Based on hundreds of thousands of years of evidence on how the climate responds to greenhouse gases (GHGs), we can calculate the total quantity of all fossil fuels we can burn, adding the carbon they contain to the atmosphere, while still giving ourselves a good chance of avoiding a 2˚C increase.2

Not sure about the grammar on this one. Consider “…we can calculate the total quantity of GHGs we can further release into the atmosphere while still giving ourselves a good chance of avoiding a 2C increase.”

May need to rework later sentences to make it work.

natural gas would produce 2,795 gigatonnes of CO2

Should “would” be “will”?

planetary limits, by choosing

comma required?

* As a random comment, in section “1.0” at the end right before 1.1 where it talks about investment in further exploration, maybe it would be useful to incorporate the stat about how much is spent on worldwide exploration for fossil fuels just so the reader realizes how insane the amount is (according to Do The Math its $100 000 000 a day for Exxon).

It would also help strip the fossil fuel industry of its social license to operate — a privilege

it is proving unworthy of as it pushes the world heedlessly toward climatic catastrophe while imposing harm on

innocent people around the world and in future generations.

This is fairly strong language.

By selling its holdings before investors at large accept

that most of their reserves are unburnable, the university can mitigate against the risk that fossil fuel stock values

will fall substantially as the world realizes that their reserves are too dangerous to burn

Consider restructuring this sentence. “The University can mitigate against the financial risk that fossil fuel stock values will fall substantially by divesting before the world realizes that it is too dangerous to burn these reserves.”

in driving this shift toward cost-effective approaches to CO2

Should it be “towards”?

could prompt other investors to reconsider their own investment decisions.

Perhaps get rid of one of the “invest…” words. “could prompt other investors to reconsider their own decisions.”

As the analysis below demonstrates, it could do so while maintaining an overall portfolio with stable

and attractive returns. The legacy of U of T’s investments can either be the continued support for projects that

clash fundamentally with what we know to be required to preserve a safe climate, or it can be the development and

deployment of energy options that are compatible with enduring prosperity for the university and humanity as a

whole.

Would change the first sentence. “As the analysis below demonstrates, U of T can divest all holdings of fossil fuel companies while still maintaining a stable portfolio providing attractive returns.”

**Chapter 2**

**p.13**

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)

I would leave out “at least”… “date back to the 1979”

Also – the third level titles are very hard to distinguish in the PDF. We may want a style change here. See the title “Policies and infrastructure decisions justified with reference to climate change” at the bottom of page 17.