



Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2025

Pearson Edexcel International Advanced Level  
In Geography (WGE03)  
Paper 01 Contested Planet

## **Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications**

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://www.btec.co.uk). Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at [www.edexcel.com/contactus](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus).

## **Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere**

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: [www.pearson.com/uk](http://www.pearson.com/uk)

Summer 2025

Question Paper Log Number P78750

Publications Code WGE03\_01\_2506\_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2025

## General Marking Guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last.
- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.
- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.
- There is no ceiling on achievement. All marks on the mark scheme should be used appropriately.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved, i.e. if the answer matches the mark scheme. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- Where some judgement is required, mark schemes will provide the principles by which marks will be awarded and exemplification may be limited.
- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate's response, the team leader must be consulted.
- Crossed out work should be marked UNLESS the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.

**Important 2506 Country classification / development level terminology:**

**The IAL Geography Specification currently uses the terms:**

- Developing country
- Emerging country
- Developed country.

In answers candidates are likely to use the terminology above.

**Other terminology is equally acceptable and should be credited, such as:**

- Global North (referring to developed / high-income / HIC countries)
- Global South (referring to developing / low-income / LICs *and* emerging / middle-income / MIC countries)

If terminology such as LDC (Least Developed Country), NIC (Newly Industrialised Country) and other similar terms are used by candidates, credit should be given as long as the meaning is clear, and their use is accurate in the context of the question.

Question Number	Using Figure 1 in the Resource Booklet, suggest reasons for the trends in tropical cyclone disasters.	Mark
1	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>AO1 (4 marks)/AO2 (6 marks)</b></p> <p><b>Marking instructions</b> Markers must apply the descriptors in line with the general marking guidance and the qualities outlined in the levels-based mark scheme below.</p> <p><b>Indicative content guidance</b> The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all of it. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited. Relevant points may include:</p> <p>AO1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tropical cyclones (typhoons, hurricanes) are powerful storm found 5-30°N/S of the equator.</li> <li>• TCs form in water 26.5°C+, gain power from warm water and some track towards land / make landfall.</li> <li>• They have major impacts people (affected, homeless, injury, death) and property especially in coastal areas.</li> <li>• A disaster is the realisation of a hazard event when damage to people / property has occurred – above a threshold level.</li> </ul> <p>AO2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Average number of deaths per tropical cyclone disaster has fallen from about 200 in 1983 to less than 50 by 2023, which could be explained by better warning (satellites, forecast models) as well as landfall predictions and evacuations; community preparedness e.g. education may have increased awareness and understanding of risk.</li> <li>• Some very high average deaths could be related to particularly serious cyclones in particular years.</li> <li>• Equally cyclone defences (shelters, sea defences against storm surges, more resilient housing) and better warning dissemination may have reduced vulnerability – some might argue this is despite much higher coastal populations and population densities since 1983</li> <li>• Numbers affected have risen (although there is much year of year variability) which could be explained by rising coastal populations (despite falling deaths) so more people are in harm's way.</li> <li>• Some might link graphs A and B, as graph A suggests there are more cyclone disasters i.e. around 50 per year by 2023 compared to 20-30 per year in the 1980s; this could suggest more people are at risk so more hazards turn into disasters.</li> </ul>	<b>(10)</b>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Graph A might suggest the number of disasters peaked in the early 2000s and has stabilised since – perhaps suggesting better management.</li> <li>• Accept the idea that more frequent disasters may be linked to more intense / more frequent tropical cyclone hazards so more become disasters; this could be linked to global warming and rising SSTs.</li> <li>• Accept explanations relating to changes in ‘disaster’ definition over the 40 years, and better data reliability in more recent times.</li> </ul> <p><b>NB Accept other reasonable explanations linked to the Figure.</b></p>	
--	--	--

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
Level 1	1-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates isolated or generic elements of geographical knowledge and understanding, some of which may be inaccurate or irrelevant. (AO1)</li> <li>• Applies knowledge and understanding to geographical information inconsistently. Connections/relationships between stimulus material and the question may be irrelevant. (AO2)</li> <li>• Applies knowledge and understanding of geographical information/ideas to produce an interpretation with limited relevance and/or support. (AO2)</li> </ul>
Level 2	5-7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates geographical knowledge and understanding, which is mostly relevant and may include some inaccuracies. (AO1)</li> <li>• Applies knowledge and understanding to geographical information to find some relevant connections/relationships between stimulus material and the question. (AO2)</li> <li>• Applies knowledge and understanding of geographical information/ideas to produce a partial but coherent interpretation that is mostly relevant and supported by evidence. (AO2)</li> </ul>
Level 3	8-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates accurate and relevant geographical knowledge and understanding throughout. (AO1)</li> <li>• Applies knowledge and understanding to geographical information logically to find fully relevant connections/relationships between stimulus material and the question. (AO2)</li> <li>• Applies knowledge and understanding of geographical information/ideas to produce a full and coherent interpretation that is relevant and supported by evidence. (AO2)</li> </ul>

Question Number	Using Figure 2 in the Resource Booklet, suggest reasons why future biodiversity levels are uncertain.	Mark
2(a)	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>AO1 (4 marks) /AO2 (6 marks)</b></p> <p><b>Marking instructions</b> Markers must apply the descriptors in line with the general marking guidance and the qualities outlined in the levels-based mark scheme below.</p> <p><b>Indicative content guidance</b> The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all of it. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited. Relevant points may include:</p> <p>AO1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Biodiversity is the range / number of plant / animal species in an area, or present on the whole planet.</li> <li>• It can be degraded / destroyed by demand for resource (fossil fuels, timber, water, minerals).</li> <li>• Resource extraction directly destroys ecosystems and biodiversity, and resource use indirectly destroys it via pollution and climate change.</li> <li>• Conservation refers to efforts to protect / preserve ecosystems and species, or even restore degraded ecosystems.</li> </ul> <p>AO2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Biodiversity has declined steeply since 1970, a 69% drop on species since 1970 according to WWF: this is just one measure and does not include the extent of ecosystems or differentiate between ecosystems e.g. TRF versus the tundra.</li> <li>• The causes of the decline are many and varied: rising human population (+4 billion since 1970), deforestation, urbanisation, farm expansion and indirect threats such as pollution and global warming (the latter might be argued as very important – possibly undermining conservation efforts).</li> <li>• The business-as-usual pathway might be argued as likely to occur if population continues to rise and resource consumption per person rises – leading to greater deforestation and urbanisation and a continuation of global warming; this pathway likely has limited conservation i.e. economic development and resources consumption is prioritised over biodiversity and ecosystems.</li> <li>• The ‘Recovery’ pathway might be considered unlikely by some; it would require a reversal of per capita resource</li> </ul>	<b>(10)</b>

	<p>consumption; some might argue fossil fuels and other non-renewable resource use would need to be stopped; conservation takes priority (but this is costly, difficult and possibly unlikely).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In order to actually reverse biodiversity decline very widespread conservation, ecosystem restoration and 'rewilding' might be needed; some ecosystems (coral reefs, TRF) may never return – might be explained as very unlikely based on past trends.</li> <li>• Stabilisation might be seen as 'sustainable' i.e. a balance between conservation to cause no more damage alongside an economic system that uses renewable resources / recycling – but is not a fundamentally different system to today's.</li> <li>• Uncertainty arises out of decisions, willingness to act, future population and resources consumption levels, and even physical systems tipping points, as well as whether international agreements can be made.</li> </ul> <p><b>NB Accept other reasonable explanations linked to the Figure.</b></p>	
--	--	--

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
Level 1	1-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates isolated or generic elements of geographical knowledge and understanding, some of which may be inaccurate or irrelevant. (AO1)</li> <li>• Applies knowledge and understanding to geographical information inconsistently. Connections/relationships between stimulus material and the question may be irrelevant. (AO2)</li> <li>• Applies knowledge and understanding of geographical information/ideas to produce an interpretation with limited relevance and/or support. (AO2)</li> </ul>
Level 2	5-7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates geographical knowledge and understanding, which is mostly relevant and may include some inaccuracies. (AO1)</li> <li>• Applies knowledge and understanding to geographical information to find some relevant connections/relationships between stimulus material and the question. (AO2)</li> <li>• Applies knowledge and understanding of geographical information/ideas to produce a partial but coherent interpretation that is mostly relevant and supported by evidence. (AO2)</li> </ul>
Level 3	8-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates accurate and relevant geographical knowledge and understanding throughout. (AO1)</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Applies knowledge and understanding to geographical information logically to find fully relevant connections/relationships between stimulus material and the question. (AO2)</li><li>• Applies knowledge and understanding of geographical information/ideas to produce a full and coherent interpretation that is relevant and supported by evidence. (AO2)</li></ul>
--	--	--

Question Number	Assess the importance of different players in the management of biodiversity at both local and global scales.	Mark
2(b)	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>AO1 (5 marks)/AO2 (10 marks)</b></p> <p><b>Marking instructions</b> Markers must apply the descriptors in line with the general marking guidance and the qualities outlined in the levels-based mark scheme below.</p> <p><b>Indicative content guidance</b> The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all of it. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited. Relevant points may include:</p> <p>AO1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Players include governments, IGOs (UN), NGOs, community groups and individuals.</li> <li>• Management might be considered in terms of protecting species or ecosystems from harm, or balancing human and ecosystem needs to maintain ecosystem health.</li> <li>• Local scale management occurs at community level and is focussed on small areas and direct actions.</li> <li>• Global scale management is more about international agreements (CITES, BAPs, REDD+) that might directly protect ecosystems / species or focus on indirect threats (MARPOL, COPs).</li> </ul> <p>AO2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NGOs and community groups / community led initiatives might be argued as important as they focus on small scale areas, have narrow aims and work with local knowledge e.g. reef management, rainforest reserves, forest parks with alternative incomes (ecotourism); however the impact of these schemes is small and funding is always an issue.</li> <li>• Some governments have prioritised conservation e.g. Costa Rica with widespread national parks and protected areas whereas others focus more on economic development and do not protect biodiversity as well (emerging economies); some governments take BAPs and other measures (CITES enforcement) much more seriously than others.</li> <li>• There are numerous global agreements with many signatories, but these rely largely on national actions i.e. funding, monitoring, setting up NPs, MPAs, and BAPs and policing them; action is highly variable and there is not a global framework for enforcement; some examples like the ATS might be seen as an example of international cooperation working.</li> </ul>	<b>(15)</b>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Individual consumers can pressure for change based on consumption patterns (fur, FSC wood, palm oil free, rainforest alliance etc) although the market for 'sustainable' products is small so ethical decisions may not make a huge difference overall.</li> <li>• Answers need to focus on biodiversity and ecosystems primarily; global warming actions are relevant as part of a wider answer (GW focussed answers are likely to be Max L2).</li> </ul> <p><b>NB Accept other reasonable explanations.</b>  <b>NB Answers that either focus on local or global will likely be self-penalising.</b></p>	
--	--	--

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
Level 1	1-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates isolated elements of geographical knowledge and understanding, some of which may be inaccurate or irrelevant. (AO1)</li> <li>• Applies knowledge and understanding of geographical information/ideas, making limited and rarely logical connections/relationships, to produce an interpretation with limited relevance and/or support. (AO2)</li> <li>• Applies knowledge and understanding of geographical information/ideas to produce an unsupported or generic conclusion, drawn from an argument that is unbalanced or lacks coherence. (AO2)</li> </ul>
Level 2	5-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates geographical knowledge and understanding, which is occasionally relevant and may include some inaccuracies. (AO1)</li> <li>• Applies knowledge and understanding of geographical information/ideas with limited but logical connections/relationships to produce a partial interpretation that is supported by some evidence but has limited coherence. (AO2)</li> <li>• Applies knowledge and understanding of geographical information/ideas to come to a conclusion, partially supported by an unbalanced argument with limited coherence. (AO2)</li> </ul>
Level 3	9-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates geographical knowledge and understanding, which is mostly relevant and may include some inaccuracies. (AO1)</li> <li>• Applies knowledge and understanding of geographical information/ideas logically, making some relevant connections/relationships. (AO2)</li> <li>• Applies knowledge and understanding of geographical</li> </ul>

		information/ideas to produce a partial but coherent interpretation that is mostly relevant and supported by evidence. (AO2)
Level 4	13-15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates accurate and relevant geographical knowledge and understanding throughout. (AO1)</li> <li>• Applies knowledge and understanding of geographical information/ideas logically, making relevant connections/relationships. (AO2)</li> <li>• Applies knowledge and understanding of geographical information/ideas to produce a full and coherent interpretation that is relevant and supported by evidence. (AO2)</li> </ul>

Question number	“Globalisation brings people together to solve environmental threats such as pollution and global warming.” To what extent do you agree?	Mark
3	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>AO1 (5 marks)/AO2 (10 marks)</b></p> <p><b>Marking instructions</b> Markers must apply the descriptors in line with the general marking guidance and the qualities outlined in the levels-based mark scheme below.</p> <p><b>Indicative content guidance</b> The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all of it. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited. Relevant points may include:</p> <p>AO1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Globalisation has increased the number, speed and density of global connections in terms of trade, movement of people and information.</li> <li>• Global awareness and coverage of environmental threats has increased.</li> <li>• Globalisation has contributed to increases in trade, wealth and also resource consumption.</li> <li>• Environmental threats are arguably now global e.g. pollution (water, air), land use change, global warming (driven by emissions from fossil fuels) and deforestation.</li> <li>• Some actions have been taken to mitigate against environmental threats which are ‘global’ in nature e.g. COP agreements and others.</li> </ul> <p>AO2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communications technology (internet, social media, mobile phones, global media companies such as CNN, BBC) have increased awareness of, and reporting of, environmental issues such that concern is widespread even in low-income countries.</li> <li>• However, this shared awareness and concerns has not necessarily led to action to reduce the threats e.g. the relative failure of successive COP agreements to reduce carbon emissions; there is variability in climate action with some countries very proactive (EU) but others less committed (China, OPEC).</li> <li>• Some might argue globalisation’s focus on trade and economic growth is simply not compatible with tackling environmental issues e.g. emissions from air travel and global shipping i.e. more pollution.</li> <li>• Emerging countries are still focussed on increasing incomes and therefore have little to gain from minimising</li> </ul>	<b>(15)</b>

	<p>environmental damage e.g. Indonesian Palm Oil and increases in deforestation under Bolsonaro's Brazil – reosurces are seen as a path to wealth.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some might argue that globalisation has brought people together in terms of awareness, but that 'solutions' are as yet not forthcoming i.e. a disconnect between people's concerns and actual actions by governments and IGOs.</li> <li>• Political globalisation could lead a greater focus on shared global governance and biodiversity protection, although as yet global systems for this are fragmented and not universal.</li> </ul> <p><b>NB Accept other reasonable explanations.</b></p>	
--	---	--

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
Level 1	1-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates isolated elements of geographical knowledge and understanding, some of which may be inaccurate or irrelevant. (AO1)</li> <li>• Applies knowledge and understanding of geographical information/ideas, making limited and rarely logical connections/relationships, to produce an interpretation with limited relevance and/or support. (AO2)</li> <li>• Applies knowledge and understanding of geographical information/ideas to produce an unsupported or generic conclusion, drawn from an argument that is unbalanced or lacks coherence. (AO2)</li> </ul>
Level 2	5-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates geographical knowledge and understanding, which is occasionally relevant and may include some inaccuracies. (AO1)</li> <li>• Applies knowledge and understanding of geographical information/ideas with limited but logical connections/relationships to produce a partial interpretation that is supported by some evidence but has limited coherence. (AO2)</li> <li>• Applies knowledge and understanding of geographical information/ideas to come to a conclusion, partially supported by an unbalanced argument with limited coherence. (AO2)</li> </ul>
Level 3	9-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates geographical knowledge and understanding, which is mostly relevant and may include some inaccuracies. (AO1)</li> <li>• Applies knowledge and understanding of geographical information/ideas logically, making some relevant</li> </ul>

		<p>connections/relationships. (AO2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Applies knowledge and understanding of geographical information/ideas to produce a partial but coherent interpretation that is mostly relevant and supported by evidence. (AO2)</li> </ul>
Level 4	13-15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates accurate and relevant geographical knowledge and understanding throughout. (AO1)</li> <li>• Applies knowledge and understanding of geographical information/ideas logically, making relevant connections/relationships. (AO2)</li> <li>• Applies knowledge and understanding of geographical information/ideas to produce a full and coherent interpretation that is relevant and supported by evidence. (AO2)</li> </ul>

Question Number	Using Figure 3 in the Resource Booklet, explain how this landscape could be used to generate renewable energy.	Mark
<b>4(a)</b>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>AO1 (2 marks)/AO2 (3 marks)</b></p> <p>Award <b>1</b> mark (AO1) for each relevant point and further expansion marks for reasons/explanations linked to the data shown (AO2), up to a maximum of 5 marks.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flat coastal land (1) with potentially high wind speeds / offshore areas with even higher wind speeds (1) could be used for onshore / offshore wind turbines (1).</li> <li>• High mountain areas with rivers / snowmelt (1) could be dammed / reservoir built (1) to provide HEP (1).</li> <li>• Flat coastal land (1) which appears to be a relatively large area (1) could be used for solar PV panels / a solar array (1).</li> </ul> <p>Accept other valid suggestions but not fossil fuels, nuclear or biofuels.</p>	<b>(5)</b>

Question Number	Using named examples, assess how far biofuels are the best 'carbon neutral' alternative to fossil fuels.	Mark
4(b)	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>AO1 (5 marks)/AO2 (10 marks)</b></p> <p><b>Marking instructions</b> Markers must apply the descriptors in line with the general marking guidance and the qualities outlined in the levels-based mark scheme below.</p> <p><b>Indicative content guidance</b> The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all of it. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited. Relevant points may include:</p> <p>AO1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Biofuels are crops / crop residues converted into bioethanol and biodiesel that can replace fuels derived from crude oil; biomass is also used as a fuel (but is not a replacement for fossil fuels)</li> <li>• Carbon neutral implies none, or very low, life-cycle carbon emissions for an energy source.</li> <li>• Biofuels have a lower carbon footprint than fossil fuels, but are not entirely carbon neutral; crop regrowth sequesters some emitted carbon.</li> <li>• Other alternative energy sources such as nuclear have lower carbon emissions than fossil fuels and renewable energy may approach carbon neutrality.</li> <li>•</li> </ul> <p>AO2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Biofuels can replace some fossil fuels (petrol, diesel) and are used for transport fuels and in power stations; because next year's crops sequester CO<sub>2</sub> they have low carbon emissions: but processing, fertilizers and transport mean they are not 'carbon neutral.'</li> <li>• Biofuels, being liquids, are flexible and easy to transport so have a major advantage in terms of powering transport; however they require vast areas of land (that could be used for food) and have been widely linked to deforestation – further eroding their 'green credentials.'</li> <li>• Biofuels are widely used in consumer petrol and diesel (E15, B7) but at a low %; wider use requires different / new engine technology – however biofuels can directly replace some fossil fuels in motor vehicles and even aircraft.</li> <li>• Other energy sources tend to focus on electricity generation i.e. nuclear and renewables (HEP, solar wind) and these can have very low carbon emissions so might be considered a 'better' replacement e.g. for gas used in power stations; however for</li> </ul>	<b>(15)</b>

	<p>these energy sources to be used to power transport vehicles a wholesale switch to EVs would be needed – this is happening but the transition is slow and costly; some question the environmental benefits and carbon neutrality of EVs (emissions associated with mining lithium)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It could be argued that renewable electricity and EVs (charged by renewables) are in fact ‘better’ than biofuels; some might consider hydrogen an alternative pathway, or argue that energy conservation would have a larger impact on emissions reduction.</li> <li>• Credit can be given to 'alternative ways' in which societies can manage the continued use of fossil fuels for example by mitigating risk through carbon capture and storage or conserving energy generated by fossil fuel use through energy conservation.</li> <li>• Credit can be given to discussion of radical technologies such as hydrogen fuel cells.</li> </ul> <p><b>NB Accept other reasonable explanations.</b></p>	
Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
Level 1	1–4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates isolated elements of geographical knowledge and understanding, some of which may be inaccurate or irrelevant. (AO1)</li> <li>• Applies knowledge and understanding of geographical information/ideas, making limited and rarely logical connections/relationships, to produce an interpretation with limited relevance and/or support. (AO2)</li> <li>• Applies knowledge and understanding of geographical information/ideas to produce an unsupported or generic conclusion, drawn from an argument that is unbalanced or lacks coherence. (AO2)</li> </ul>
Level 2	5-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates geographical knowledge and understanding, which is occasionally relevant and may include some inaccuracies. (AO1)</li> <li>• Applies knowledge and understanding of geographical information/ideas with limited but logical connections/relationships to produce a partial interpretation that is supported by some evidence but has limited coherence. (AO2)</li> <li>• Applies knowledge and understanding of geographical information/ideas to come to a conclusion, partially supported by an unbalanced argument with limited coherence. (AO2)</li> </ul>
Level 3	9-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates geographical knowledge and understanding, which is mostly relevant and may include some inaccuracies.</li> </ul>

		<p>(AO1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Applies knowledge and understanding of geographical information/ideas logically, making some relevant connections/relationships. (AO2)</li> <li>• Applies knowledge and understanding of geographical information/ideas to produce a partial but coherent interpretation that is mostly relevant and supported by evidence. (AO2)</li> </ul>
Level 4	13-15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates accurate and relevant geographical knowledge and understanding throughout. (AO1)</li> <li>• Applies knowledge and understanding of geographical information/ideas logically, making relevant connections/relationships. (AO2)</li> <li>• Applies knowledge and understanding of geographical information/ideas to produce a full and coherent interpretation that is relevant and supported by evidence. (AO2)</li> </ul>

Question Number	Using Figure 4, explain how the hydrological cycle operates in this landscape.	Mark
5(a)	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>AO1 (2 marks)/AO2 (3 marks)</b></p> <p>Award <b>1</b> mark (AO1) for each relevant point and further expansion marks for reasons/explanations linked to the data shown (AO2), up to a maximum of 5 marks.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sunlight evaporates water from the ocean which condenses as it rises and cools to form clouds (1) which will then generate rainfall over the land / mountains (1).</li> <li>• Precipitation falling in the mountain areas contributes to the formation of rivers (surface runoff) (1) which then transfer the water back to the ocean (1).</li> <li>• Some precipitation is stored as snow /ice in the mountains (1), this is slowly / seasonally released into water courses (1)</li> <li>• Some precipitation will infiltrate into the ground / ground water stores (1) and make its way as throughflow / groundwater flow back to the river / ocean (1).</li> </ul> <p><b>NB Accept other reasonable explanations linked to the Figure.</b></p>	<b>(5)</b>

Question Number	Using named examples, assess how far desalination is the best solution to water insecurity.	Mark
5(b)	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>AO1 (5 marks)/AO2 (10 marks)</b></p> <p><b>Marking instructions</b> Markers must apply the descriptors in line with the general marking guidance and the qualities outlined in the levels-based mark scheme below.</p> <p><b>Indicative content guidance</b> The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all of it. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited. Relevant points may include:</p> <p>AO1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desalination converts salt water into freshwater either thermally or using membrane technology (reverse osmosis)</li> <li>• It is an energy intensive process and requires a source of ocean water i.e. at a coastline.</li> <li>• Water insecure places lack adequate, reliable, safe water supplies that people can afford.</li> <li>• Water demand continues to grow and desalination could increase supply, as could groundwater, reservoir construction and water transfers.</li> <li>• Desalination has become increasingly popular with some 20,000 plants now operating.</li> </ul> <p>AO2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desalination is heavily relied on in the MENA region, and increasingly elsewhere. In MENA it represents the primary water supply on countries such as SA and the UAE; with limited groundwater and very low precipitation / few rivers desalination is the only option.</li> <li>• However, it is energy intensive (many MENA countries have oil / gas supplies) and there are concerns about its environmental impact (carbon emissions, salt dumping, outfall impacts on biodiversity); added to these concerns are the high per litre water cost compared to river and aquifer sources – desalinated water may be unaffordable to low-income groups in developing countries.</li> <li>• In some locations other options are available such as reservoir construction; however these can also have environmental and social downsides such as relocations, loss of forests in flooded valleys and high capital costs; some water supply systems could be vulnerable to future climate change.</li> <li>• Water conservation and small-scale supply systems are an intermediate technology option, but they often require higher levels of renewable water than available in the</li> </ul>	<b>(15)</b>

	<p>MENA and are generally not scalable – in which case desalination may be the only viable option.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In many places where desalination is being considered, water conservation and more efficient supply systems could reduce the need for it – but desalination may be seen as an ‘easier’ option despite the costs.</li> <li>• In some place e.g. India, Pakistan – where water insecurity is rising rapidly, the scale of the problem may be too large for desalination to be an option.</li> </ul> <p><b>NB Accept other reasonable explanations.</b></p>	
--	--	--

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
Level 1	1-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates isolated elements of geographical knowledge and understanding, some of which may be inaccurate or irrelevant. (AO1)</li> <li>• Applies knowledge and understanding of geographical information/ideas, making limited and rarely logical connections/relationships, to produce an interpretation with limited relevance and/or support. (AO2)</li> <li>• Applies knowledge and understanding of geographical information/ideas to produce an unsupported or generic conclusion, drawn from an argument that is unbalanced or lacks coherence. (AO2)</li> </ul>
Level 2	5-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates geographical knowledge and understanding, which is occasionally relevant and may include some inaccuracies. (AO1)</li> <li>• Applies knowledge and understanding of geographical information/ideas with limited but logical connections/relationships to produce a partial interpretation that is supported by some evidence but has limited coherence. (AO2)</li> <li>• Applies knowledge and understanding of geographical information/ideas to come to a conclusion, partially supported by an unbalanced argument with limited coherence. (AO2)</li> </ul>
Level 3	9-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates geographical knowledge and understanding, which is mostly relevant and may include some inaccuracies. (AO1)</li> <li>• Applies knowledge and understanding of geographical information/ideas logically, making some relevant connections/relationships. (AO2)</li> <li>• Applies knowledge and understanding of geographical information/ideas to produce a partial but coherent interpretation that is mostly relevant and supported by</li> </ul>

		evidence. (AO2)
Level 4	13-15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates accurate and relevant geographical knowledge and understanding throughout. (AO1)</li><li>• Applies knowledge and understanding of geographical information/ideas logically, making relevant connections/relationships. (AO2)</li><li>• Applies knowledge and understanding of geographical information/ideas to produce a full and coherent interpretation that is relevant and supported by evidence. (AO2)</li></ul>

Question number	To what extent are the economic power of TNCs and political influence within IGOs important in explaining superpower status?	Mark
6	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>AO1 (5 marks)/AO2 (15 marks)</b></p> <p><b>Marking instructions</b></p> <p>Markers must apply the descriptors in line with the general marking guidance and the qualities outlined in the levels-based mark scheme below.</p> <p>Responses that demonstrate <b>only</b> AO1 without any AO2 should be awarded marks as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Level 1 AO1 performance: 1 mark</li> <li>• Level 2 AO1 performance: 2 marks</li> <li>• Level 3 AO1 performance: 3 marks</li> <li>• Level 4 AO1 performance: 4–5 marks</li> </ul> <p><b>Indicative content guidance</b></p> <p>The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all of it. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited. Relevant points may include:</p> <p>AO1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Superpowers are countries with disproportionate power and influence based on economic, military, resource, cultural and political power.</li> <li>• Economic power is sometime considered the ‘base’ for other types of power and influence.</li> <li>• TNCs bring huge wealth, cultural and technological influence to the countries they hail from e.g. USA tech TNCs</li> <li>• IGOs are the bodies that ‘govern’ the world through a system of overlapping organisations, and are the seats of political and economic influence e.g. UN, WTO, G20.</li> </ul> <p>AO2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TNCs generate wealth for countries such as the USA and tech-companies have strongly synergistic links to security and defence in the USA (and elsewhere); the economic power generated through trade is the basis for much of the USA’s power.</li> <li>• This sits alongside the cultural and societal influence of major tech, media, food and entertainment companies which in the USA’s case are often ‘disruptive’ in terms of consumer lifestyles; this might be contrasted with China’s undoubted economic wealth (often from state-led industries, and FDI companies) but more limited broader influence of its TNCs (which are limited in terms of global influence).</li> <li>• The wealth of the USA (and EU, possibly Japan) might be seen as being strongly linked to their TNCs economic power, and therefore wider status because other types of power in part depend on economic.</li> </ul>	<b>(20)</b>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some might argue military power is very important in terms of status (nuclear weapons, surveillance tech, jets, carriers) because of its hard power ‘threat’ – possibly why Russia is still viewed as a superpower despite its small, weak economy and limited economic influence.</li> <li>• The political power stemming from IGOs might be seen as important due to some superpowers’ sitting at the ‘top table’ at the UN, WTO, WB etc and therefore being in a position to shape the geopolitical agenda.</li> <li>• On the other had the IGO system might be viewed by some as being rather broken or at least dysfunctional: China has increasingly drifted away from many post-war IGOs and to some degree has its own IGO systems based on the BRICs+</li> <li>• There is a ‘rules based’ versus ‘power based’ debate to be had; the former based on political and economic influence since 1945, and the latter based more of military power and economic leverage since 2010 (led by China).</li> </ul> <p><b>Note:</b> the question is about why TNCs and political influence are important in terms of the status of superpower countries, <i>not</i> how IGOs and TNCs ‘are superpowers.’</p> <p><b>NB Accept other reasonable explanations.</b></p> <p><b>NB If the answer discusses only TNCs OR IGO’s it is likely to be self-penalising.</b></p>	
Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
Level 1	1–5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates isolated elements of geographical knowledge and understanding, some of which may be inaccurate or irrelevant. (AO1)</li> <li>• Applies knowledge and understanding of geographical ideas, making limited and rarely logical connections/relationships. (AO2)</li> <li>• Applies knowledge and understanding of geographical information/ideas to produce an interpretation with limited coherence and support from evidence. (AO2)</li> <li>• Applies knowledge and understanding of geographical information/ideas to produce an unsupported or generic conclusion, drawn from an argument that is unbalanced or lacks coherence. (AO2)</li> </ul>

Level 2	6-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates geographical knowledge and understanding, which is occasionally relevant and may include some inaccuracies. (AO1)</li> <li>• Applies knowledge and understanding of geographical information/ideas with limited but logical connections/relationships. (AO2)</li> <li>• Applies knowledge and understanding of geographical ideas in order to produce a partial interpretation that is supported by some evidence but has limited coherence. (AO2)</li> <li>• Applies knowledge and understanding of geographical information/ideas to come to a conclusion, partially supported by an unbalanced argument with limited coherence. (AO2)</li> </ul>
Level 3	11-15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates geographical knowledge and understanding, which is mostly relevant and accurate. (AO1)</li> <li>• Applies knowledge and understanding of geographical information/ideas to find some logical and relevant connections/relationships. (AO2)</li> <li>• Applies knowledge and understanding of geographical ideas in order to produce a partial but coherent interpretation that is supported by some evidence. (AO2)</li> <li>• Applies knowledge and understanding of geographical information/ideas to come to a conclusion, largely supported by an argument that may be unbalanced or partially coherent. (AO2)</li> </ul>
Level 4	16-20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates accurate and relevant geographical knowledge and understanding throughout. (AO1)</li> <li>• Applies knowledge and understanding of geographical information/ideas to find fully logical and relevant connections/relationships. (AO2)</li> <li>• Applies knowledge and understanding of geographical information/ideas to produce a full and coherent interpretation that is supported by evidence. (AO2)</li> <li>• Applies knowledge and understanding of geographical information/ideas to come to a rational, substantiated conclusion, fully supported by a balanced argument that is drawn together coherently. (AO2)</li> </ul>

Question Number	To what extent are trade and the quality of governance important in explaining differences in development progress?	Mark
7	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>AO1 (5 marks)/AO2 (15 marks)</b></p> <p><b>Marking instructions</b></p> <p>Markers must apply the descriptors in line with the general marking guidance and the qualities outlined in the levels-based mark scheme below.</p> <p>Responses that demonstrate <b>only</b> AO1 without any AO2 should be awarded marks as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Level 1 AO1 performance: 1 mark</li> <li>• Level 2 AO1 performance: 2 marks</li> <li>• Level 3 AO1 performance: 3 marks</li> <li>• Level 4 AO1 performance: 4-5 marks</li> </ul> <p><b>Indicative content guidance</b></p> <p>The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all of it. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited. Relevant points may include:</p> <p>AO1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development progress means rising incomes, improving HDI and possibly progress in terms of equality, democracy and freedom.</li> <li>• Development progress is not uniform: rapid progress in SE/E Asia has not been matched in parts of South Asia and SSA.</li> <li>• Trade is the exchange of goods and services and it generates wealth; trade is uneven and often not 'free;' in some cases terms of trade are 'unfair' e.g. commodity export dependency.</li> <li>• Governance measures how 'well run' a country or region is i.e. how effectively government (quality) meets the needs of people and builds resilience (or succumbs to corruption).</li> </ul> <p>AO2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trade might be viewed as the 'engine of growth' having allowed many countries (China, SK, Vietnam) to trade their way to wealth, and in the process reduced poverty and increased HDI – although not necessarily with progress in democracy, equality and human rights.</li> <li>• On the other hand for countries in SSA / S Asia that export commodities (foods, oil, minerals) or low value goods (textiles) trade could be argued to have fewer benefits i.e. exporting low value goods, but needing to import costly machines / technology from western TNCs (terms of trade).</li> <li>• Some might argue that trade system is stacked against developing countries because western TNCs dominate trade and raw material prices are set in London / NY; developmental models such as dependency theory / world</li> </ul>	<b>(20)</b>

	<p>systems theory could be used to support an argument about the periphery (or relative success of emerging economies)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are other factors / explanations that could be used e.g. the importance of the MDGs and SDGs in development progress in some areas (poverty reduction, primary education) – the global drive to eliminate some major social issues has born fruit in some areas.</li> <li>• Governance is weak / poor quality in some states and is a barrier to progress (Haiti, SSA, Myanmar) and governments either only partly function and / or function for an elite due to corruption; this hinders progress and makes gains very hard to achieve; many developing countries have experienced conflict and a lack of accountable government – often for decades.</li> <li>• Foreign aid / ODA / FDI could be seem as important in terms of transferring resources to places with low HDI and helping them make progress – although all of these ways have pros and cons (debt for instance); there is a link to quality of governance i.e. how effective aid / FDI is and how far corruption reduces its effectiveness.</li> </ul> <p><b>NB Accept other reasonable explanations.</b></p> <p><b>NB If the answer only discusses trade OR quality of governance then it is likely to be self-penalising.</b></p>	
Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
Level 1	1–5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates isolated elements of geographical knowledge and understanding, some of which may be inaccurate or irrelevant. (AO1)</li> <li>• Applies knowledge and understanding of geographical ideas, making limited and rarely logical connections/relationships. (AO2)</li> <li>• Applies knowledge and understanding of geographical information/ideas to produce an interpretation with limited coherence and support from evidence. (AO2)</li> <li>• Applies knowledge and understanding of geographical information/ideas to produce an unsupported or generic conclusion, drawn from an argument that is unbalanced or lacks coherence. (AO2)</li> </ul>

Level 2	6-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates geographical knowledge and understanding, which is occasionally relevant and may include some inaccuracies. (AO1)</li> <li>• Applies knowledge and understanding of geographical information/ideas with limited but logical connections/relationships. (AO2)</li> <li>• Applies knowledge and understanding of geographical ideas in order to produce a partial interpretation that is supported by some evidence but has limited coherence. (AO2)</li> <li>• Applies knowledge and understanding of geographical information/ideas to come to a conclusion, partially supported by an unbalanced argument with limited coherence. (AO2)</li> </ul>
Level 3	11-15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates geographical knowledge and understanding, which is mostly relevant and accurate. (AO1)</li> <li>• Applies knowledge and understanding of geographical information/ideas to find some logical and relevant connections/relationships. (AO2)</li> <li>• Applies knowledge and understanding of geographical ideas in order to produce a partial but coherent interpretation that is supported by some evidence. (AO2)</li> <li>• Applies knowledge and understanding of geographical information/ideas to come to a conclusion, largely supported by an argument that may be unbalanced or partially coherent. (AO2)</li> </ul>
Level 4	16-20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates accurate and relevant geographical knowledge and understanding throughout. (AO1)</li> <li>• Applies knowledge and understanding of geographical information/ideas to find fully logical and relevant connections/relationships. (AO2)</li> <li>• Applies knowledge and understanding of geographical information/ideas to produce a full and coherent interpretation that is supported by evidence. (AO2)</li> <li>• Applies knowledge and understanding of geographical information/ideas to come to a rational, substantiated conclusion, fully supported by a balanced argument that is drawn together coherently. (AO2)</li> </ul>

