examine these environmental impacts and not simply support the wholesale use of non-fossil fuels (renewables) regardless of their impacts as suggested in the comment from Hungary? Perhaps this type of comment was elicited by the focus on sources for energy production that plays such an important role in Prof. Rosen's introductory presentation.

David Barkin ? ? ? ? ? ??
MEXICO

Date: Tue, 19 Nov 2013

Dear colleagues,

I would like to call your attention about a wider approach of the term Sustainability, for instance in relation with Astrobiology:

http://www.mdpi.com/journal/sustainability/special_issues/astrobiology

and also to the connection between Sustainable development and Planetary Boundaries.

http://www.post2015hlp.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/06/Rockstroem-Sachs-Oehman-Schmidt-Traub_Sustainable-Development-and-Planetary-Boundaries.pdf

I realize these issues are not so relevant considering a classical Earth-based scenario, but they are also being taken into account for many authors --including myself in a holistic view.

With my best wishes,

Jesús Martínez-Frías

--
Prof. Jesús Martínez-Frías
Geosciences Institute, IGEO (CSIC-UCM)
Facultad de Ciencias Geológicas C/ José Antonio Novais, 2,
Ciudad Universitaria 28040 Madrid (Spain)

Head, CSIC Research group "Meteorites and Planetary Geosciences"
Co-I, NASA-MSL and ESA-ExoMars
Chair, IUGS-COGE http://www.iugscoge.org/
President, International Association for Geoethics
(IAGETHhttp://icog.es/iageth/)
Councilor, European Astrobiology Network Association
(EANAhttp://www.astrobiologia.pl/eana/)
Science Officer, Origins & Astrobiology. Division of Planetary and Solar
System Sciences (EGU http://www.egu.eu/ps/structure/)

Date: Tue, 19 Nov 2013

Hi David,

thanks for sharing your thought with us.

My comment was for indicating a conversation on potential energy sources, their production. From this point of view we should care the production chain - here I mentioned some questions how to optimize it, reducing the potential costs -, but do not forget: the critical points are: what to include into the cost side!

I am really not on the side of primary biomass production instead of food production.

We have to find those solutions that can reduce the needed efforts to solve such problems (like the example was) and not to create such versions that are working (maybe in an effective way), but do not pay attention to all internal and external impacts for shorter and longer future.

Katalin Takács-György

Dr. Takácsné dr. habil György Katalin
egyetemi tanár
Károly Róbert Főiskola
H-3200 Gyöngyös Mátrai u. 36. Magyarország

Dr. Hab. Takács-György Katalin Ph.D.

Professor
Károly Róbert College
H-3200 Gyöngyös Mátrai u. 36.
HUNGARY

Date: Wed, 20 Nov 2013

Dear Colleagues,

I am grateful to Prof. Martinez-Frias for his comment and for posting the recent paper by Rockström & Sachs. His comments seem to me anything but "not so relevant considering a classical Earth-based scenario".

I regard the issue of planetary boundaries the ultimate bottom line for considering how sustainable a given development initiative might be. Compared to that the issue of profitability seems rather trivial, transient, and beside the point.

Moreover, profitability comes with implications that can be outright counterproductive. As Rockström & Sachs imply, the evident global ecological overshoot coupled with the distributive injustice between high-income and low-income countries necessitates that wealthy economies shrink, not grow. How does profitability help towards that goal?

Best wishes,
Alex Lautensach

Alexander Lautensach
Dipl.Biol. MSc. BEd. MScT. PhD.
Assistant Professor, School of Education
University of Northern British Columbia
4837 Keith Ave, Terrace BC, V8G 1K7 Canada
Associate Editor, Journal of Human Security
Deputy Director, Human Security Institute (Canada)
http://www.hsihumansecurityinstitute.com

Date: Fri, 22 Nov 2013

Dear Colleagues,

I agree with prof. D. Barkin's comments regarding the WSF. I do not really see why we should allow any technical or ideological blinders to narrow down our focus to only some technical aspects or relatively minor problems, without posing the most fundamental issues concerning world sustainability and social welfare.

With best regards
George Liodakis

--
George Liodakis
Professor of Political Economy
Dept. of Mineral Resources Engineering
Technical University of Crete
ZIP: 73100 Chania, Greece

Date: Tue, 26 Nov 2013

Dear All,

I have read the abstract of all the papers and some of the papers.

Nowhere is it mentioned that population increase and the pursuit of economic growth are the two principal factors that will profoundly affect sustainable development. By 2050, the world's population is anticipated to increase by 2.5 billion to about 9.7 billion by 2050. The principal cause of deforestation is clearing land for subsistence agriculture and for cash crops. Unless agricultural productivity increases at the same rate as population increase, then all the efforts to preserve and improve forest cover such as REDD+ will not stop land clearing. Efforts should be made worldwide to temper population growth, while most of the population increase is in developing countries, it is important that developed countries reduce their population as well. A child in developed countries will consume about 20 times more goods and services than one in developing countries. Some forests (and grasslands) are being cleared for soy and rape seed, sugar and palm oil etc. to produce bio-diesel and ethanol etc. for motive power. This decreases the carbon store in the biomass and the soils beneath the forests and grasslands.

Methanol (wood alcohol) and wood gas/gengas can be produced by the destructive distillation of biomass. These products can be directly as energy or turned into productions of higher energy value. The annual growth of wood in most regions of the word is 3 to 5 times annual consumption, not the other way round. Thus with proper management, more wood could be sustainably used for all purposes without eating into the tree capital. This may be a better option than the other forms of organic fuel.

It has been estimated that the world can support about 3-4 billion people at the living standard of North America, but we are already at over 7 billion people. Climate change coupled with population increase is leading to drought and floods and conflicts between nations. The next big fight may be over water as witnessed between Ethiopia and Egypt over the Blue Nile water.

Without tackling agricultural productivity and population increase, a debate on sustainability is ignoring the elephants in the room!

Keith Openshaw <openshaw.keith at gmail.com>

Date: Tue, 26 Nov 2013

Dear Keith Openshaw,

We thank you and agree with your comment that no sustainable future will be possible without effectively addressing (i.e. Reducing) population increase and economic "growth". We had hoped that we had made this imperative clear in our paper,

Assessing the Top Performers: Mindful Conservatism and 'Sustainable Development'
http://www.sciforum.net/conference/wsf3/paper/2281/paper

To take your point a step further:

We assume that we can all agree that nature sooner or later will make the global situation sustainable. That is, a state of long-term equilibrium will be attained that either includes a human population implementing a sustainable modus vivendi, or an equilibrium that does not include Homo sapiens at all.

That raises the question, what are the possible ways in which the human population and its environmental impact can be reduced, and which of those ways would we find least objectionable? The 'business as usual' scenario would result in ways of reduction that would be very much objectionable for various ethical reasons. And as a further question - what can and should humanity, governments, citizens, communities do to escape from the 'business as usual' track, to avoid such objectionable consequences as famines, wars, pandemics, and direct our fate towards acceptable alternatives while still reducing our population and impact quickly enough?

The answers must go beyond the tired old admonitions of becoming more efficient, adapting to changing climates, reducing our consumption, etc. but actually getting up from our front row seat in the auditorium, bowing gracefully, and choosing a seat further back in the audience among the newly evolved upstart species like ourselves, letting the world's ecosystems recover from the relentless onslaught of our billions – a peaceful, tranquil and just recovery described expertly by Alan Weisman in The World Without Us (Toronto: Harper Collins 2007). This course of action lies within our power; we only need to choose it in sufficient numbers.

Best wishes,
Alex & Sabina Lautensach

Alexander Lautensach
Dipl.Biol. MSc. BEd. MScT. PhD.
Assistant Professor, School of Education
University of Northern British Columbia
4837 Keith Ave, Terrace BC, V8G 1K7 Canada
+1 250 615 3334, fax 615 5478 alexl at unbc.ca
Associate Editor, Journal of Human Security
Deputy Director, Human Security Institute (Canada)
http://www.hsihumansecurityinstitute.com

Date: Thu, 28 Nov 2013

I have not been active in this forum due to a high degree of unexpected travel that kept me away from the discussions. Professor Barkin's comments echo a point that emerged quit strongly in Geography in the 1980's. Development cannot be discussed without reference to ecology or political economy. In fact, Lakshman Yapa coined the term eco-political economy to describe his own work in this area. In a parallel development, the sociologist Anthony Giddens was writing about the social structures or systems that in turn structure many of our decisions. I had forgotten about Giddens. Although he was also very popular with geographers in the 1980's, perhaps more so than sociologists, I had not kept up with this discussion. I was reminded of it two weeks ago while discussing some collaboration with an institute of social innovation. We were discussing how farmers might reduce phosphorus inputs on their fields or in the runoff from their fields. The staff told me that they follow Anthony Giddens, and in doing so, they would be interested in uncovering the system that seems to lock farmers into their current practice, even when alternatives (i.e. the technological solutions) are available.

I am not necessarily advocating that we read or reread Yapa or Giddens, but like the technological solutions, many of which are available, the social side of sustainable development has not been ignored, but those on either side are often not speaking with each other.

I am fortunate, in some ways, to work in a science-based policy shop, where we are often merging both of the discussions, although Professor Barkin's response has alerted me that we may need to go even deeper.

Summary of the 3rd World Sustainability Forum Mailing List

As we come an end of the WSF3, it is my hope that we can facilitate more cross-cultural and cross-disciplinary discussion on concepts, analysis and techniques.

On another note, much of my presentation dealt with the use of fuzzy cognitive maps for the analysis of complex systems when data are not available. I now have a much clearer set of images if anyone is interested in this topic.

Brad Bass, PhD

Great Lakes Issue Management and Reporting Section
Environment Canada
4905 Dufferin Street
Toronto ON M3H 5T4

Date: Fri, 29 Nov 2013

Dear All,

Last year I made an interesting author´s experience with the WSF2.

My article "Geoethics and Sustainability" (ID 900) in Related Topics was perhaps the most frequently visited contribution (more than 800 cases recorded).

On the other hand I was disappointed when another my abstract was rejected; it was submitted for topic A under the title "Geoethical Approach to the Environmental Sustainability" (ID 899) emphasizing that geological factors need to be reflected and respected in any concept of environmental sustainability. I took it just as a testimony that "pure environmentalists" prefer the absolute governance of the human kind over the planet. That appeared before the Rio+20 summit in the lack of interest for geological factors among them whereas the IUGS President (then Professor Alberto Riccardi) representing the Earth scientists put into the official IUGS statement for Rio+20 just such a need and repeated it also when opening in August 2012 the International Geological Congress in Brisbane.

The recent INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON GEOETHICS held at Pribram (Czech Republic) has brought very interesting results concerning my experiences from 2012:
a) Environmental sustainability without taking into consideration existing geological factors and their fundamental significance for the development of the Earth environment cannot represent any scientific point of view;
b) The earthquake in L´Aquila on April 6, 2009 was correctly predicted (!!) but the top seismologists of Italy present for less than one hour at a special session of the Great Risks Board in the city on March 31 denied any scientific character for such a prediction (referring only to a previous contact with the man even without mentioning his name and insisting only on forbidding any diffusion of that prediction classified by them as a "false alarm").

Valuable additional information is available in the enclosed AGID 2013 Statement.

Finally let me inform you about the Symposium EOS 13 (GEOETHICS AND GEOEDUCATION) to be held in Vienna, Austria, as part of the General Assembly of the European Union of Geologists 2014 (visit egu2014.eu/). The Symposium will be realized perhaps in one day in the week starting on 27 April 2014 (see the enclosed Call to Vienna).

Kind regards,

Vaclav Nemec

convener, EOS 13 (Vienna 2014)
AGID Vice-president for Europe
head, AGID Working Group for Geoethics

Date: Sat, 30 Nov 2013

Dear Colleagues and Friends,

As the Third World Sustainability Forum (WSF3), held virtually at http://www.wsforum.org, comes to a close, I wish as Conference Chair to express my gratitude to all who participated - by authoring papers, or commenting on them, or contributing to the discussions on this mailing list.

I have thoroughly enjoyed the Forum and have been greatly impressed by the insights brought forth through the papers as well as the questions, and in many instances answers, that were presented.

The questions discussed, such as what could be a common and universally acceptable definition of "sustainability", have been thought provoking and enlightening. And the survey on the relative importance of different aspects of sustainability, that was introduced through this mailing list, allowed participants to provide meaningful input to ongoing research on methods for evaluating and measuring sustainability.

Please let me know if you have recommendations regarding conference papers that are particularly noteworthy or ground-breaking, so that they should be considered for publication in the open access journal Sustainability (ISSN 1999-923, http://www.mdpi.com/journal/sustainability).

Thank you again for a productive and enjoyable e-Forum!

Professor Dr. Marc A. Rosen
Chair, 3rd World Sustainability Forum, and Editor-in-Chief, Sustainability
University of Ontario Institute of Technology, Oshawa, Canada

Date: Sat, 30 Nov 2013

I think many of us are disappointed that Prof Rosen chose not to respond to the substantive questions raised about his initial presentations and other papers in the collection

David Barkin
Profesor de Economía
Universidad Autonoma Metropolitana-Xochimilco
Calzada del Hueso 1100, Villa Quietud
04960 Coyoacan, DF MEXICO

Date: Sun, 1 Dec 2013

Dear Participants in the Third World Sustainability Forum:

It is very nice to see that the interest in the Forum continues, even after the event has ended. I understand Dr Barkin's request that I respond to his email, and I am happy to do so. I had not responded earlier as I instead hoped the message instead would spur others to contribute to the Forum, and it seems to have done that nicely.

Nonetheless, I am happy to add some thoughts to foster ongoing discussion and explain my thinking. Generally, I agree with most of the comments Dr Barkin made. I did not intend in my keynote address to diminish the importance of the social and socioeconomic factors related to sustainability, like

intensive patterns of consumption, control over natural resources, social polarization, and displacing people. And I did try to cover social factors in my presentation, albeit not in as much detail as probably necessary. But, I chose to approach the question of sustainability from an engineering perspective, under the assumption - mistaken or not - that if we develop solutions to the fundamental technical issues facing society, then it will be easier to resolve the many social and socieoeconomic factors that stand in the way of sustainability.

I of course realize there are many different viewpoints one can take in approaching sustainability, such as the one proposed by Dr Barkin as well as the many others discussed and presented at the Third World Sustainability Forum. And I think they all have merit and are worth examining and considering.

I hope that the dialogue considers after and outside of the Third World Sustainability Forum, and hope we can convene for another World Sustainability Forum next year. Unfortunately, with the close of the Forum, it will not be possible to add any further postings to the Third World Sustainability Forum mail list.

Thank you all once again for a productive e-Forum. And I wish to correct an omission in my earlier message by thanking the Section Chairs for their tremendous work.

Sincerely,

Professor Dr. Marc A. Rosen
Chair, 3rd World Sustainability Forum, and Editor-in-Chief, Sustainability
University of Ontario Institute of Technology, Oshawa, Canada