

The Fossil Fuel Industry and the Case for Divestment

Toronto 350.org

May 12, 2013

Rendered into PDF: May 12, 2013

Contents

1	Executive summary	4
2	Climate change is settled science	6
2.1	From the U of T divestment policy	6
2.2	It is not properly the subject of ongoing academic debate that	6
2.3	The University of Toronto is already taking action on climate change	8
3	The activities of fossil fuel companies are socially injurious, and this social injury cannot be reasonably remedied through shareholder voice	10
3.1	From the U of T divestment policy	10
3.2	Social injury	10
3.3	The harm caused is inherent to the primary business of fossil fuel companies	11
3.4	The business activities of these companies frustrate the enforcement of the rules of domestic and international law intended to protect individuals against deprivation of health, safety, and basic freedoms	12
3.5	Why fossil fuels are like tobacco	15
4	Divestment is compatible with the university's fiduciary duties	17
4.1	From the U of T divestment policy	17
4.2	There is no evidence of a divestment penalty for investors	17
4.3	Market capitalization and value at risk	18
	Stated policy objectives are incompatible with the current valuation of fossil fuel reserves	18

Regulatory risk is not adequately priced	18
There is a strong potential for malinvestment in capital-intensive, long-term projects . . .	19
Fossil fuel reserves as stranded assets	21
Volatility of investor sentiment	21
4.4 Fossil fuels represent a risk to the university's other investments	22
4.5 Attractive substitutes exist for divested equities	22
4.6 Pensions and climate change	23
5 Actions have been taken by the Canadian government and international bodies on this issue	25
5.1 From the U of T divestment policy	25
5.2 Federal government	25
5.3 Government of Ontario	26
5.4 City of Toronto	27
5.5 Actions taken by other national bodies	29
United States	29
United Kingdom	33
Germany	35
China	37
France	38
5.6 Actions taken by international bodies	42
6 Why start with Royal Dutch Shell?	43
6.1 Shell's ongoing history of social injury	44
Legal offences in Nigeria	44
Infringements on governmental regulations and international health and environmental standards with respect to operations in Nigeria	47
Legal offences in Alberta	47
Continued threats to human rights, environmental well-being and international law . . .	49
6.2 Shell represents financial risk	50
Poor reputation for social responsibility lowers shareholder confidence	50
Fossil fuel extraction in the Arctic represent particularly high-risk and unpredictable endeavours	51

6.3	Divestment from Shell would not hurt the university financially	53
7	Appendix I: Issues With Respect to University Divestment	60
7.1	Policy on Social and Political Issues With Respect to University Divestment	60
7.2	Procedures for Responding to Social and Political Issues with Respect to University Di- vestment	61
8	Appendix II: The 200 Companies	64

Outstanding general issues: (a) standardize dates, spelling, formatting of the names of court cases, etc (b) fix the references that mysteriously render only as periods in the bibliography (c) deal with other
~~LaTeX~~errors

1 Executive summary

This will be filled in once we are reasonably happy with the rest of the brief. It will certainly be the section that the most people read and which gets the most attention, so we should make a special effort to make the case compelling here.

Citations (and probably internal links to later parts of the brief) should be added to this section.

The governments of the world, including the government of Canada, have agreed that raising global temperatures to more than 2°C above where they were before we started burning fossil fuels would be “dangerous”. [CITE COPENHAGEN ACCORD] If we are to achieve that objective, we cannot burn most of the fossil fuels that remain on the planet. Based on hundreds of thousands of years of evidence on how the climate responds to greenhouse gasses (GHGs), we can calculate that avoiding a 2°C increase means we must keep future GHG pollution to no more than 565 billion tonnes (gigatonnes) of carbon dioxide (CO₂). [CITE] At the same time, we know that burning the world's proven reserves of coal, oil, and natural gas would produce 2,795 gigatonnes of CO₂ --- nearly five times as much as it would be safe to burn. [CITE] That means we need to find a way to keep 80% of the world's fossil fuel reserves unburned.

The business plans of fossil fuel companies do not take this objective into account. They assume they can burn all of their proven reserves, along with any additional reserves they discover in unconventional areas like the arctic, the deep ocean, and Canada's bituminous sands. Right now, we are adding about 30 gigatonnes of CO₂ to the atmosphere each year, and the amount we add is increasing at a rate of about 3%. That means that we are on track to exceed the 565 gigatonne limit within 15 years.

Two big implications arise from this. First --- we need to find a way to meet the world's energy needs without burning most of the Earth's remaining fossil fuels. This requires a massive redirection of investment from fossil fuel energy sources to different energy sources that do not alter the climate. Second --- the stockmarket value of fossil fuel companies is based on the assumption that they will be able to dig up and burn what they own. If they are allowed to do this, the global effects will be catastrophic. As such, much of the value of these companies is an illusion, based on an out-dated assumption that we can use the atmosphere forever as a free dumping ground for CO₂.

The University of Toronto has an opportunity to do two things: to take part in the redirection of investment that is necessary to prevent climatic catastrophe, and to sell its shares in fossil fuel companies before the general public accepts that most of their reserves are unburnable.

This brief will explain in detail why divestment from fossil fuel companies is in keeping with the

values of the university and why it is feasible and financially prudent. Campaigns to divest from fossil fuel companies are ongoing at more than 250 universities across North America, including Harvard, Yale, McGill, and the University of British Columbia. [NUMBER] schools have already committed to divest.

By making the same choice, the University of Toronto can improve its future financial prospects, uphold its values, and take part in a necessary global transition away from CO₂-intensive forms of energy.

2 Climate change is settled science

2.1 From the U of T divestment policy

The University's core academic values include freedom of inquiry and open debate. As a general matter, the University does not take positions on social or political issues apart from those directly pertinent to higher education and academic research. Instead, its role is to provide a forum within which issues can be studied carefully and debated vigorously. Given these values, the University will not consider any proposals for restrictions on its investments that require the institution to take sides in matters that are properly the subject of ongoing academic inquiry and debate.

2.2 It is not properly the subject of ongoing academic debate that

Ideally, for each claim we should cite the best possible accessible source for laypeople as well as the most authoritative possible scientific source. It would be great if people could add additional references to this section.

- The 10,000 years of human civilization have taken place during a span of relative climatic stability.¹²
- Burning coal, oil, and gas produces known quantities of carbon dioxide (CO₂).³
- Before the industrial revolution, the concentration of CO₂ in the atmosphere was approximately 280 parts per million (ppm).⁴⁵
- It has now risen to over 390 ppm, largely because of the burning of fossil fuels.
- At present, the concentration of CO₂ in the atmosphere is rising at a rate of approximately 2.0 ppm per year.⁶
- If humanity continues to burn fossil fuels at the present rate, the concentration of CO₂ in the atmosphere will rise to well over 550 ppm by 2100.

¹This claim is supported by evidence from ice core samples taken in Vostok, Antarctica as well as other proxy measures of climate such as pollen in lake sediments and tree rings.

²Alley, *The Two Mile Time Machine: Ice Cores, Abrupt Climate Change, and Our Future*, p. 4.

³For example, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency lists quantities of CO₂ produced by burning a barrel of oil, metric tonne of coal, or therm of natural gas: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Calculations and References*.

⁴Evidence for this includes the records of how much fossil fuel has been burned, as well as the changing isotopic ratio of carbon in the atmosphere.

⁵Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, *Climate Change 2007: Working Group I: The Physical Science Basis*,

⁶U.S. National Oceanic & Atmospheric Administration, *Trends in Atmospheric Carbon Dioxide*.

- Adding carbon dioxide to the atmosphere reduces the amount of energy the Earth radiates into space. This causes the planet to warm.⁷
- Based on evidence from ice cores, we know that doubling the amount of CO₂ in the atmosphere causes global temperatures to rise by about 3°C.
- Governments around the world, including the government of Canada, have adopted 2°C as the threshold beyond which climate change should be considered 'dangerous'.
- If the world is to avoid crossing the 2°C limit, most of the world's remaining fossil fuels must be kept in the ground.⁸

Comprehensive and authoritative scientific statements on the key elements of climate change date back at least to the 1979 U.S. National Academy of Sciences report (the Charney report).⁹ The report concluded that human activities --- particularly greenhouse gas emissions --- were altering the climate in potentially dangerous ways. These conclusions have been subsequently re-affirmed in the four major reports of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) in 1990, 1995, 2001, and 2007.¹⁰¹¹¹²¹³

Add reference to G8 science academy statement: <http://www.nationalacademies.org/includes/G8+5energy-climate09.pdf>

Mitigating climate change is important for allowing the university to achieve its academic mission. In the event that the world fails to curb greenhouse gas emissions and produces well over 2°C of climate change, substantial damage is expected to be imposed on the global economy. This threatens the growth prospects of the endowment and pension funds of the University of Toronto. It also creates additional geopolitical risks such as agricultural disruption and forced migration.

James Powell, former President of Oberlin, Franklin and Marshall, and Reed College, argues that university trustees have a quasi-legal duty to do all they can about climate change, arguing:

“The board is supposed to make sure that the endowment allows for intergenerational equity, that the students who are going to Oberlin in 2075 get as much benefit from it as those there now. But with global warming, you’re guaranteeing a diminution of quality of life decades out.”

⁷Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, *Climate Change 2007: Working Group I: The Physical Science Basis*,

⁸International Energy Agency, *World Energy Outlook: 2012*.

⁹U.S. National Academy of Sciences, *Ad Hoc Study Group on Carbon Dioxide and Climate*.

¹⁰Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, *First Assessment Report*.

¹¹Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, *Second Assessment Report: Climate Change 1995*.

¹²Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, *Third Assessment Report: Climate Change 2001*.

¹³Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, *Fourth Assessment Report: Climate Change 2007*.

Taking action to address climate change is not an example of needlessly taking sides in a controversial issue. Rather, it is a matter of taking part in a necessary global transition. If the world fails to constrain the worst impacts of climate change, serious deleterious impacts can be expected for Canada and the University of Toronto.

2.3 The University of Toronto is already taking action on climate change

In response to the settled science of climate change, the university has already taken a number of actions motivated by concern about climate change and a desire to reduce the university's greenhouse gas pollution impact. The university's actions show climate change to be ``directly pertinent to higher education and academic research".

Policies and infrastructure decisions justified with reference to climate change

The university has adopted an Environmental Protection Policy

This section needs to be filled out

Academic programming

In 2005, the university established a new Centre for Global Change Science (CGCS), which has since conducted exemplary research into climate change effects, as well as a wide array of public lectures focused around climate-related themes. The CGCS has hosted a number of talks as part of its Distinguished Lecture Series including:¹⁴

- Successes and Challenges for Biodiversity Science: Distribution Responses to Climate Change --- James Clark, Duke University, September 18, 2012
- High Altitude Climate Change: The Survival Struggle of our Earth's Alpine Glaciers --- Andrew Bush, University of Alberta, October 16, 2012
- Assessing Vegetation Responses and Feedbacks to Climate Change --- John Gamon, University of Alberta, November 6, 2012
- Cumulative Carbon Emissions and the Climate Mitigation Challenge --- Damon Matthews, McGill University, February 5, 2013; and
- Trees to Tailpipes: Natural and Anthropogenic Influences on Global Atmospheric Composition --- Colette Heald Massachusetts Inst. of Technology, March 5, 2013.

The university also offers courses on climate-change-related themes, including:

¹⁴See: http://www.cgcs.utoronto.ca/Series/Lecture_Series.htm

- Applied Climate Change
- Gaining Practical Skills for Climate Change Adaptation (UTSC Summer Institute 2013)
- Climate Change Law (LAW269H1S); and
- Climate Change and Human Health (CEM 406).

Climate change is certainly an area of active scholarly research, but that research does not question the fundamental connection between burning fossil fuel and warming the planet. Nor does it challenge the argument that climate change is likely to cause a great deal of social injury and human suffering. Rather, the academic work being conducted on climate change at U of T reinforces the case for divestment.

3 The activities of fossil fuel companies are socially injurious, and this social injury cannot be reasonably remedied through shareholder voice

We may want to come up with a snappier title for this section. Also, since this whole section is largely about law, we need to (a) be completely clear and correct in what we say about the contents and interpretation of these laws (b) make completely defensible claims about the impacts of climate change and fossil fuel extraction generally (c) make sure to run this by some lawyers and people familiar with the U of T administration before we submit it

3.1 From the U of T divestment policy

Social injury is the injurious impact which the activities of a company are found to have on consumers, employees, or other persons, particularly including activities which violate, or frustrate the enforcement of, rules of domestic or international law intended to protect individuals against deprivation or health, safety, or basic freedoms

3.2 Social injury

The primary activities of fossil fuel companies impose social injury on consumers, employees, or other persons. The burning of a large portion of the world's reserves of fossil fuels would inflict great social injury through:

1. The impact of climate change on agriculture
2. The inundation of coastal areas
3. Storms, droughts, other extreme weather
4. The spread of tropical disease
5. Ecosystem collapse
6. Threats to First Nations groups and indigenous cultures
7. Threats to the infrastructure of cities, including Toronto

8. The threat of abrupt and non-linear adverse climate impacts, arising from positive feedback effects and important thresholds in the climate system

Monica has prepared additional text to add to each of these points. As discussed at the 23 April 2013 planning meeting, she and Jon will revise that text until they are happy with it and then send it to Milan to incorporate into the ~~TEX~~file

3.3 The harm caused is inherent to the primary business of fossil fuel companies

The harms from fossil fuel extraction and burning arise directly and inescapably from the core business activities of fossil fuel companies. As a result, shareholder voice is not an effective strategy for mitigating these harms. The value of these companies reflects the assumption that these reserves will be extracted and burned. The University of Toronto's investments in these companies increase the amount of harm that will arise as a result of climate change.

Divestment is the only way for the University of Toronto to avoid contributing financially to the fossil fuel industry, and by extension, to the socially injurious impacts delineated above. Besides divestment, another approach to socially responsible investment is to try to alter a firm's behaviour by applying pressure through shareholder voice. However, the harmful activities (extracting and selling fossil fuels) are inherent to the primary business of fossil fuels companies in which the university is invested. In this sense, investments in fossil fuel companies closely parallel investments in tobacco companies; in both cases, the problem is the primary product being produced by the industry.

For example, Shell Canada lists its business activities as follows: "Shell Canada's Upstream businesses explore for and extract natural gas, and market and trade natural gas and power. Our Downstream business refines, supplies, trades and ships crude oil worldwide and manufactures and markets a range of products, including fuels, lubricants, bitumen and liquified petroleum gas (LPG) for home, transport and industrial use." ExxonMobil describes its upstream and downstream activities similarly.

Given the centrality of oil and natural gas extraction, as well as the refinement and sale of these resources to the business models of these companies, shareholder voice would not be an effective method to address social injury since the companies could not abandon the socially injurious activity without dissolving their existing business models. Moreover, the market value of these companies reflects an assumption that their reserves will be extracted and burned. Therefore, it would be unreasonable for the University of Toronto to expect to be able to alter the socially injurious activities of these companies while holding onto its investments in the fossil fuel industry. Thus, divestment is the only appropriate

response for the University of Toronto to adopt in order to dissolve any financial complicity in the fossil fuels industry's socially injurious activities.

3.4 The business activities of these companies frustrate the enforcement of the rules of domestic and international law intended to protect individuals against deprivation of health, safety, and basic freedoms

The socially injurious activities of fossil fuel companies frustrate the enforcement of rules of domestic and international law intended to protect individuals against deprivation of health, safety and basic freedoms.

The section below needs a fair amount of work. We need to go beyond pointing to very general rights in the constitution and international legal documents and work toward a convincing legal case.

First, these activities undermine the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*. Section 7 states "the right to life, liberty and security of the person and the right not to be deprived thereof except in accordance with the principles of fundamental justice." Since life and security of the person depend on a healthy environment, implicit in this statement is the right to a healthy environment. By contributing to increasingly dangerous global climate change, the activities of companies in the fossil fuels industry undermine the right to life by depriving people of the benefits of a healthy environment.

In addition, numerous pieces of Canadian environmental legislation explicitly recognize and seek to protect the right to a healthful environment. The *Ontario Environmental Bill of Rights* (1993) recognizes the "inherent value of the natural environment" and states that "the people of Ontario have the right to a healthful environment" and "have as a common goal the protection, conservation and restoration of the natural environment for the benefit of present and future generations." The purposes of the act are:

1. to protect, conserve and, where reasonable, restore the integrity of the environment by the means provided in this Act;
2. to provide sustainability of the environment by the means provided in this Act; and
3. to protect the right to a healthful environment by the means provided in this Act. 1993, c. 28, s. 2 (1).

Legislation cited here should be cited using the same \LaTeX footnote system employed through the rest of the brief.

The above purposes include the following:

1. The prevention, reduction and elimination of the use, generation and release of pollutants that are an unreasonable threat to the integrity of the environment.
2. The protection and conservation of biological, ecological and genetic diversity.
3. The protection and conservation of natural resources, including plant life, animal life and ecological systems.
4. The encouragement of the wise management of our natural resources, including plant life, animal life and ecological systems.
5. The identification, protection and conservation of ecologically sensitive areas or processes. 1993, c. 28, s. 2 (2).

The activities of fossil fuel companies frustrate all of the above purposes by contributing to climate change, thereby undermining the right to a healthy environment of the people of Ontario.

More specific examples of how each of these purposes are challenged by climate change should be added.

Environmental laws for other provinces of Canada recognize and seek to protect the same right to a healthy environment.

For example, Part 1, section 6 of the *Yukon Environment Act* states that: "The people of the Yukon have the right to a healthful natural environment." In accordance with this right, the Act seeks to protect the environment of the Yukon by providing an appropriate process to assess the environmental effects of projects and activities in the Yukon or that may have effects in the Yukon. Similarly, the *Northwest Territories Environmental Rights Act* recognizes that "the people of the Northwest Territories have the right to a healthy environment and a right to protect the integrity, biological diversity and productivity of the ecosystems in the Northwest Territories" and establishes the means by which individuals can act to protect the environment from harm. By pursuing the extraction of fossil fuels, the companies in question undermine the right to a healthy environment that these acts articulate and protect. Finally, Quebec's *Environmental Quality Act* states that, "Every person has a right to a healthy environment and to its protection, and to the protection of the living species inhabiting it, to the extent provided for by this Act and the regulations, orders, approvals and authorizations issued under any section of this Act and, as regards odours resulting from agricultural activities, to the extent prescribed by any standard

originating from the exercise of the powers provided for in subparagraph 4 of the second paragraph of section 113 of the Act respecting land use planning and development" (chapter A-19.1).

Should we be including legislation from provinces other than Ontario? If so, it should be cited in the standard way for the brief.

The activities of the fossil fuels industry in Canada also violate the constitutional and treaty rights of Canada's First Nations. These violations arise both from the specific impact of fossil fuel development projects --- such as the oil sands --- and from the inevitable consequences of burning fossil fuels. Rights that are being violated include the right to consultation and accommodation; the right to waters and land and to fish, hunt and trap; and the aboriginal rights affirmed in Canada's constitution.

Keepers of the Athabasca member Vivienne Beisel explains how the oil sands development has violated Treaty 8 and the Constitution: "The cumulative impacts of oil sands development has all but destroyed the traditional livelihood of First Nations in northern Athabasca watershed. The law is clear that First Nations must be consulted whenever the province contemplates action that may negatively affect Aboriginal and treaty rights... The province has continued to issue approvals for new developments without obtaining their consent or consulting with First Nations in a meaningful and substantial way. This is in direct breach of Treaty 8 First Nations' treaty-protected Aboriginal rights to livelihood, and thus a violation of s.35(1) of the Constitution".

MIE HAD THIS TEXT, BUT I DON'T THINK IT ADDS TO OUR CASE ``and Articles 26 and 27 of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, an international agreement which Canada, along with three other nations, has refused to sign." We need to add information on how the rights of aboriginals in Ontario specifically risk being violated by fossil fuel companies.

Finally, the activities of the fossil fuels companies in which the University of Toronto is invested frustrate international law. First, Article 3 of the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* states that "Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of person." The right to life is a precondition to all other fundamental human rights. The activities of companies in the fossil fuels industry undermine the right to life by depriving people of the benefits of a healthy environment. In addition, the *Hague Declaration on the Environment* (1989), to which Canada is a signatory, makes the link between the right to life and the harmful change effects of climate change explicit: "The right to live is the right from which all other rights stem. Guaranteeing this right is the paramount duty of those in charge of all States throughout the world. Today, the very conditions of life on our planet are threatened by the severe attacks to which the earth's atmosphere is subjected." In signing onto this Declaration, Canada recognized the reality of the threat to human life posed by climate change and pledged to take measures to address that threat. The

University of Toronto's investment in fossil fuels frustrates any efforts Canada has taken or may take in the future to address the problem of climate change by supporting the companies that most significantly contribute to the problem.

Again, this needs to be made more specific both in terms of impacts and in terms of laws. Where possible, we want to be able to point to specific documented effects that contravene specific pieces of applicable legislation.

The activities of fossil fuel companies are also at odds with the fundamental objective of the *United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change* (UNFCCC), which was ratified by Canada and which entered into force on March 21st 1994. The UNFCCC affirms the intention of signatories to achieve "stabilization of greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere at a level that would prevent dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system". Countries including Canada have since adopted a threshold of 2°C of global temperature increase above pre-industrial levels as constituting 'dangerous' climate change. Achieving this objective requires that most of the reserves of fossil fuel companies be left unburned underground. It also requires the abandonment of projects intended to extract unconventional reserves of fossil fuels, through activities including oil and gas drilling in the arctic, exploitation of the oil sands, and extraction of previously inaccessible oil and gas reserves through hydraulic fracturing.

3.5 Why fossil fuels are like tobacco

In 2007, the University of Toronto decided to divest from tobacco companies, after determining that the case to do so was consistent with university policies. There are several important ways in which the tobacco precedent is relevant to fossil fuel divestment.

Firstly, the scientific case demonstrating the harm caused by tobacco strengthened progressively over the span of decades. Companies were initially willing to challenge these claims, but the weight of evidence eventually made their case untenable. Similarly, the evidence demonstrating the seriousness of anthropogenic climate change has now progressed beyond the point where it can be considered a subject of ongoing academic inquiry and debate.

Secondly, in both the cases of tobacco and fossil fuels the problem is the primary product being produced by the industry. Just as it would be ineffective to use shareholder voice to try to convince a tobacco company to stop producing and selling tobacco, it is implausible that the university could use shareholder activism to convince fossil fuel companies to desist from activities that create and facilitate major greenhouse gas pollution.

Thirdly, both investments in tobacco and fossil fuels challenge the core values of the university.

Elaborate, and add citations related to the tobacco precedent. Also, consider whether any other previous U of T divestment campaigns can be cited as useful precedents.

4 Divestment is compatible with the university's fiduciary duties

4.1 From the U of T divestment policy

(i) prudent investment. The University has a fiduciary duty to manage investments responsibly to maximize return on its investments within a policy risk tolerance as approved by Business Board from time to time.

...

The committee will consider the following guidelines in considering the appropriate response to any request:

- the extent and significance of the University's investment in a particular entity. Determination of whether investments are considered significant will depend on the committee's judgment of the relative magnitude of the University's holdings both as a fraction of all University investments and in relation to the market capitalization of the entity under review.*
- the degree to which the entity itself is involved in the undesirable activity.*

Normally, activity is considered significant if more than ten percent of the entity's revenues are derived from the undesirable activity.

4.2 There is no evidence of a divestment penalty for investors

Several studies have attempted to quantify the financial consequences of divestment from the fossil fuel industry or heavy polluters in general. In aggregate, these studies found no significant impact on investment risk in predictive models, nor a performance penalty in tests using historical data.

Historical The UN Environment Program Finance Initiative meta-analysis found there to be no evidence of penalty to screened portfolios¹⁵ *I (Stu) didn't really understand the document. This comment should be clarified.*

Risk Based Assessment The aperio group found that divesting from the "Filthy Fifteen" "increases absolute portfolio risk by only 0.0006%, or about a half of one one-thousandth of a percent." Even divesting from the entire Fossil Fuel sector only results in a 0.0034% return penalty. In

¹⁵United Nations Environment Programme Finance Initiative and Mercer, *Demystifying Responsible Investment Performance: A review of key academic and broker research on ESG factors*.

other words, the portfolio does become riskier, but by such a trivial amount that the impact is statistically irrelevant.¹⁶

Forward Looking Carbon Tracker and Standard & Poors together conducted a study on the implications of carbon constraints for credit ratings of the oil and gas sector. Their scenario assumes reducing demand for CO₂-intensive fuels, in line with the internationally recognized limit of a 2°C rise in global temperatures, and is “not materially different from the current price deck assumptions.” The study concludes with the statement,

“as the price declines persist in our stress scenario of weaker oil demand, meaningful pressure could build on ratings. First to be affected would be the relatively focused, higher cost producers, and then the more diversified integrated players. In both cases, according to our study, the causes would be a decline in operating cash flows, weakening free cash flow and credit measures, along with less certain returns on investment and less robust reserve replacement.”¹⁷

So not only does divestment present little risk of missing out on improvements in ratings (and therefore, investment returns), divestment could actually be beneficial for the portfolio, in that it would remove risk of being invested in companies which only appear to decline in the long term.

4.3 Market capitalization and value at risk

Stated policy objectives are incompatible with the current valuation of fossil fuel reserves

Fossil fuels may provide a hedge against other asset classes, but only in scenarios where unconstrained emissions lead to accelerated and possibly catastrophic warming. The international community is in broad agreement that this must be prevented from happening.

Regulatory risk is not adequately priced

As one scenario for the World Energy Outlook in 2012, the International Energy Agency assumes international cooperation to keep CO₂ under 450ppm, which in their model constrains the likelihood of warming greater than 2°C to 55%. This is in contrast to their baseline New Policies Scenario, which assumes modest reductions in the rate of emissions increase compared to the third scenario, Current Policies. Regarding the effect this policy environment would have on the price of fossil fuels they estimate:

¹⁶Geddes, *Do the Investment Math: Building a Carbon-Free Portfolio*.

¹⁷Simon Redmond, *What A Carbon-Constrained Future Could Mean For Oil Companies' Creditworthiness*.

Compared with the New Policies Scenario, the global oil price in the 450 Scenario in 2035 is \$25 per barrel lower and the coal price almost 40% lower. The price for natural gas falls by 23% in Europe and 4% in North America.¹⁸

For any scenario where emissions are constrained to keep warming under 2°C, market assumptions regarding the profitability of fossil fuel extraction are necessarily optimistic. Marginal projects will become unprofitable and returns to investors for even the most profitable projects will decline. Indeed, the study conducted by Standard & Poors even indicates near-term threats to the stability of investing in some fossil fuel companies: "Under our stressed scenario, the ratings on companies with high development and production costs, including those focused on unconventional resources, could see rating pressure build *within one or two years*, especially if the companies are relatively undiversified" (emphasis ours).¹⁹ The study continues, "We see a deterioration in credit measures for these smaller oil companies over 2014-2015, to a degree that could potentially lead to negative outlook revisions and downgrades over 2014-2017. ... this could result in an earlier deterioration in our business risk profile assessments." Furthermore, even "the financial risk profiles of the oil majors would weaken modestly over the next five years."

It is also worthy of note that the study claims, "the core business model [of fossil fuel companies] could come into question," and that "this could potentially result in *a downgrade of more than one notch* if we were to place less reliance on undeveloped or probable reserves than at present" (emphasis ours). Indeed, even for the 'oil majors', "reserve replacement ratios (RRRs) below 100%... could in our opinion become a rating constraint."

There is a strong potential for malinvestment in capital-intensive, long-term projects

The IEA's World Energy Outlook (2012) concluded that, "more than two-thirds of current proven fossil-fuel reserves cannot be commercialized in a 2DegC world before 2050."²⁰ The Standard & Poors Carbon Tracker Initiative study raises their concerns concerning the fossil fuel sector: "This illustrates to us the apparent divergence between the assets owned by coal, oil, and gas companies and the direction of negotiations at UNFCCC conferences."²¹ Indeed, investment in CO2-emissions-enabling infrastructure goes in the opposite direction of the international community.

The persistently high price of fuels on the world market in recent years has lead to unprecedented

¹⁸International Energy Agency, *World Energy Outlook: 2012*, p. 257.

¹⁹Simon Redmond, *What A Carbon-Constrained Future Could Mean For Oil Companies' Creditworthiness*.

²⁰International Energy Agency, *World Energy Outlook: 2012*.

²¹Simon Redmond, *What A Carbon-Constrained Future Could Mean For Oil Companies' Creditworthiness*.

investment on the part of the fossil fuel industry in projects that were previously deemed too marginal to profitably develop. Development of unconventional hydrocarbon reserves such as tar sands, oil shale, offshore drilling in extremely deep water and the arctic, hydraulic fracturing and mountaintop removal coal mining entails extremely high capital investment. Scenarios in which carbon emissions are restricted sufficiently to keep global temperatures from rising more than 2°C would likely cripple the return on much of this investment.

In anticipating such a scenario, the fossil fuel industry has been pinning its hopes on the development of effective methods of carbon capture and sequestration (CCS). Despite tremendous investment in this technology on the part of both the private and public sectors, economically feasible sequestration of emissions at scales needed to mitigate climate change remains elusive. There are currently no commercial scale CCS projects in operation on the planet, and in 2008 Cambridge Energy Research Associates (CERA) predicted that it would be another two decades before CCS saw large-scale deployment.²² According to the Carbon Tracker Initiative, even if CCS is deployed in line with an idealised scenario by 2050, this would only extend fossil fuel carbon budgets by 12-14%, or just 4% of total global reserves.²³ It must be remembered that at the current rate of global carbon emissions, the entire budget of carbon emissions would be spent by the late 2020s, several years before large-scale CCS can be expected to come online.²⁴

CCS has many other problems associated with it. For example, CCS would use extra energy, potentially as much as 40% of the power generated by a power station.²⁵ This reduces the efficiency of the power plant, both increasing financial costs, and increasing the amount of fuel needed per energy output, which in turn increases the problems associated with fossil fuel extraction. Indeed, the increased cost of the energy provided by CCS-enabled power stations would likely be higher than the cost of energy from renewable sources, and so would almost certainly never be implemented.²⁶ Storing carbon underground is risky—safe and permanent storage of CO₂ cannot be guaranteed, and even very low leakage rates could undermine any climate mitigation efforts.²⁷ Finally, money spent on CCS will divert investments away from sustainable solutions to climate change, which the world will need to transfer to eventually, whether or not it burns all the available (non-renewable) fossil fuels.

Therefore, pinning our hopes on a non-existent technology, that is likely to both be more expensive

²²Cambridge Energy Research Associates, *Crossing the Divide: The Future of Clean Energy*.

²³Carbon Tracker Institute, *Unburnable Carbon 2013: Wasted capital and stranded assets*.

²⁴Carbon Tracker Institute, *Unburnable Carbon: Are the world's financial markets carrying a carbon bubble*.

²⁵Greenpeace, *False Hope: Why carbon capture and storage won't save the climate*.

²⁶Nelder, *Why carbon capture and storage will never pay off*.

²⁷Greenpeace, *False Hope: Why carbon capture and storage won't save the climate*.

and problematic than other energy sources, is a false hope.

Fossil fuel reserves as stranded assets

Given the degree to which proven reserves of carbon exceed allowable emissions for sub-2°C warming, companies with fossil fuel reserves as their largest assets may be substantially overvalued under current market conditions. Stranded assets in the form of unburnable reserves and large liabilities incurred to develop those reserves combine to create a risk not only to equity, but to bondholders as well. The Carbon Tracker Initiative reports that in 2012 the Fossil Fuel sector spent \$674 billion prospecting for new sources of carbon, sources which cannot be exploited if the 2C target is to be met.²⁸

As the Carbon Tracker Initiative's 2012 report made clear, fossil fuel companies have significantly more exploitable sources of carbon available than is safe to burn.²⁹ Therefore, when considering ``What A Carbon-Constrained Future Could Mean For Oil Companies' Creditworthiness," Standard & Poors decided that, ``instead of considering issues of peak oil in terms of supply, this introduces a concept of peak oil demand."³⁰

Volatility of investor sentiment

Current market capitalization of the fossil fuel industry rests in part on the assumption that the global investor class will continue to see the sector as a reliable investment even as damage from climate change becomes apparent. This assumption has been increasingly challenged from both outside and within the financial industry. Traditionally conservative-minded publications such as *The Economist*,³¹ *Business Week*³² and the *Financial Times*³³ have published articles suggesting the fossil fuel sector is overvalued. In recent months, other voices within the financial industry such as investors groups and hedge fund managers have been increasingly sounding the alarm over the ``Carbon Bubble".³⁴ The Guardian recently reported

The message to all the players across the financial chain, from ratings agencies through accountants, to actuaries, investment advisors and all the rest, is also obvious. If the regulators won't do their job, do it for them. *Jump, before you are pushed* (emphasis ours).³⁵

²⁸Carbon Tracker Institute, *Unburnable Carbon 2013: Wasted capital and stranded assets*.

²⁹Carbon Tracker Institute, *Unburnable Carbon: Are the world's financial markets carrying a carbon bubble*.

³⁰Simon Redmond, *What A Carbon-Constrained Future Could Mean For Oil Companies' Creditworthiness*.

³¹*Economist*, *Unburnable fuel*.

³²*Businessweek*, *Economist: Energy reserves overvalued by global markets*.

³³Stern, *A profound contradiction at the heart of climate change policy*.

³⁴Hickman, Jeremy Grantham, environmental philanthropist: 'We're trying to buy time for the world to wake up'.

³⁵J. Leggett, B. Mckibben, *How your pension is being used in a 6trillionclimategamble*.

The afore-mentioned Standard & Poors study, which saw a declining trend on both the short-term and long-term outlook for fossil fuel companies (both mid-size and large), reached their conclusion without ``explicitly [factoring in] any mitigating measures such as ... material cuts in near-term capital investment."³⁶ However, there is already a significant, international fossil-fuel divestment movement, which could result in such material cuts: over 300 colleges and universities, and over 100 cities and states currently have divestment campaigns, along with several religious institutions. So far, ten cities and four colleges have pledged to divest and the movement is only just getting started.

4.4 Fossil fuels represent a risk to the university's other investments

Institutional investors, and universities in particular are unique in that they are often expected to plan financially on a timescale far longer than average. On timescales of 50 years or more, the consequences of unconstrained emissions are very likely to overshadow all other financial considerations. According to a 2012 report by DARA, Climate change is already costing the world more than \$1.2 trillion, wiping 1.6% annually from global GDP. By 2030, the researchers estimate, the cost of climate change and air pollution combined will rise to 3.2% of global GDP, with the world's least developed countries forecast to bear the brunt, suffering losses of up to 11% of their GDP.³⁷ Going further into the future is increasingly hard to predict, with estimates varying widely: the Stern Review estimates losses of between 5%-20%,³⁸ and a United Nations report asserts that climate change could cost Latin American and Caribbean countries 137% of GDP by 2100.³⁹ However, regardless of the variations of predictions, the trend is crystal clear: the more the climate changes, the greater the reductions to GDP. Therefore, reducing climate change will result in increased GDP, therefore, greater returns on the University's investments.

4.5 Attractive substitutes exist for divested equities

There are many attractive alternatives that could form substantial portions of the Universities' portfolio. The renewable energy sector has enormous growth potential, and is starting to match even convention fossil-fuel energy prices (let alone unconventional). Unsubsidised renewable energy is now cheaper than electricity from new-build coal- and gas-fired power stations in Australia, according to new analysis from research firm Bloomberg New Energy Finance.⁴⁰ Solar power is predicted to be cheaper than fossil fuel

³⁶Simon Redmond, *What A Carbon-Constrained Future Could Mean For Oil Companies' Creditworthiness*.

³⁷International, *Climate Vulnerability Monitor: A Guide to the Cold Calculus of A Hot Planet*.

³⁸Stern, *The Economics of Climate Change: The Stern Review*.

³⁹ECLAC, *Economics of Climate Change in Latin America and the Caribbean*.

⁴⁰Finance, *RENEWABLE ENERGY NOW CHEAPER THAN NEW FOSSIL FUELS IN AUSTRALIA*.

power in the USA as soon as 2015.⁴¹ In March 2013, 100% of the new energy on the U.S. grid was solar power.⁴²

There are three broad-based mutual funds that are completely fossil free: Green Century Balanced Fund, Portfolio 21 Global Equity Mutual Fund, and Shelton Green Alpha Fund.⁴³

4.6 Pensions and climate change

Pensions are intended to allow the pensioner to enjoy a satisfactory, even comfortable, retirement. However, the more the climate is changed, the lower the quality of life that will be enjoyed by the retirees. A study conducted by the World Bank makes it clear that a 4°C hotter world will be a much more hostile world than one in which there has only been a 2°C rise, with 6°C or greater rises being even more hostile still.⁴⁴ We saw in the previous sections of this brief that even a 2°C rise will result in a greater frequency of natural disasters than the relative climate stability of the development of human civilisation. Indeed, the worlds' top scientists have calculated that a concentration of CO₂ in the atmosphere that is higher than 350ppm is not compatible with the planet "on which civilization developed and to which life is adapted."⁴⁵

Therefore, it is in the best interests of the future pensioners of the University of Toronto (its current employees) to live in a world with a stable climate. For example, if a 55 year old college president were to insist today that a portfolio requires fossil fuel investment, then when that president reaches the age of retirement, only 11% of the CO₂ released during the class of 2016's education will have left the atmosphere. The same article also highlights the perspective of students:

"Even if today's college students live to be 100 years old, more than half of the CO₂ released into the atmosphere during the four years they are in college will still be present there at the end of their lives – warming the planet and contributing to extreme events, like droughts, floods, and storms all the while – long after the decision makers behind those investment choices will have left office. The college students across the US who are arguing that their education should not be funded by actions that diminish the health of the world in which their future will unfold have a strong case, supported by the basic physics of the climate."⁴⁶

This concept is further reinforced by James Powell, former-president of Oberlin, Franklin and Marshall,

⁴¹GlobalData, *Grid Parity for Wind and Solar Power - Future Outlook and Impact Analysis*.

⁴²Fleischfresser, *Solar power produced 100% of new energy on U.S. grid in March*.

⁴³350.org, *Move My Money*.

⁴⁴Bank, *Turn Down the Heat: Why a 4°C Warmer World Must be Avoided*.

⁴⁵James Hansen, *Target Atmospheric CO₂: Where Should Humanity Aim?*

⁴⁶Sawin, *Carbon Dioxide Will Persist in the Atmosphere Long After Current Decision Makers Have Left Their Roles: On Ethical Grounds, Young People Should Have a Say*.

and Reed College, who suggests that trustees have a quasi-legal duty to do all they can about climate change. ``The board is supposed to make sure that the endowment allows for intergenerational equity, that the students who are going to Oberlin in 2075 get as much benefit from it as those there now. But with global warming, you're guaranteeing a diminution of quality of life decades out."⁴⁷

Therefore, not only is divestment from the fossil fuel industry a sound financial decision for meeting the financial obligations of prudent investment, the current employees of the University of Toronto will benefit from such divestment.

Notes on this section:

Stuart took over the drafting of this section. This may be a place where we can make especially good use of documents already prepared by other schools, including: (a) schools U of T regards as peers, like Harvard (b) schools in a similar position to U of T, like McGill and UBC and (c) schools that have already divested.

This section also needs to specifically address this section from the Procedures for Responding to Social and Political Issues with Respect to University Divestment: ``the extent and significance of the University's investment in a particular entity. Determination of whether investments are considered significant will depend on the committee's judgment of the relative magnitude of the University's holdings both as a fraction of all University investments and in relation to the market capitalization of the entity under review."

It is virtually certain that the ad hoc committee will consider the special responsibility the university has toward current and future retirees. We need to make the case that (a) divestment is a sound financial decision for meeting those obligations and (b) if current employees want a decent retirement, dangerous climate change must be avoided.

⁴⁷Mckibben, *The Case for Fossil-Fuel Divestment*.

5 Actions have been taken by the Canadian government and international bodies on this issue

All three levels of Canada's government have taken action in response to the threat of climate change.

5.1 From the U of T divestment policy

Responses should be based on the following principles:

...

(iii) actions taken by the Canadian government or other national or international bodies with regard to the particular issue of concern.

5.2 Federal government

Emission standards for passenger vehicles and light trucks In November 2012, proposed regulations were released for vehicles beginning with the 2017 model year. Average emissions from vehicles in 2025 are expected to be 50% of those sold in 2008.⁴⁸

Heavy duty vehicles In April 2012, the federal government released regulations for heavy duty vehicles beginning with the 2014 model year.⁴⁹

Coal-fired power plants In September 2012, final regulations were introduced to limit emissions from the coal-fired electricity sector.⁵⁰

Renewable fuel requirement As of December 2010, gasoline is required to contain an average of 5% renewable content, with a 2% requirement for diesel fuel.⁵¹

Carbon capture and storage (CCS) Canada's federal and provincial governments have committed a total of approximately \$3 billion in funding for CCS, which could lead to as many as five to six large-scale demonstration projects in Canada.⁵²

⁴⁸Environment Canada, *Reducing Greenhouse Gases*.

⁴⁹*Ibid.*

⁵⁰Environment Canada, *Harper Government Moves Forward on Tough Rules for Coal-Fired Electricity Sector*.

⁵¹Environment Canada, *Reducing Greenhouse Gases*.

⁵²*Ibid.*

Agricultural greenhouse gases Canada is contributing \$27 million toward the Global Research Alliance on Agricultural Greenhouse Gases, a group created to advance research, technology transfer, and adoption of beneficial management practices to mitigate agricultural greenhouse gases.⁵³

5.3 Government of Ontario

Emission reduction targets The Government of Ontario has legislated greenhouse gas emission reduction targets of 6% below 1990 levels by 2014, 15% below by 2020, and 80% below by 2050.⁵⁴

Phasing out coal The Government of Ontario has committed to phasing out coal-fired electricity generation by 2014.⁵⁵

Public transit investments The Ontario government is contributing over \$9 billion to the Metrolinx Regional Transportation Plan.⁵⁶

Green Energy Act Ontario's 2009 Green Energy Act created a system of feed-in tariffs to support the deployment of renewable energy options including solar photovoltaic, biogas, biomass, landfill gas, and wind power.⁵⁷ It established a right for all renewable energy projects to be connected to the grid, streamlined the approval process for green energy projects, and began the implementation of a 'smart' energy grid.

Forest protection Ontario has protected roughly half of the province's boreal forest from mining and forestry, motivated in part by the forest's importance as a carbon sink.⁵⁸

Establishment of a Climate Change Secretariat In 2008, the province created a permanent secretariat to coordinate its *Climate Change Action Plan*.⁵⁹

Community Go Green Fund The province provided \$6 million to 90 community groups in order to help charitable or environmental organizations, youth or cultural associations, educational institutions and Aboriginal communities reduce their carbon footprint.⁶⁰

⁵³Environment Canada, *Reducing Greenhouse Gases*.

⁵⁴Ontario Ministry of the Environment, *Climate Change - Greening Our Ways*.

⁵⁵Government of Ontario, *Ontario Regulation 496/07: Cessation of Coal Use – Atikokan, Lambton, Nantcoke and Thunder Bay Generating Stations*.

⁵⁶Ontario Ministry of the Environment, *Climate Change - Greening Our Ways*.

⁵⁷Ontario Ministry of the Environment, *Green Energy Act*.

⁵⁸.

⁵⁹.

⁶⁰Ontario Ministry of the Environment, *Climate Change - Greening Our Ways*.

5.4 City of Toronto

Climate Change Action Plan

The city's Climate Change, Clean Air and Sustainable Energy Action Plan was unanimously adopted by Toronto City Council in July 2007. The city allocated over \$1 billion over the next five years to projects to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.⁶¹

These commitments included:

- \$67 million for the Better Building Partnership and the Sustainable Energy Funds, which are low interest revolving loan funds that support energy conservation and renewable energy
- \$136 million for energy retrofits to and installation of renewable energy systems on City owned buildings;
- \$24 million for tree planting, in addition to the \$40 million a year operating budget for the city's Forestry Unit;
- \$36 million to accelerate implementation of the City's Bike Plan;
- \$20 million for the Live Green Toronto program which provides support for neighbourhood and community groups in taking action on Climate Change;
- \$10 million for continued conversion of traffic signals to LED lights;
- \$7 million for the Clean Roads to Clean Air street sweeping initiative;
- \$186 million for water efficiency and improved energy efficiency in Toronto Water operations that will achieve an annual avoidance of an estimated 14,000 tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions;
- \$21 million for methane gas capture and control at closed and operating landfills;
- \$67 million to build anaerobic digestion facilities that will capture biogas from collected Green Bin organic materials and generate enough electricity to power an estimated 1,700 homes;
- \$380 million to improve rapid transit services, such as, new light rapid transit lines, rapid transit routes for buses and an improved signalling system that will increase the capacity of the Yonge subway line;
- \$400 million for the purchase of electric-hybrid buses; and

⁶¹Office, *Climate Change, Clean Air and Sustainable Energy Action Plan*.

- \$10 million plus for a range of initiatives including the Green Fleet Transition, the Eco-Roofs and Greenroofs Incentive programs, and support initiatives that promote production and consumption of locally grown food.

These investments are specifically justified with reference to the danger of climate change, with expected impacts on the city including rising mean temperatures, warmer winters, changes in disease vectors, changes in precipitation patterns, increased extreme weather, falling lake and stream levels, and rising sea levels.⁶²

The City of Toronto has also committed to specific greenhouse gas reduction targets, starting with the city's 1990 baseline level of approximately 22 million tonnes per year:⁶³

- 6 percent by 2012 (1,320,000 tonnes per year)
- 30 percent by 2020 (6,600,000 tonnes per year)
- 80 percent by 2050 (17,600,000 tonnes per year)

Other actions taken by the city include:

Adaptation The city is making efforts to prepare for the impacts of climate change, through programs and policies including Toronto's Heat Alert system and Hot Weather Response Plan, The Wet Weather Flow Master Plan, Green Roof Pilot Incentive Program, Deep Lake Water Cooling (En-wave), Peaksaver and Keep Cool Programs (Toronto Hydro), Green Development Standard, and Better Buildings Partnership.

Great Lakes Climate Change Policy Coordination Along with 10 other cities in the Great Lakes region, Toronto is working to develop an international city-level policy on climate change.

Live Green Toronto This five-year, \$20-million dollar program is intended to promote and support actions by residents and community groups to reduce emissions, clean our air and protect our climate.

Landfill gas The City of Toronto collects and burns landfill gases that are emitted at its three largest landfill sites: Keele Valley, Brock West and Beare. The city explains that: "the process of collecting and incinerating landfill gases is crucial to the goal of combating the emission of greenhouse gases into the atmosphere". Toronto, *Toronto Atmospheric Fund - Emission reduction*

⁶²Office, *Climate Change, Clean Air and Sustainable Energy Action Plan*.

⁶³Toronto, *Toronto Atmospheric Fund - Emission reduction*.

Greenhouse Gas and Air Emissions Inventory In 2007, the city completed a combined greenhouse gas and air quality emissions inventory, with information about energy consumption and pollutants within the city.

Concern about oil sands pipelines The Toronto City Council has expressed its desire to review the application of Enbridge to reverse their Line 9 pipeline to carry diluted bitumen from the oil sands. The city may apply to become an intervenor in the National Energy Board process.

5.5 Actions taken by other national bodies

The extensive actions undertaken by other countries demonstrates the seriousness of climate change. In many cases, they have implemented significantly more ambitious policies than those enacted in Canada to date. This action demonstrates how, in the view of the world's major governments, the need to mitigate climate change is not properly the subject of academic inquiry and debate.

United States

Federal government

At the federal level, the White House under the leadership of President Obama has taken many steps towards mitigating and adapting to climate change.

Monitoring Emissions The United States is comprehensively cataloguing greenhouse gas emissions from its largest emitting sources.

Government Procurement and Energy Consumption President Obama directed the Federal Government – the largest energy consumer in the U.S. economy – to reduce its greenhouse gas emissions from direct sources such as building energy use and fuel consumption by 28 percent by 2020. He also directed Federal agencies to reduce their greenhouse gas emissions from indirect sources, such as those from employee commuting, by 13 percent by 2020.

Creation of the Climate Change Adaptation Task Force (CCATF) and the U.S. Global Change Research Program

The CCATF recommends how Federal agency policies and programs can better prepare the United States to address the risks associated with a changing climate. The USGCRP is a collaborative effort involving 13 Federal agencies to evaluate the current and future impacts of climate change, inform policy-makers and the public about scientific findings, and investigate effective ways to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and deploy cost-effective clean energy technology.

Investing in Clean Energy With the support of administration policy, the U.S. has nearly doubled renewable energy generation from wind, solar, and geothermal sources since 2008. Since 2009, the Department of Interior has approved 29 onshore renewable energy projects, including 16 solar, 5 wind, and 8 geothermal projects. Moving forward, the Department of Interior is committed to issuing permits for 10,000 megawatts of renewable power on public lands and in our offshore waters by the end of 2012, enough to power 3 million homes. In 2010, President Obama also set a goal of breaking ground on at least four commercial scale cellulosic or advanced biorefineries by 2013. That goal was accomplished a year ahead of schedule.

Smart Grid In 2011, the Administration announced that it would accelerate the permitting review of seven proposed electric transmissions lines. These infrastructure projects, when built, will increase grid capacity, facilitating better integration of renewable energy sources, avoiding blackouts, and helping to accommodate the growing number of electric vehicles on the road. The Administration also launched a Green Button initiative in 2011 to empower Americans to reduce energy use in their homes. Already, utilities across the country have committed to providing 27 million households with access to data about their own energy use with a simple click of an online "Green Button" that will help them reduce waste and shrink their energy bills.

Clean Energy Research & Development In 2009, the Administration funded the Department of Energy's Advanced Research Project Agency-Energy (ARPA-E), which focuses on "out-of-the-box" transformational energy research that brings together the nation's best scientists, engineers, and entrepreneurs. Building upon the initial investment, in late September 2011, the ARPA-E program announced 60 cutting-edge research projects in 25 states. In total, The ARPA-E has supported more than 120 individual projects.

Clean Energy Innovation Hubs The Administration also launched a series of clean energy innovation hubs, which bring together teams of the best researchers and engineers in the United States to solve major energy challenges. The hubs will focus on improving batteries and energy storage, reducing constraints from critical materials, developing fuels that can be produced directly from sunlight, improving energy efficient building systems design, and using modelling and simulation for advanced nuclear reactor operations.

The President's Better Buildings Challenge The President's Better Buildings Challenge has set a goal to improve the energy efficiency of commercial buildings by 20 percent by 2020. The Administra-

tion has also partnered with manufacturing companies, representing over 1,400 plants, to improve energy efficiency by 25 percent over 10 years.

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

The EPA develops standards for greenhouse gas emissions from mobile and stationary sources under the Clean Air Act. Its federal regulatory activities are in addition to its volunteer programs, international partnerships, and partnerships with states and tribes.

Standards to Cut Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Fuel Use for New Motor Vehicles The EPA is enabling the production of a new generation of clean vehicles --- from the smallest cars to the largest trucks --- through reduced greenhouse gas emissions and improved fuel use. Together, the enacted and proposed standards are expected to save more than six billion barrels of oil through 2025 and reduce more than 3,100 million metric tons of carbon dioxide emissions

Renewable Fuel Standard Program A set of regulations to ensure that transportation fuel sold in the United States contains a minimum volume of renewable fuel. By 2022, the Renewable Fuel Standard (RFS) program will reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 138 million metric tons, about the annual emissions of 27 million passenger vehicles, replacing about seven percent of expected annual diesel consumption

Proposed Carbon Pollution Standard for New Power Plants On March 27, 2012, EPA proposed a Carbon Pollution Standard for New Power Plants that would, for the first time, set national limits on the amount of carbon pollution that power plants can emit. The proposed rule, which applies only to new fossil-fuel-fired electric utility generating units, will help ensure that current progress continues toward a cleaner, safer, and more modern power sector.

Oil and Natural Gas Air Pollution Standards On April 18, 2012, EPA finalized cost effective regulations to reduce harmful air pollution from the oil and natural gas industry, while allowing continued, responsible growth in U.S. oil and natural gas production. The final rules are expected to yield a nearly 95 percent reduction in VOC emissions from more than 11,000 new hydraulically fractured gas wells each year. The rules will also reduce air toxics and emissions of methane, a potent greenhouse gas.

Geologic Sequestration of Carbon Dioxide The EPA has finalized requirements for geologic sequestration, including the development of a new class of wells, Class VI, under the authority of the Safe Drinking Water Act's Underground Injection Control Program.

The EPA is also taking adaptation measures. These include:

- The Climate Ready Estuaries program works with the National Estuary Programs and the coastal management community to: (1) assess climate change vulnerabilities, (2) develop and implement adaptation strategies, and (3) engage and educate stakeholders.
- The EPA's Climate Ready Water Utilities (CRWU) initiative assists the water sector, which includes drinking water, wastewater, and stormwater utilities, in addressing climate change impacts.

Some federal departments are also taking actions specific to their purview. For example, the Department of Transportation's Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Improvement Program provides over \$8.1 billion dollars in funds to State DOTs, MPOs, and transit agencies to invest in projects that reduce emissions from transportation-related sources. Since October 2009, the Department of Energy and the Department of Housing and Urban Development have jointly completed energy upgrades in more than one million homes across the country.

Regional/State/Local level

This is the only place in the brief where we include raw URLs right in the brief text

There are a vast number of initiatives happening across the U.S. at the regional, state, and local levels. Due to the sheer volume, these initiatives cannot possibly be catalogued in this space. However, the Department of Transportation has two useful web-pages with links to various databases and initiatives across the country.

- Local action: <http://climate.dot.gov/state-local/local-action-plans.html>
- Regional initiatives: <http://climate.dot.gov/state-local/regional-initiatives.html>

One initiative notable for its aggressiveness in tackling climate change is California Senate Bill X1-2. SBX1-2 directs California Public Utilities Commission's Renewable Energy Resources Program to increase the amount of electricity generated from eligible renewable energy resources per year to an amount that equals at least 20% of the total electricity sold to retail customers in California per year by December 31, 2013, 25% by December 31, 2016 and 33% by December 31, 2020.

Joint State-Provincial Initiatives

There are several cross-border initiatives between U.S. states and Canadian provinces that are working to address climate change. These initiatives have been designed to reduce GHG emissions, develop clean energy sources, and achieve other environmental and economic goals.⁶⁴ They include:

⁶⁴Centre for Climate and Energy Solutions, *Multi-State Climate Initiatives*.

- North America 2050: <http://www.c2es.org/us-states-regions/regional-climate-initiatives#NA2050>
- Western Climate Initiative: <http://www.c2es.org/us-states-regions/regional-climate-initiatives#WCI>
- Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative: <http://www.c2es.org/us-states-regions/regional-climate-initiatives#RGGI>
- Midwest Greenhouse Gas Reduction Accord: <http://www.c2es.org/us-states-regions/regional-climate-initiatives#MGGRA>
- Transportation and Climate Initiative <http://www.c2es.org/us-states-regions/regional-climate-initiatives#TCI>

United Kingdom

The Climate Change Act 2008 made the UK the first country in the world to have a legally binding long-term framework to cut carbon emissions. It introduced a long-term framework for managing emissions through a system of national carbon budgets: caps on the total quantity of greenhouse gases permitted in the UK over a specified time. Each carbon budget covers a five year period, with the first three carbon budgets running from 2008 to 2012, 2013-2017 and 2018-2022. During these periods, emissions must be reduced (from 1990 levels) by 22%, 28% and 34% respectively.

The Act also created a framework for building the UK's ability to adapt to climate change, including:

- a UK-wide Climate Change Risk Assessment that must take place every five years
- a National Adaptation Programme which must be put in place and reviewed every five years to address the most pressing climate change risks to the UK
- a mandate giving the government the power to require 'bodies with functions of a public nature' and 'statutory undertakers' (eg water and energy utilities) to report on what they are doing to address the risks posed by climate change to their work.

The UK Department of Energy & Climate Change has set the following national policies and strategies for combating climate change:

- setting carbon budgets to limit the amount of greenhouse gases the UK is allowed to emit over a specified time

- using statistics on greenhouse gas emissions and further evidence, analysis and research to inform energy and climate change policy
- using the EU Emissions Trading Scheme (EU ETS) to meet over 50% of the UK's carbon emissions reduction target between now and 2020
- using a set of values for carbon to make sure project and policy appraisals account for their climate change impacts
- using the 2050 Calculator to let policy makers and the public explore the different options for meeting the 2050 emissions reduction targets

Reducing the demand for energy and helping people and businesses to use energy more efficiently:

- reducing demand for energy with smart meters and other energy-efficient measures for industry, businesses and the public sector
- reducing emissions by improving the energy efficiency of properties through the Green Deal
- providing incentives for public and private sector organisations to take up more energy-efficient technologies and practices through the CRC Energy Efficiency Scheme
- reducing greenhouse gases and other emissions from transport
- reducing greenhouse gas emissions from agriculture

Investing in low-carbon technologies:

- taking action to increase the use of low-carbon technologies and creating an industry for carbon capture and storage
- reducing emissions from the power sector and encouraging investment in low-carbon technologies by reforming the UK's electricity market
- providing over £200 million of funding for innovation in low-carbon technologies from 2011 to 2015

Publicly reporting carbon emissions from businesses and the public sector:

- encouraging corporate reporting of greenhouse gas emissions
- asking English local authorities to measure and report their greenhouse gas emissions

Germany

Targets

In the framework of EU effort sharing under the Kyoto Protocol, Germany has committed itself to cutting its emissions of climate-damaging gases by a total of 21% in the period 2008 to 2012 compared with 1990. In addition, Germany has pledged to reduce its GHG emissions by 40% by 2020, 55% by 2030, 70% by 2040, and by 80-95% by 2050 (compared with 1990 levels). Germany has also set ambitious targets for increasing the share of renewable energy in final energy consumption, with 18% by 2020, 30% by 2030 and by 60% by 2050.

Emissions Trading

Emissions trading in particular makes a significant contribution to emissions reductions in Germany. The climate protection targets for the period 2008 to 2012 have been made significantly more stringent: from 2008, old power plants in Germany will be allocated around 30 percent fewer emission allowances than their current level of emissions. Furthermore, 10 percent of the allowances will be auctioned.

Feed-In Tariff

The use of an adequate, long-term and predictable feed-in tariff encourages the construction of many renewable energy production sites. The differentiated feed-in tariff leads to one of the most diversified ranges of renewable energy technologies used within the European Union.

Integrated Energy and Climate Programme (IECP)

In order to reach the German climate protection goals the Federal Government has elaborated a comprehensive Integrated Energy and Climate Programme (IECP). Its goal is to ensure an ultramodern, secure and climate-friendly energy supply in Germany. It comprises measures for enhanced energy efficiency and expanded use of renewable energy sources.

Measures contained in the IECP include:

Amendment to the Combined Heat and Power Act The share of high-efficiency CHP plants in electricity production will be doubled by 2020 from the current level of around 12 percent to around 25 percent.

Amendment to the Energy Industry Act Liberalising electricity metering will facilitate and promote innovative metering methods and demand-related, time-variable tariffs. This will enable consumers to reduce their energy costs and will improve the efficiency of the power generation sector.

Report and draft amendment to the Energy Saving Ordinance Energy standards will be tightened

by an average 30 percent from 2009. As a second step (planned for 2012), these efficiency standards will be tightened by a further 30 percent.

Clean power plants Standards will be laid down for nitrogen oxide emissions from new power plants.

Guidelines on the procurement of energy-efficient products and services Energy-efficient appliances and services will be promoted through priority procurement.

Amendment to the Renewable Energy Sources Act The government's goal is to increase the share of renewables in the electricity sector from the current level of over 13 percent to 25-30 percent in 2020, and then to continue increasing the level further. The amendment to the Renewable Energy Sources Act contains among other things new provisions for regulating tariffs for offshore wind farms.

Renewable Energies Heat Act The share of renewable energies in heat provision will be increased to 14 percent by 2020. Obligations to use renewable energies in new buildings are laid down in the Renewable Energies Heat Act. Funding for the government support programme for existing buildings will increase - from 130 million euro in 2005 to up to 350 million in 2008 and up to 500 million euro from 2009.

Amendment to the Gas Grid Access Ordinance The amendment to the Gas Grid Access Ordinance will ensure that biogas can be fed into the natural gas grid to a greater extent. A share of 10 percent biogas is possible by 2030.

Amendment to the Biofuel Quota Act The share of biofuels will be increased and from 2015 will be geared more towards reducing greenhouse gas emissions. The amendment to the Biofuel Quota Act will lead to a rise in the biofuels' share to around 20 percent by volume (17 percent by energy content) by the year 2020.

Sustainability Ordinance The Sustainability Ordinance will ensure that when producing biomass for biofuels, minimum requirements for sustainable management of agricultural land and for the conservation of natural habitats are complied with.

Fuel Quality Ordinance The amended Fuel Quality Ordinance will increase the blending limit of bioethanol in petrol fuels from 5 to 10 percent volume. For biodiesel in diesel fuels, this blending limit will increase from 5 to 7 percent volume.

Reform of vehicle tax to a pollutant and CO2 basis For new vehicles, this tax will then be calculated on the basis of a vehicle's emissions rather than engine capacity as before.

Chemicals Climate Protection Ordinance This Ordinance will reduce emissions of fluorinated greenhouse gases from mobile and stationary cooling installations through provisions on leakproofness and labelling of the installations and on recovery and return of the refrigerants used.

China

China has surpassed the United States as the world's largest greenhouse gas emitter. In 2011, China was the world leader in renewable energy technology investments, spending \$52 billion.

Targets

Under China's 12th Five Year Plan, the government set binding targets to reduce energy consumption per unit of GDP by 16 percent, cut CO2 emissions per unit of GDP by 17 percent, and raise the proportion of non-fossil fuels in the overall primary energy mix to 11.4 percent. At the Copenhagen Climate Change Summit in 2009, the Chinese government signalled its goal to reduce the carbon emissions intensity per unit of GDP by 40-45% from 2005 levels by 2020.

Transformation and upgrading of traditional industries

Conserving energy and cutting emissions by optimizing and upgrading its industrial structure. The government has stepped up evaluation and examination of energy conservation, environmental impact assessments, and preliminary examination of land used for construction projects. It has raised the entry threshold for certain industries and limited new projects in industries with high energy consumption, high pollutant emissions or excess capacity. It has also controlled the export of products with high energy consumption and high pollutant emissions.

Supporting the development of strategic and newly emerging industries

China has initiated a special fund to boost the development of strategic emerging industries, and expanded its venture capital program for emerging industries. So far 102 venture capital funds have been set up under the program, managing a total of 29 billion yuan. Among these funds, 24, with a total value of 7 billion yuan, are designed to stimulate the development of the energy-saving, environmental protection and new energy sectors.

Carbon pricing

Although this was not included in China's 12th Five Year Plan, there have been reports that the Chinese government will be introducing a carbon tax on major energy consumers before the end of the

plan. It is estimated that the tax would begin at 10 yuan (\$1.59) per ton of carbon dioxide emitted, and would increase depending on the company's emission levels (information is not yet available on the details of the tax increases).

Five Chinese cities (Shanghai, Beijing, Shenzhen, Tianjin, and Chongqing) and two provinces (Guangdong and Hubei) are currently preparing pilot emissions trading schemes, set to begin in 2013. The Chinese government has ordered these areas to set greenhouse gas emissions control targets, and to implement an emissions trading scheme in order to meet these targets. This pilot project is considered to be an important learning step, leading up to the implementation of a national emissions trading scheme by 2015.

France

Targets

France continues to support the targets stipulated in the Kyoto Protocol and sees the UNFCCC as a primary body through which climate change negotiations will move forward. France has already made progress in reducing its greenhouse gas emissions; in 2010, France had reached a 6.6% reduction in emissions (compared to 1990 levels). France is committed to meeting the EU target of a 20% reduction in emissions by 2020 (1990 levels) and has also set a goal of a 75% reduction in emissions by 2050 (1990 levels), with intermediary targets of 40% reduction by 2030 and 60% reduction by 2040. Currently, France estimates that it will exceed its targets and achieve a 22.8% reduction in greenhouse gas emissions by 2020 (compared to 1990 levels).

L'Observatoire National sur les Effets du Réchauffement Climatique (ONERC - National Observatory on the Effects of Climate Change)

ONERC was created by legislation passed on February 19th 2001. The ONERC has three main purposes:

- To collect and spread information on risks related to global warming
- To formulate recommendations on adaptation measures to mitigate the effects of climate change.
- To be the focal point of the IPCC in France.

Stratégie nationale d'adaptation au changement climatique (SNACC - National Strategy from Climate Change Adaptation)

France's national adaptation strategy was adopted on the 13th of November 2006, based on recommendations from the ONERC.

It outlines four priority areas for adaptation

- Acting to ensure public security and health
- Addressing social aspects and inequalities of climate-change risk
- Limiting costs and taking advantage of the change
- Protecting cultural heritage

There are eight strategic action steps developed in the strategy:

- Developing scientific knowledge
- Consolidating observation systems
- Informing and educating all actors
- Promoting a regional and community-oriented approach
- Financing adaptation actions
- Utilizing legislative and regulatory instruments
- Taking into consideration the special status of overseas territories
- Contributing to international cooperation

Grenelle Environment

The Grenelle Environment was a series of political talks initiated by Nicolas Sarkozy in September and October 2007 that brought together representatives of all levels of government, civil society and industry to develop public policy on environmental and sustainable development issues. It has led to the following policies and actions in these areas:

Residential Sector

- After 2012, all new buildings must have a primary energy consumption of less than 50kWh/m²/year on average. This standard was implemented in after 2010 for all public buildings and for construction under the National Urban Renovation Program. By 2020, all new buildings must have a primary energy consumption that is less than the amount of renewable energy produced in the buildings (energy positive buildings).

- Eco-loans at 0% interest: allow owners to take 10-15 year loan of up to 30,000 euros towards improving the energy efficiency of their property. This program can be combined with other financial support tools.
- All public and state owned buildings will undergo an energy performance assessment by 2010, and renovations will begin on these buildings in 2012 that should result in a 40% reduction in energy consumption and a 50% reduction of greenhouse gas emissions within a period of 8 years.
- The most energy intensive 800,000 social housing units will be renovated prior to 2020. Loans will be made available at a 1.9% interest rate between 2009-2010 to allow for the immediate renovation of 100,000 units, and upgrades will continue at a rate of 70,000 units per year.

Transportation

- 2,000 km of high-speed rail will be built by 2020 and an additional 2,500km will be planned.
- France will meet the EU objective of reducing vehicle emission to 120g CO₂/km.
- The “bonus-malus” program in place since January 2008 provides a credit for the purchase of low-emitting vehicles (less than 130g CO₂/km) and imposes a tax on purchase of vehicles emitting more than 160g CO₂/km.
- France had the objective of a 5.75% biofuel mix between 2001-2008, and increased the target to 7% in 2010 and 10% by 2015. To reach these objectives, a general tax on polluting activities (TGAP) will be imposed on operators not respecting this fuel mix ratio and an exemption program on the domestic tax for petroleum products (TIPP) for biofuels will be implemented.

Industry

- The 2005 directive creating a cap and trade system will be reviewed. This review was adopted by the European Parliament and Council in December 2008. It will allow the implementation period to be extended, to harmonize the system of quota allocation and to reinforce the objectives of reducing greenhouse gas emissions in this sector. This measure will achieve, at the European level a 21% reduction of emissions in this sector between 2005-2020 (1990 levels).

Energy

- Certificates of Energy Efficiency, in place since 2006, will be expanded.
- The “Ecoconception” Directive will be implemented:

- Completely retiring incandescent light bulbs by 2012.
- Limiting the consumption of single digital decoders to 1W by 2010 and 0.5W by 2012.
- Improving the performance of electric chargers and external power supplies.
- Developing renewable energy to achieve 23% mix in energy consumption by 2020 by increasing the annual production of renewable energy by 20 million tons of oil equivalent.
- Renewable Heat Fund (Fonds chaleur renouvelable): this program created a fund of 1 billion euros for 2009-2011 to develop renewable sources such as wood, geothermal, and solar to be used for heating in the tertiary sector and in industry,
- Tax credit for sustainable development that promotes the purchase of solar water heaters and solar panels was extended until 2012.
- The construction of new biomass plants with a capacity of 250MW.
- Increasing the capacity of geothermal energy sixfold by 2020, by providing 2 million homes with heat pumps.
- A fixed tariff for wind energy and improving the planning and consultation process for new wind turbines; simplification of the process for developing off-shore wind energy.
- 1 billion euros will be devoted to research into sustainable development.

For solar energy

- Building a solar plant in each French region for a cumulative power of 300 MW, supported by simplified tariffs to secure long term investment.
- Creating a 45 euro cent/kWh tariff to facilitate the installation of solar panels on private buildings.
- Reducing the administrative and financial steps when panels do not exceed 30 m².
- Increasing the scope of the public buildings that are eligible for the reduced tariff for purchasing electricity produced from renewable sources.
- Construction permits cannot oppose the installation of renewable energy production systems on buildings.

5.6 Actions taken by international bodies

Substantially more information and examples could be added here.

International efforts to address climate change have often been centred around the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), though many other international forums and organizations have also made efforts to address the issue.

United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC)

- Signed in 1992, came into force in 1994 with 50 ratifications
- Objective: ``stabilize greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere at a level that would prevent dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system"
- This has subsequently come to be understood to mean limiting warming to less than 2°C

Other sub-components of UNFCCC – adaptation funding, etc

Canada has repeatedly endorsed the 2°C limit for warming

- The 2009 Copenhagen Accord - signed by Canada - recognizes ``the scientific view that the increase in global temperature should be below 2 degrees Celsius"
- Other references to the limit
- For the world to reach this goal, fossil fuels need to be phased out aggressively

This is another section where we need to be very careful to maintain a dispassionate tone and to include strong evidence supporting our factual and legal claims. It isn't enough that a newspaper article alleges that some kind of nefarious activity has taken place (though we might be able to cautiously cite such reports). Ideally, we want impeccably-documented examples of wrongdoing by Shell, along with information on which laws they have violated.

6 Why start with Royal Dutch Shell?

The preceding sections of this brief show climate change to be the cause of increasing instability and harm to the planet. Consequences of climate change have the potential to cause unprecedented levels of social and environmental damage, unless dramatic policy changes are put into place rapidly. One important dimension of that response is the redirection of large amounts of investment away from new fossil fuel developments.

As outlined, human-driven activities that are direct causes of climate change include the extraction and burning of fossil fuels. Thus, these activities are directly implicated in the harmful consequences of climate change. It follows logically that:

- Investing in the extraction and burning of fossil fuels --- which implies dependence on the fruition and future growth of the industry --- and,
- Profiting from the extraction and burning of fossil fuels --- which constitutes financial benefit from harmful activity --- are not in accordance with socially or ethically responsible investment practices.⁶⁵

As a first step toward divestment from the fossil fuel industry, we ask that the University of Toronto divest 100% of its holdings from Royal Dutch Shell by the end of 2013. As one of the largest fossil fuel companies in the world, as well as the university's largest single holding, Shell represents an ideal starting point for the university's move to divest from the fossil fuel industry.

In addition to the broader implication of Shell's activities as directly contributing to the harmful affects of climate change, Shell represents an ideal case for divestment due to three main reasons that are related to the internal operations of the company:

1. Shell has repeatedly and willfully carried out actions resulting in social injury, including conduct that has directly conflicted with domestic and international law as a result of their operations in

⁶⁵Richardson, *Socially Responsible Investment law: Regulating the Unseen Polluters*.

Nigeria and Alberta.

2. Shell represents a financial risk to investors, with even greater shareholder uncertainty projected in the medium and long term due to proposed projects that are costly and high-risk.
3. Divestment from Shell will not adversely affect the university's portfolio.

6.1 Shell's ongoing history of social injury

The sources cited for this section need to be especially reputable and convincing

Royal Dutch Shell has been found to repeatedly and willfully cause social injury as a result of activities that:

1. directly conflicted with national and international law,
2. infringed on governmental regulations or on international health and safety or environmental standards.

The following list of legal actions taken against Shell stands as evidence that the company has consistently and knowingly inflicted social harm as a consequence of a number of its global operations.

Ideally, we want facts that have been established in court judgments --- not just allegations that have been made in lawsuits.

Legal offences in Nigeria

Shell has a long history of human rights and environmental abuses in the Niger Delta region, where it has operated since 1958. Currently, Shell is the midst of a number of litigation processes at various stages, as documented in Shell's 2011 Annual Report:

Shell subsidiaries and associates operating in Nigeria are parties to various environmental and contractual disputes. These disputes are at different stages in litigation, including at the appellate stage, where judgments have been rendered against Shell. If taken at face value, the aggregate amount of these judgments could be seen as material.

Since the publication of the report, Shell has been charged on one count in the case of Niger Delta Farmers vs. Shell (detailed below). The parties are currently in the process of negotiating compensation. The company asserts that individual charges in this particular case will not have a material affect (ref – pg # of Annual Report needed). However, as suggested in the annual report, considerations regarding the

full impact of this case on the company cannot be restricted to the individual case alone but must include any potential payouts and related damages that may occur as an outcome of future legal challenges, in addition to possible damages as a result of ongoing cases yet to be settled. Thus, the full financial impact of the companies ``environmental and contractual disputes" in Nigeria is not yet known and could have a material effect on the company (ref – pg # of Annual Report needed).⁶⁶

Citations need to be fixed in the section above

The following constitutes a non-exhaustive list of legal challenges to Shell's activities in Nigeria over the span of approximately fifteen years:

Bodo vs. Shell:

This case is ongoing. It was first brought before the High Court in London on June 18, 2012, and will be heard sometime this year. Shell is challenged by 11,000 members of the Niger Delta Bodo community, who say the company is responsible for spilling approximately 500,000 barrels of oil in 2008. Shell has admitted liability for two spills in the Bodo region.

Kiobel vs. Shell:

Which Supreme Court?

This case is ongoing. It was first brought before the Supreme Court and granted petition on October 17, 2011. Nigerian plaintiffs accuse Royal Dutch Shell and its affiliate Shell Transport and Trading Company PLC of providing transportation and payments to government forces who committed crimes against humanity in the Ogoni region, including the arrest, torture and murder of protestors challenging Shell operations. This case involves activities included in the Saro-Wiwa vs. Shell case (see below).

Niger Delta Farmers vs. Shell Oil Company:

A verdict for this case was reached in January 2013. Shell Nigerian subsidiary, Shell Petroleum Development Company of Nigeria Ltd. (SPDC), was sued by four farmers and the environmental organization Friends of the Earth on October 10th 2012. SPEDC was found responsible for oil spills in Niger Delta on one of four counts and ordered to pay compensation to Nigerian farmer Friday Akpan for incidents occurring in 2004, 2005, 2007. Compensation is being negotiated.

Saro-Wiwa vs. Shell:

In 2009 Shell was accused of engaging in activities resulting in the unlawful arrest, torture and assassination of Ken Saro-Wiwa and 8 other Ogoni tribe leaders. Shell settled legal action out of court with a payout of \$15.5 million dollars. The settlement is one of the largest payouts by a multinational corporation charged with human rights violations to date and speaks to the company's complicity in

⁶⁶Shell, *Building an Energy Future: Annual Report*, p. 139.

these activities.

This should probably be elaborated upon

US Dept. of Justice vs. Panalpina, Shell, et al.

In 2010, Shell was implicated in a case brought against Panalpina, a Swiss-based company that provides international air and ocean freight, by the US Department of Justice. Panalpina was implicated in foreign bribery charges by US regulatory bodies and settled on a total of \$85 million over these allegations. Royal Dutch Shell and five other oil companies were also implicated and charged along with Panalpina, paying a total of \$246 million in penalties altogether. As stated by Robert Khuzami, the Director of Enforcement for the US Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC), ``These companies resorted to lucrative arrangements behind the scenes to obtain phoney paperwork and special favors, and they landed themselves squarely in investigators' crosshairs."⁶⁷ The case is significant as setting potential precedents of vigilance for global companies that utilize external contractors in parts of the world ``where resources are plentiful but the rule of law is shaky."⁶⁸

With respect to Shell's role, the company was implicated in corrupt activities that took place in Nigeria and included the expedition of services such as clearing drilling rigs and other equipment through customs (more specifically, using a customs broker to pay officials to acquire special treatment for a project conducted in Nigeria).⁶⁹ Shell consented to pay a disgorgement of \$18.15 million and a criminal fine of \$30 million.⁷⁰ Shell subjected to a Deferred Prosecution Agreement (DPA) with the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) for violations of bribery and books provisions of the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act (FCPA). Shell also consented to a Cease and Desist Order from the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) on account of record keeping violations and internal control provisions of the FCPA. As a result, the DPA outlined an ethics program designed to prevent and identify any breach of the FCPA as well as any other applicable anti-corruption laws corresponding to all aspects of Shell's operations. The program also calls for Shell to immediately report any evidence of questionable activity to the DOJ. As stated in Shell's 2011 annual report, such activity could have a significant impact on the company: ``Any violations of the DPA, or of the SEC's Cease and Desist Order, could have a material adverse effect on the Company."⁷¹

Gas flaring

⁶⁷Nick Kochan, *Corruption: The New Corporate Challenge*, p. 119.

⁶⁸*Settlements Near In Bribery Case.*

⁶⁹*Shell Bribes Among 'Culture of Corruption,' Panalpina Admits.*

⁷⁰Sullivan and Cromwell, *Foreign Corrupt Practices Act – Recent Developments.*

⁷¹Shell, *Building an Energy Future: Annual Report.*

Since 2005, Shell has refused to comply with a Federal High Court order to end gas flaring in the Iwherekan community in Nigeria. Shell is also avoiding payment of \$1.5 billion in compensation to the Delta's Ijaw ethnic group for decades of pollution.⁷²

Oil spills

Going forward, Shell faces thousands of claims related to oil spills in Nigeria, and charges in the most recent case (Niger Delta Farmers vs. Shell) opens doors for further legal actions.⁷³

Infringements on governmental regulations and international health and environmental standards with respect to operations in Nigeria

The release of the Assessment of the Environment of Ogoniland by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) on August 4th 2011 confirmed the devastating extent of pollution in the minority Ogoni region. Estimates place clean up at between 25 to 30 years. The UN condemned Shell for failing to comply to its own operating standards and for under-reporting pollution.⁷⁴

The same UN report also confirms that all water bodies in Ogoniland are polluted with hydrocarbons and reveals that benzene, a known carcinogen, is concentrated at a level 900 times above World Health Organization standards for safe drinking water.

Shell repeatedly ignores Nigerian federal law (and its own internal policies) calling for regular inspection and maintenance and upgrading of pipelines and production facilities, as well as and prompt and effective response to oil spills.⁷⁵⁷⁶

Legal offences in Alberta

It would be good to have some statistics to substantiate the claims in the next paragraph.

Shell is one of the biggest players in developing the Athabasca oil sands. Shell Canada currently operates the Alberta Oil Sands Project (AOSP), which consists of the Albion Sands Mine, Muskeg River Mine, Jackpine Mine, and the Scotford Upgrader.

The legal claims below need to be clarified. In particular, ``Section 35 of the Canadian constitution (Treaty 8)" doesn't make sense and is insufficiently specific. The empirical claims made below also need good citations.

⁷²Ukala, ``Gas Flaring in Nigeria's Niger Delta: Failed Promises and Reviving Community Voices".

⁷³.

⁷⁴Program, *Environmental Assessment of Ogoniland*.

⁷⁵Steiner, *International Standards to Prevent and Control Pipeline Oil Spills, Compared with Shell Practices in Nigeria*.

⁷⁶Steiner, *Shell practices in Nigeria compared with international standards to prevent and control pipeline oil spills and the Deepwater Horizon oil spill*.

The AOSP is proximal to a number of First Nations communities who claim that the project adversely affects their health, livelihood, and lands.⁷⁷ Legally applied, Section 35 of the Canadian constitution (Treaty 8) has meant that there is a duty for government to consult Aboriginal peoples on development projects and to accommodate any of their concerns regarding the effects of these projects. There are currently a series of legal proceedings related to tar sands developments launched by First Nations that could impact the viability of Shell's current and future operation plans, as outlined below:

1. Ongoing - ACFN vs. Shell Canada: In continuing legal battles throughout 2011-2012, the Athabasca Chipewyan First Nations (ACFN) sued Shell Canada for breach of terms of agreements made in 2003 and 2006 regarding the company's existing tar sands mines. Shell has not honoured these agreements with the ACFN, leaving many commitments outstanding. These breaches have allowed Shell's operations to continue damaging the surrounding environment and the rights of ACFN peoples. Affected First Nations communities continue to seek legal options to delay or halt Shell's operations in the AOSP.
2. 2009 - Ecojustice vs. Shell Canada: Ecojustice, an environmental organization, took Shell to the Alberta Court of Appeal after Shell breached signed commitments with the government of Alberta to reduce carbon emissions for the Jackpine and Muskeg River mines. Alberta courts instructed regulators to ignore the breach. However, the ruling has prompted both residents and elected officials in Alberta to demand an overhaul of regulatory approval processes in the province.⁷⁸
3. Cases related to groundwater contamination: As described in their 2011 Annual Report, Royal Dutch Shell (including subsidiaries), has been sued repeatedly by public and semi-private water purveyors, as well as governmental bodies, who insist that Shell take responsibility for groundwater contamination in various instances.⁷⁹ As outlined in the Annual Report, at the end of 2011, fewer than 10 of these cases remained open, with the remaining cases in various stages of litigation. The number of allegations made by numerous public and private entities, including governmental agencies, speaks to Shell's consistent negligence in ensuring environmental safety. While groundwater cases remain ongoing, a study published by Alberta Health in 2008 confirmed a 30% rise in the number of cancers between 1995 and 2006 in the community of Fort Chipewyan,⁸⁰ provid-

⁷⁷B. Amuna, *Risking Ruin: Shell's Dangerous Developments in the Tar Sands, Arctic, and Nigeria*.

⁷⁸*Ibid.*

⁷⁹One barrel of surfaced-mined oil from tar sands extraction requires 2-4 barrels of freshwater and creates about 1.5 barrels of toxic waste. This waste is held in 'tailings ponds', which covered 176km² in 2010 and contained 830 billion litres of toxic waste. Shell's tailings ponds cover 23km² and contain millions of litres of toxic waste. Each day, 11 million litres of waste leaks into the Athabasca River from tar sands operations. These toxins are known carcinogens and leaks have had devastating impacts on human and ecological health.

⁸⁰B. Amuna, *Risking Ruin: Shell's Dangerous Developments in the Tar Sands, Arctic, and Nigeria*.

ing scientific evidence supporting the appeals of First Nations residents that AOSP activities were polluting the surrounding environment.⁸¹ An internal government memo, obtained by journalist Mike De Souza by virtue of Access to Information legislation, confirms groundwater toxins related to bitumen mining and upgrading are seeping from tailings ponds and contaminating groundwater. These toxins are not naturally occurring, contrary to statements made by government and industry.⁸²

Alongside the promise of future legal conflicts as a result of the company's activities in Nigeria, more legal challenges are almost certain to arise as First Nations communities pledge to oppose Shell's operations. Whereas past legal proceedings have resulted in outcomes favourable to Shell, the International Finance Corporation's (IFC) implementation of a new Sustainability Framework, which requires clients of Equator Principle banks to obtain the free, prior and informed consent of indigenous communities impacted by mining projects, poses a significant obstacle to the company going forward where they conflict with the interests of various First Nations communities.⁸³

Possible legal precedents to be set re: Northern Gateway and FIPA?

Continued threats to human rights, environmental well-being and international law

This is one of many sections where we need to standardize how we write dates. Also, the 'where there is smoke there is fire' argument isn't very strong. We need to stick with facts that will stand up to scrutiny.

Court rulings in cases brought against Shell over the past fifteen years have resulted in determinations of guilt, out of court settlements, and case dismissals. In the case of Shell, one can reasonably argue that where there is smoke there is fire --- that is, regardless of the outcomes of individual legal challenges, the sheer volume of allegations against the company stand as evidence of Shell's willful and repeated acts of social injury. Moreover, a review of Shell's most recent activities and the projects it has slated for the immediate future indicates that Shell will continue to engage in activities that constitute human rights abuses and environmental degradation. For instance:

1. In the summer of 2011, Shell supported Syrian President Bashar al-Assad's regime by contributing over \$55 million during government crackdowns.⁸⁴ Moreover, Shell continued drilling and exporting crude oil from Syria throughout the first year of the popular revolt and did not halt operations

⁸¹This study, however, lacks appropriate data and is considered a conservative estimate by many residents

⁸²Canada, *Memorandum to the Minister*.

⁸³Sosa, *License to Operate: Indigenous Relations and Free Prior and Informed Consent in the Mining Industry*.

⁸⁴Minio-Paluello, *Shell supports Syrian regime with 55million during crackdown; one out of six Syrian tanks run on Shelloil..*

until Western imposed oil sanctions and global outrage forced them to withdraw from the country on the 2nd December 2011.

2. Existing international law already states that "In no case may a people be deprived of its own means of subsistence."⁸⁵ This right is recognized and affirmed by UN member states. Both Shell's current activities and its proposed projects in the Arctic will threaten local First Nations communities such as the Inupiat who live around the Beaufort and Chukchi Sea and who practice a subsistence culture, both by tradition and by necessity.⁸⁶

"See section X of this brief for more on threats to the Arctic and Northern communities by extraction projects" - Do/will we have a section like this?

6.2 Shell represents financial risk

Royal Dutch Shell or any of its subsidiaries represent a risky investment for two main reasons:

1. previous violations of human rights and environmental regulations may ultimately have a material affect on the company; these same activities can also manifest in decreased shareholder confidence
2. high-risk ventures going into the medium and long term introduce uncertainty on a number of levels.

Poor reputation for social responsibility lowers shareholder confidence

Add citations

Shell's reputation for complicity in human rights and environmental degradation has resulted in lowered shareholder confidence. For instance, the Dow Jones Sustainability Index, which integrates assessment of economic, environmental and social criteria with emphasis on long-term shareholder value, excluded Shell from the Index in both 2010 and 2011 following concerns about the company's activities in Nigeria (which include both human rights and environmental abuses). Shell's European Universe was included in the 2012 Index, but all others remain excluded (including the North American, Asia Pacific, Aussie, Emerging Markets, Korean Universes).

Fix internal reference below

⁸⁵Article I of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and Article I of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights

⁸⁶B. Amuna, *Risking Ruin: Shell's Dangerous Developments in the Tar Sands, Arctic, and Nigeria*, p. 13.

In February of 2012, 28 Right Livelihood Award Laureates made up of conservation scientists and professionals petitioned the Norway Government Pension Fund to divest all its holdings in Royal Dutch Shell. The petition was made after this group, in collaboration with numerous other Nigeria scientists and communities, found the Delta to be "one of the most severely oil-impacted ecosystems in the world."⁸⁷ It was this collaborative team of scientists and Nigerian residents that urged the 2011 UNEP assessment, referred to in Section 4.1.3 of this section. As stated on their petition, the argument for divestment is based on the company's "willful negligence" which resulted in the extensive environmental harm found in the Niger Delta region.⁸⁸

Fossil fuel extraction in the Arctic represent particularly high-risk and unpredictable endeavours

Fix internal reference below, add citation, elaborate

The arctic is experiencing some of the most profound effects of climate change (see section X in Chapter X). For instance, world renowned physicist and oceans expert Peter Wadhams calls the situation in the Arctic a "global disaster," suggesting ice is disappearing at a faster rate than previously predicted, and could be gone within as few as four years (ref).

—NOT SURE WE NEED THIS NEXT SECTION (HENCE THEY GREY OUT) INSTEAD WE COULD JUST REFER TO A RELEVANT EARLIER SECTION (as indicated in blue below)...

Fix internal reference below

Despite the growing body of accepted scientific facts that point towards the significant and unpredictable consequences of a melting Arctic (see section X in Chapter X in this brief?) Shell has spent over \$4.5 billion on operations and lease purchases in the far north, taking advantage of the climate impacts in the Arctic to secure further exploration and drilling. Because Shell's production has been decreasing for the past 10 years --- with the exception of a 5% increase in 2010 --- booking new reserves is of primary importance for the company. For instance, Shell's Alaskan project alone accounted for about one-seventh of Shell's total exploration spending in 2011. While Arctic extraction projects represent a new branch of growth for the company, these projects are also incredibly risky from shareholder perspective due to four central reasons, elaborated below:

High costs

Unconventional methods of extracting oil, especially in harsh and isolated regions such as the Arctic, are extremely costly due to technological requirements, human resources, costs of spill cleanups, and

⁸⁷ *Niger Delta Natural Resource Damage Assessment and Restoration Project – Phase I Scoping Report.*

⁸⁸ *Petition for Norway Pension Fund. The Right Livelihood Award.*

other related expenses. For example, recent projects such as Shell's Sakhalin-2 project in Russia saw an unexpected cost overrun from \$6 - \$22 billion dollars in 2006.⁸⁹

Add citations below

Moreover, at the time of writing this brief (February--March, 2013) the latest in a string of incidents casting doubt on Shell's arctic operations has occurred. Sixteen distinct and serious safety and environmental violations were discovered on a Shell drilling rig anchored in the arctic waters off Alaska. The UK Coast Guard inspected the rig and reported findings of "systematic failure and lack of main engine preventative maintenance." Findings have been turned over to the U.S. Department of Justice. U.S. federal prosecutors have been asked to take legal action over these violations as of late February, 2013. As a result of this incident, Shell has canceled its arctic drilling plans outright through 2013, though it has stated its intention to resume arctic drilling in future seasons.

Arctic projects are dependent on a favourable political climate

An interaction of soaring costs, uncertainty related to project completion, and popular resistance against drilling in sensitive regions such as the Arctic may lead to difficulties securing subsidies or tax breaks from governments.

Lack of oil spill plan

There is currently no proven method to clean up an oil spill in the remote and extreme arctic landscape, nor are there many resources available for such an event. For instance, a 2011 report from top scientists at the U.S. Geological Survey confirm that not enough is known about the arctic's unique marine environment to ensure an adequate or sufficient clean up plan in the case of an oil spill. As asserted in this survey, this lack of knowledge presents a "major constraint to a defensible scientific framework for critical Arctic decision making."⁹⁰

Funding challenges

The social and environmental responsibility guidelines of international financial institutions (IFIs) and signatories to the Equator Principles --- the voluntary set of standards for assessing and managing social and environmental risk --- have delayed or halted funding for frontier extraction projects in the past. For example, the European Bank did not solicit funds in 2003--2006 for the Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) of Shell's Sakhalin-2 due to serious breaches of their environmental and sustainability guidelines. Growing frustration and resistance on behalf of First Nations communities and the implementation of new IFC guidelines promise more delays on account of legal challenges posed by

⁸⁹For more on these four central risk factors see Greenpeace, *Out in the Cold: Investor Risk in Shell's Arctic Exploration*.

⁹⁰L. Holland-Bartels, *An Evaluation of the Science Needs to Inform Decisions on Outer Continental Shelf energy Development in the Chukchi and Beaufort Seas, Alaska*.

affected communities.⁹¹

Supporting industry-based evidence of risks to Shell's ongoing and proposed projects

Fix internal references below, add citation

1. On March 8th, 2013, Norwegian state-owned oil company, Statoil, announced that it is slowing plans to drill for oil in US arctic waters after Shell's most recent string of incidents in arctic, as described above in Section 4.2.
2. German bank WestLB announced it would not invest in any company drilling in the arctic because the ``risks and costs are simply too high."⁹²
3. Total, the French oil company, has disavowed drilling in the arctic; CEO Christophe de Margerie claims that ``Oil on Greenland would be a disaster ... A leak would do too much damage to the image of the company."⁹³
4. Growing resistance around production of tar sands puts operations there at risk, as Shell has already faced shareholder resolutions demanding greater clarity over the risk of tar sands investments
5. The Carbon Bubble: Latest climate science tells us that approximately 80% of reserves owned by fossil fuel companies cannot be burned.

949596

6.3 Divestment from Shell would not hurt the university financially

Was tobacco divestment in 2006 or 2007? We must be consistent throughout the brief

Shell constitutes the university's largest single holding at approximately \$9.48 million dollars as of March 2012.⁹⁷ At the same time, it represents about 1% of the institution's total known endowment. When the university divested from the tobacco industry in 2006 its holdings in the industry were calculated at 1.6% of US equities and .98% of international equities, for a total weight in tobacco stocks of

⁹¹Mathiason, *EBRD freezes Shell Sakhalin loan*.

⁹²Naidoo, *Drilling for oil in the Arctic: the risks are too great for companies to take on*.

⁹³wire, *Environmental risk of drilling in Arctic too high, CEO of oil giant Total says*.

⁹⁴*Carbon Tracker Initiative*.

⁹⁵(UNEP), *Climate and Trade Policies in a Post-2012 World*.

⁹⁶P. Spedding, *Oil and carbon revisited: Value at risk from 'unburnable' reserves*.

⁹⁷Toronto Asset Management Corporation, *Canadian Equities Above \$1 Million As at March 31, 2012*.

2.28%.⁹⁸ It was concluded that divestment in this case would not adversely affect the university's portfolio. Thus, divestment from Shell would also not have a significant impact on the university's financial position.

CAN SOMEONE PLEASE READ THE BLURB BELOW (taken from the Advisory Board Report explaining their decision for tobacco divestment) AND MAKE SURE I AM RIGHT IN THIS LAST PARAGRAPH? I'M REALLY SLOW WHEN IT COMES TO THIS KIND OF STUFF AND I WANT TO MAKE SURE I'M NOT JUST MAKING THIS UP!

In its assessment of the impact of prohibiting University funds on tobacco investments, UTAM indicated that it could implement the divestment of tobacco stocks only for Separate Accounts with minimal management and monitoring costs expected. While Separate Accounts constitute 54% of total investments, as of the end of July 2006, the amount of equities in Separate Accounts as a proportion of total investments is 28%. The amount of tobacco stocks that could be divested would be a very small portion of this 28%.

The case for Pooled Accounts which make up 46% of total investments is a different matter. Divestiture of all Pooled Account holdings would involve significant time and costs as it would require a fundamental change in the UTAM business model for managing the university's investments. It is not feasible for the university to change its investment structure to move away from pooled funds, given that it is substantially less expensive to manage, and so provide a higher expected return, net of costs. Thus the "prudent investor" rule would only permit divestment from tobacco stocks held in separate accounts.

Should reference the latest policy

The 1978 policy contemplates the possibility of the university voting proxies and attempting to influence the conduct of companies in which it invests. Some other institutions, including Yale, do so. The University of Toronto has neither the resources nor the jurisdiction to monitor the business practices of tobacco companies, or any other enterprises. The university must devote its resources to its mission of research and teaching. Nor is the university a large enough investor to shape the conduct of companies in which it invests.

This seems like a weak ending for this section

⁹⁸Advisory Board, *Report of the Advisory Board on Tobacco Investment*.

References

- 350.org. *Move My Money*. 2013. URL: <http://gofossilfree.org/mymoney/>.
- Advisory Board, University of Toronto. *Report of the Advisory Board on Tobacco Investment*. 2007.
- Alley, Richard. *The Two Mile Time Machine: Ice Cores, Abrupt Climate Change, and Our Future*. Princeton University Press, 2000.
- B. Amuna N. Bassey, E. Deranger F. Gemmill M. Laboucon-Massimo R. Plain D. Vassey. *Risking Ruin: Shell's Dangerous Developments in the Tar Sands, Arctic, and Nigeria*. 2012.
- Bank, The World. *Turn Down the Heat: Why a 4°C Warmer World Must be Avoided*. 2012. URL: http://climatechange.worldbank.org/sites/default/files/Turn_Down_the_heat_Why_a_4_degree_centrigrade_warmer_world_must_be_avoided.pdf.
- Businessweek, Bloomberg. *Economist: Energy reserves overvalued by global markets*. 2013. URL: http://investing.businessweek.com/research/markets/news/article.asp?docKey=600-201304201443UPI____TOPITRAK_130454_7316-1.
- Cambridge Energy Research Associates. *Crossing the Divide: The Future of Clean Energy*.
- Canada, Natural Resources. *Memorandum to the Minister*. 2012.
- Carbon Tracker Initiative*.
- Carbon Tracker Institute. *Unburnable Carbon 2013: Wasted capital and stranded assets*. 2013. URL: <http://carbontracker.live.kiln.it/Unburnable-Carbon-2-Web-Version.pdf>.
- *Unburnable Carbon: Are the world's financial markets carrying a carbon bubble*. 2012. URL: <http://www.carbontracker.org/wp-content/uploads/downloads/2012/08/Unburnable-Carbon-Full1.pdf>.
- Centre for Climate and Energy Solutions. *Multi-State Climate Initiatives*. URL: <http://www.c2es.org/us-states-regions/regional-climate-initiatives>.
- ECLAC. *Economics of Climate Change in Latin America and the Caribbean*. 2009. URL: http://www.eclac.cl/publicaciones/xml/3/38133/2009-851-Summary-Economics_climate_change-WEB.pdf.
- Economist, The. *Unburnable fuel*. 2013. URL: <http://www.economist.com/news/business/21577097-either-governments-are-not-serious-about-climate-change-or-fossil-fuel-firms-are>.
- Environment Canada. *Harper Government Moves Forward on Tough Rules for Coal-Fired Electricity Sector*. URL: <http://www.ec.gc.ca/default.asp?lang=En&n=714D9AAE-1&news=4D34AE9B-1768-415D-A546-8CCF09010A23>.
- *Reducing Greenhouse Gases*. URL: <http://climatechange.gc.ca/default.asp?lang=En&n=4FE85A4C-1>.

- Finance, Bloomberg New Energy. *RENEWABLE ENERGY NOW CHEAPER THAN NEW FOSSIL FUELS IN AUSTRALIA*. 2013. URL: <http://about.bnef.com/press-releases/renewable-energy-now-cheaper-than-new-fossil-fuels-in-australia/>.
- Fleischfresser, Channal. *Solar power produced 100% of new energy on U.S. grid in March*. 2013. URL: <http://www.smartplanet.com/blog/bulletin/solar-power-produced-100-of-new-energy-on-us-grid-in-march/18083>.
- Geddes, Patrick. *Do the Investment Math: Building a Carbon-Free Portfolio*. Electronic - Aperio Group. 2013. URL: https://www.aperiogroup.com/system/files/documents/building_a_carbon_free_portfolio_0.pdf.
- GlobalData. *Grid Parity for Wind and Solar Power - Future Outlook and Impact Analysis*. 2012. URL: <http://store.globaldata.com/market-reports/alternative-energy/Grid-Parity-for-Wind-and-Solar-Power-Future-Outlook-and-Impact-Analysis>.
- Government of Ontario. *Ontario Regulation 496/07: Cessation of Coal Use – Atikokan, Lambton, Nantcoke and Thunder Bay Generating Stations*. URL: http://www.e-laws.gov.on.ca/html/regs/english/elaws_regs_070496_e.htm.
- Greenpeace. *False Hope: Why carbon capture and storage won't save the climate*. 2013. URL: <http://www.greenpeace.org/usa/Global/usa/report/2008/5/false-hope-why-carbon-capture.pdf>.
- Greenpeace Platform, Fair Pensions. *Out in the Cold: Investor Risk in Shell's Arctic Exploration*. 2012.
- Hickman, Leo. *Jeremy Grantham, environmental philanthropist: 'We're trying to buy time for the world to wake up'*. 2013. URL: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2013/apr/12/jeremy-grantham-environmental-philanthropist-interview>.
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. *Climate Change 2007: Working Group I: The Physical Science Basis*,
 — *First Assessment Report*. URL: https://www.ipcc.ch/ipccreports/1992%20IPCC%20Supplement/IPCC_1990_and_1992_Assessments/English/ipcc_90_92_assessments_far_overview.pdf.
 — *Fourth Assessment Report: Climate Change 2007*. URL: https://www.ipcc.ch/publications_and_data/ar4/syr/en/contents.html.
 — *Second Assessment Report: Climate Change 1995*. URL: <https://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/climate-changes-1995/ipcc-2nd-assessment/2nd-assessment-en.pdf>.
 — *Third Assessment Report: Climate Change 2001*. URL: http://www.grida.no/publications/other/ipcc_tar/.
- International, DARA. *Climate Vulnerability Monitor: A Guide to the Cold Calculus of A Hot Planet*. 2nd edition. DARA and the Climate Vulnerable Forum.

International Energy Agency. *World Energy Outlook: 2012*. Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, 2012. ISBN: 9789264180840. DOI: 10.1787/weo-2012-en. URL: http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/energy/world-energy-outlook-2012_weo-2012-en.

J. Leggett, B. Mckibben. *How your pension is being used in a 6trillionclimategamble*. 2013. URL: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2013/apr/19/carbon-bubble-financial-crash-crisis>.

James Hansen Makiko Sato, Pushker Kharecha David Beerling Valerie Masson-Delmotte Mark Pagani Maureen Raymo Dana L. Royer James C. Zachos. *Target Atmospheric CO2: Where Should Humanity Aim?* 2008. URL: http://www.columbia.edu/~jeh1/2008/TargetCO2_20080407.pdf.

L. Holland-Bartels, B. Pierce. *An Evaluation of the Science Needs to Inform Decisions on Outer Continental Shelf energy Development in the Chukchi and Beaufort Seas, Alaska*. 2011.

Mathiason, N. *EBRD freezes Shell Sakhalin loan*. 2005.

Mckibben, Bill. *The Case for Fossil-Fuel Divestment*. 2013. URL: <http://www.rollingstone.com/politics/news/the-case-for-fossil-fuel-divestment-20130222>.

Minio-Paluello, Mika. *Shell supports Syrian regime with 55millionduringcrackdown;oneoutofsixSyriantanksrusonShell*

Naidoo, K. *Drilling for oil in the Arctic: the risks are too great for companies to take on*. 2012.

Nelder, Chris. *Why carbon capture and storage will never pay off*. 2013. URL: <http://www.smartplanet.com/blog/take/why-carbon-capture-and-storage-will-never-pay-off/534>.

Nick Kochan, Robin Goodyear. *Corruption: The New Corporate Challenge*. Palgrave MacMillan, 2011.

Niger Delta Natural Resource Damage Assessment and Restoration Project – Phase I Scoping Report. 2006.

Office, Toronto Environment. *Climate Change, Clean Air and Sustainable Energy Action Plan*. 2007. URL: http://www.toronto.ca/changeisintheair/pdf/clean_air_action_plan.pdf.

Ontario Ministry of the Environment. *Climate Change - Greening Our Ways*. URL: http://www.ene.gov.on.ca/environment/en/category/climate_change/STDPDOD_078897.html.

— *Green Energy Act*. URL: http://www.ene.gov.on.ca/environment/en/legislation/green_energy_act/index.htm.

P. Spedding K. Mehta, . & N. Robins. *Oil and carbon revisited: Value at risk from ‘unburnable’ reserves*. 2013.

Petition for Norway Pension Fund. The Right Livelihood Award. 2012.

Program, United Nations Environment. *Environmental Assessment of Ogoniland*. 2011.

Richardson, Benjamin. *Socially Responsible Investment law: Regulating the Unseen Polluters*. Oxford University Press, 2008.

Sawin, Elizabeth. *Carbon Dioxide Will Persist in the Atmosphere Long After Current Decision Makers Have Left Their Roles: On Ethical Grounds, Young People Should Have a Say*. 2012. URL: <https://climateinteractive>.

wordpress.com/2012/12/05/carbon-dioxide-will-persist-in-the-atmosphere-long-after-current-decision-makers-have-left-their-roles-on-ethical-grounds-young-people-should-have-a-say/.

Settlements Near In Bribery Case.

Shell, Royal Dutch. *Building an Energy Future: Annual Report*. 2011.

Shell Bribes Among 'Culture of Corruption,' Panalpina Admits.

Simon Redmond, Michael Wilkins. *What A Carbon-Constrained Future Could Mean For Oil Companies' Creditworthiness*. 2013. URL: http://www.carbontracker.org/wp-content/uploads/downloads/2013/03/SnPCT-report-on-oil-sector-carbon-constraints_Mar0420133.pdf.

Sosa, Irene. *License to Operate: Indigenous Relations and Free Prior and Informed Consent in the Mining Industry*. 2011.

Steiner, R. *International Standards to Prevent and Control Pipeline Oil Spills, Compared with Shell Practices in Nigeria*. 2008.

— *Shell practices in Nigeria compared with international standards to prevent and control pipeline oil spills and the Deepwater Horizon oil spill*. 2010.

Stern, Nicholas. *A profound contradiction at the heart of climate change policy*. 2011. URL: <http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/52f2709c-20f0-11e1-8a43-00144feabdc0.html>.

— *The Economics of Climate Change: The Stern Review*. Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Sullivan and LLP. Cromwell. *Foreign Corrupt Practices Act – Recent Developments*. 2010.

Toronto, City of. *Toronto Atmospheric Fund - Emission reduction*.

Toronto Asset Management Corporation, University of. *Canadian Equities Above \$1 Million As at March 31, 2012*. 2012. URL: <http://www.utam.utoronto.ca/Assets/UTAM+Digital+Assets/UTAM/UTAM+Digital+Assets/reports/Canadian+Q1+2012.pdf>.

Ukala, E. "Gas Flaring in Nigeria's Niger Delta: Failed Promises and Reviving Community Voices". In: *Journal of Energy, Climate and Environment* (2011), pp. 98–126.

(UNEP), United Nations Environment Program. *Climate and Trade Policies in a Post-2012 World*. 2009.

United Nations Environment Programme Finance Initiative and Mercer. *Demystifying Responsible Investment Performance: A review of key academic and broker research on ESG factors*. 2007. URL: http://www.unepfi.org/fileadmin/documents/Demystifying_Responsible_Investment_Performance_01.pdf.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. *Calculations and References*. URL: <http://www.epa.gov/cleanenergy/energy-resources/refs.html>.

U.S. National Academy of Sciences. *Ad Hoc Study Group on Carbon Dioxide and Climate*. URL: http://www.atmos.ucla.edu/~brianpm/download/charney_report.pdf.

U.S. National Oceanic & Atmospheric Administration. *Trends in Atmospheric Carbon Dioxide*. URL: <http://www.esrl.noaa.gov/gmd/ccgg/trends/>.

wire, NBC News. *Environmental risk of drilling in Arctic too high, CEO of oil giant Total says*. 2012.

7 Appendix I: Issues With Respect to University Divestment

7.1 Policy on Social and Political Issues With Respect to University Divestment

March 4, 2008

Preamble

The University's core academic values include freedom of inquiry and open debate. As a general matter, the University does not take positions on social or political issues apart from those directly pertinent to higher education and academic research. Instead, its role is to provide a forum within which issues can be studied carefully and debated vigorously. Given these values, the University will not consider any proposals for restrictions on its investments that require the institution to take sides in matters that are properly the subject of ongoing academic inquiry and debate.

As a corollary, the University's response to any petition regarding divestment must be governed by the fundamental place of diversity of opinion within its community. Except in those situations in which the University must settle on an answer to controversial questions about how best to achieve its academic mission, the University risks abandoning its core values if it takes sides in ongoing debates and is perceived to be advancing a specific political or social position.

Principles

In responding to questions about social and political issues with respect to University investment, it is acknowledged that first and foremost, maximizing economic return consistent with the University's stated risk tolerance should be the criterion for purchase and sale of stock in all normal circumstances. In specific instances where the University's social responsibility as an investor is questioned, however, credible and effective procedures for responding should exist.

Responses should be based on the following principles:

(i) prudent investment. The University has a fiduciary duty to manage investments responsibly to maximize return on its investments within a policy risk tolerance as approved by Business Board from time to time.

(ii) the Yale University concept of social injury:

(a) Social injury is the injurious impact which the activities of a company are found to have on consumers, employees, or other persons, particularly including activities which violate, or frustrate the enforcement of, rules of domestic or international law intended to protect individuals against deprivation or health, safety, or basic freedoms; for purposes of this Policy, social injury shall not consist of doing business with other companies which are themselves engaged in socially injurious activities.

(iii) actions taken by the Canadian government or other national or international bodies with regard to the particular issue of concern.

Consideration of questions about social and political issues with respect to University investment must take into account applicable legislative requirements and government or University policy, as well as the legal standards applicable to prudent institutional investors.

Advisory Committee

The President will establish an *ad hoc* committee of qualified individuals to review any investments claimed to be in conflict with University's social and political positions and to advise the President on possible actions to be taken. Chaired by a senior University officer designated by the President, the committee will consist of individuals with relevant expertise from among the teaching staff, students, administrative staff and alumni. The Executive Committee of the Governing Council will be asked to approve the appointments on the recommendation of the President.

In making recommendations regarding the membership, the President will take into account any potential conflicts of interest proposed members might be expected to have with a view to minimizing such conflicts of interest on the part of committee members

The committee's report and the President's decision will be reported to the Governing Council through the Executive Committee.

The President will issue procedures regarding the implementation of this policy. The first such procedures are included here for information, and the President will review any substantive changes in those procedures with the Executive Committee of the Governing Council.

7.2 Procedures for Responding to Social and Political Issues with Respect to University Divestment

January 2008

Raising Issues

Members of the University of Toronto community who wish to raise issues with regard to University investments that are in conflict with stated University policies may do so by:

- preparing a convincing brief establishing the case; and
- presenting the evidence of general concern in the University community by collection of signatures.

Responsibility for initiating a request for University action regarding its investments rests with members

of the University community. One or more individuals must prepare a fully documented brief identifying the social or political issue that they believe requires divestment.

When the brief has been fully prepared, the initiators of the request must secure evidence of support for their cause through the collection of at least 300 signatures endorsing the brief. Up to 200 of the signatures could come from a single constituency of the University community (for the purposes of these procedures, the constituencies are teaching staff, students, administrative staff, and alumni); the remaining 100 signatures must be from at least two other University constituencies with a minimum of 25 signatures from any individual constituency. Each signatory must attest that he/she has read and agrees with the entire content of the brief.

When signatures have been added to the brief, the material is to be deposited with the office of the President.

Response

The administration will respond by establishing an *ad hoc* review committee as specified by the policy.

This committee, chaired by a senior officer designated by the President, will consider the briefs. The committee may consult with investment and other experts as they deem necessary.

If the committee determines that the brief repeats previous submissions, or is vexatious or frivolous, it will cease its deliberations and recommend to the President that the brief be dismissed. If the brief is not repetitive, vexatious or frivolous, the committee shall complete its deliberations and provide its recommendation in writing to the President regarding the appropriate action to be taken by the University.

The committee will consider the following guidelines in considering the appropriate response to any request:

- the extent and significance of the University's investment in a particular entity. Determination of whether investments are considered significant will depend on the committee's judgment of the relative magnitude of the University's holdings both as a fraction of all University investments and in relation to the market capitalization of the entity under review.
- the degree to which the entity itself is involved in the undesirable activity.

Normally, activity is considered significant if more than ten percent of the entity's revenues are derived from the undesirable activity.

The President will consider the recommendations and make the final decision.

Reporting

The written report and the President's decision will be provided to the Governing Council through the Executive Committee. Following receipt of the report and the President's decision by the Governing Council, the report and decision will be provided to the petitioners.

Approved by Governing Council on March 4, 2008, replacing the Policy on Social and Political Issues with Respect to University Investment revised and approved by the Governing Council on December 14, 1994.

8 Appendix II: The 200 Companies

Toronto350.org is asking the University of Toronto to divest from the following 200 companies, as listed in the Carbon Tracker Initiative's 2012 report, *Unburnable Carbon*.⁹⁹ These are the top 200 listed companies by estimated carbon reserves.

- African Rainbow Minerals Ltd.
- AGL Energy
- Alcoa Inc.
- Allete Inc.
- Alliance Resource Partners L.P.
- Alpha Natural Resources Inc.
- Anadarko Petroleum Corp.
- Anglo American PLC
- Apache Corp.
- Aquila Resources Ltd.
- Arc Resources Ltd.
- ArcelorMittal
- Arch Coal Inc.
- Aston Resources Pty Ltd.
- ATP Oil & Gas Corp.
- Bandanna Energy Ltd.
- Bankers Petroleum Ltd.
- Banpu PCL
- Bashneft

⁹⁹Carbon Tracker Institute, *Unburnable Carbon: Are the world's financial markets carrying a carbon bubble*.

- Baytex Energy Corp.
- Berry Petroleum Co. (Cl A)
- BG Group PLC
- BHP Billiton
- BHP Billiton
- Black Hills Corp.
- Bonavista Energy Corp
- BP PLC
- Bumi Resources
- Cairn Energy PLC
- Canadian Natural Resources Ltd.
- Canadian Oil Sands Ltd.
- Capital Power Corp.
- Cenovus Energy Inc.
- Chesapeake Energy Corp.
- Chevron Corp.
- China Shenhua Energy Co. Ltd.
- Churchill Mining PLC
- Cimarex Energy Co.
- Cliffs Natural Resources Inc.
- Cloud Peak Energy Inc.
- CLP Holdings Ltd.
- CNOOC Ltd.

- Coal India Ltd.
- Coal of Africa Ltd.
- Compania Espanola de Petroleos S.A.
- Concho Resources Inc.
- ConocoPhillips
- Consol Energy Inc.
- Continental Resources Inc. Oklahoma
- Crescent Point Energy Corp.
- Datang International Power Generation Co. Ltd.
- Datong Coal Industry Co. Ltd.
- Denbury Resources Inc.
- Devon Energy Corp.
- Ecopetrol S.A.
- El Paso Corp.
- EnCana Corp.
- Energen Corp.
- Enerplus Corp.
- ENI S.p.A.
- EOG Resources Inc.
- EQT Corp.
- Eurasian Natural Resources Corp. PLC
- Evraz Group S.A.
- Exxaro Resources Ltd.

- Exxon Mobil Corp.
- FirstEnergy Corp.
- Forest Oil Corp.
- Fortune Minerals Ltd.
- Fushan International Energy Group Ltd.
- Gansu Jingyuan Coal Industry & Electricity Power
- Gazprom OAO
- GDF Suez S.A.
- Global Energy Development PLC
- Grupo Mexico S.A.B. de C.V.
- Gujarat NRE Coke Ltd.
- Gujarat NRE Coking Coal Ltd.
- Hess Corp.
- Homeland Energy Group Ltd.
- Huolinhe Opencut Coal Industry Corp. Ltd.
- Husky Energy Inc.
- Idemitsu Kosan Co. Ltd.
- Imperial Oil Ltd.
- INA-Industrija Nafta
- Inner Mongolia Yitai Coal Co. Ltd.
- Inpex Corp.
- International Coal Group Inc.
- Irkutskenergo

- Itochu Corp.
- James River Coal Co.
- Jindal Steel & Power Ltd.
- Jizhong Energy Resources Co. Ltd.
- Kazakhmys PLC
- Kuzbassenergo
- Linn Energy LLC
- Lukoil Holdings
- Lundin Petroleum AB
- Macarthur Coal Pty Ltd.
- Magnitogorsk Iron & Steel Works
- Marathon Oil Corp.
- Mariner Energy
- Massey Energy Co.
- Mechel OAO
- Mitsubishi Corp.
- Mitsui & Co. Ltd.
- Mitsui Matsushima Co. Ltd.
- MOL Hungarian Oil and Gas Plc
- Mongolian Mining Corp.
- Murphy Oil Corp.
- NACCO Industries Inc. (Cl A)
- New Hope Corp. Ltd.

- New World Resources N.V.
- Newfield Exploration Co.
- Nexen Inc.
- Neyveli Lignite Corp. Ltd.
- Noble Energy Inc.
- Noble Group Ltd
- Northern Energy Corp. Ltd.
- Novatek
- Novolipetsk Steel OJSC
- NTPC Ltd.
- Occidental Petroleum Corp.
- Oil & Natural Gas Corp. Ltd.
- Oil India Ltd.
- Oil Search Ltd.
- OMV AG
- Optimum Coal Holdings Ltd.
- PA Resources AB
- Pacific Rubiales Energy Corp.
- Patriot Coal Corp.
- Peabody Energy Corp.
- Pengrowth Energy Corp.
- Penn West Petroleum Ltd.
- PetroBakken Energy Ltd.

- Petrobank Energy & Resources Ltd.
- Petrobras
- Petroleum Development Corp.
- Pingdingshan Tianan Coal Mining Co. Ltd.
- Pioneer Natural Resources Co.
- Plains Exploration & Production Co.
- Polo Resources Ltd.
- Polyus Gold OAO
- Premier Oil PLC
- Prophecy Resource Corp.
- PT Adaro Energy
- PT Bayan Resources
- PTT PCL
- Public Power Corp. S.A.
- Questar Corp.
- Quicksilver Resources Inc.
- Range Resources Corp.
- Raspadskaya OJSC
- Repsol YPF S.A.
- Resolute Energy Corp.
- Rio Tinto
- Rosneft
- Royal Dutch Shell PLC

- RWE AG
- SandRidge Energy Inc.
- Santos Ltd.
- Sasol Ltd.
- Severstal JSC
- Shanxi Coking Co. Ltd.
- Sherritt International Corp.
- SINOPEC Shandong Taishan Petroleum Co. Ltd.
- SK Holdings Co. Ltd.
- SM Energy Co.
- Soco International PLC
- Southwestern Energy Co.
- Statoil ASA
- Straits Asia Resources Ltd.
- Suncor Energy Inc.
- Swift Energy Co.
- Talisman Energy Inc.
- Tata Power Co. Ltd.
- Tata Steel Ltd.
- Teck Resources Ltd.
- Tokyo Electric Power Co. Inc.
- Total S.A.
- TransAlta Corp.

- Tullow Oil PLC
- Ultra Petroleum Corp.
- United Co. Rusal PLC
- United Industrial Corp. Ltd.
- Vale SA
- Venoco Inc.
- Walter Energy, Inc.
- Wescoal Holdings Ltd.
- Wesfarmers Ltd.
- Western Coal Corp.
- Westmoreland Coal Co.
- Whitehaven Coal Ltd.
- Whiting Petroleum Corp.
- Williams Cos.
- Woodside Petroleum Ltd.
- Xstrata PLC
- Yanzhou Coal Mining Co. Ltd.
- YPF S.A.
- Zhaikmunai L.P.
- Zhengzhou Coal Industry & Electric Power Co. Ltd.