October 2022

Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei

Working Paper

031.2022

Who's fit for the low-carbon transition? Emerging skills and wage gaps in job and data

Aurélien Saussay, Misato Sato, Francesco Vona
Layla O'Kane

Who's fit for the low-carbon transition? Emerging skills and wage gaps in job and data

By **Aurélien Saussay** (Grantham Research Institute, London School of Economics and Political Science and OFCE, Sciences Po)
Misato Sato (Grantham Research Institute, London School of Economics and Political Science)
Francesco Vona (University of Milan, Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei and OFCE, Sciences Po)
Layla O'Kane (Lightcast)

Summary

As governments worldwide increase their commitments to tackling climate change, the number of low-carbon jobs are expected to grow rapidly. Here we provide evidence on the characteristics of low-carbon jobs in the US using comprehensive online job postings data between 2010-2019. By accurately identifying low-carbon jobs and comparing them to similar jobs in the same occupational group, we show that low-carbon jobs differ from high-carbon or generic jobs in a number of important ways. Low-carbon jobs have higher skill requirements across a broad range of skills, especially technical ones. However, the wage premium for low-carbon jobs has declined over time and the geographic overlap between low- and high-carbon jobs is limited. Overall, our findings suggest the low-carbon transition entails potentially high labour reallocation costs associated with re-skilling and earning losses, indicating public investments in skills is needed to deliver a smooth and rapid transition.

Keywords:

JEL Classification:

Address for correspondence:
Aurélien Saussay
Assistant Professorial Research Fellow, Grantham Research Institute
London School of Economics and Political Science, Houghton Street
London, WC2A 2AE, United Kingdom
e-mail: a.saussay@lse.ac.uk

The opinions expressed in this paper do not necessarily reflect the position of Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei

Who's fit for the low-carbon transition? Emerging skills and wage gaps in job and data

Aurélien Saussay,[1,2*] Misato Sato,[1] Francesco Vona,[3,4,2] Layla O'Kane[5]

[1]Grantham Research Institute, London School of Economics and Political Science, Houghton Street, London, WC2A 2AE, U.K.

[2]OFCE, Sciences Po, 10 place de Catalogne, Paris, 75014, France

[3]University of Milan, Via Festa del Perdono 7 - 20122 Milano, Italy

[4] FEEM, Corso Magenta 63 - 20123 Milano, Italy

[5]Lightcast

*To whom correspondence should be addressed; E-mail: a.saussay@lse.ac.uk.

October 27, 2022

As governments worldwide increase their commitments to tackling climate change, the number of low-carbon jobs are expected to grow rapidly. Here we provide evidence on the characteristics of low-carbon jobs in the US using comprehensive online job postings data between 2010-2019. By accurately identifying low-carbon jobs and comparing them to similar jobs in the same occupational group, we show that low-carbon jobs differ from high-carbon or generic jobs in a number of important ways. Low-carbon jobs have higher skill requirements across a broad range of skills, especially technical ones. However, the wage premium for low-carbon jobs has declined over time and the geographic overlap between low- and high-carbon jobs is limited. Overall, our findings suggest the low-carbon transition entails potentially high labour reallocation costs associated with re-skilling and earning losses, indicating public investments in skills is needed to deliver a smooth and rapid transition.

Reaching climate neutrality by mid-century requires a deep transformation of all economic sectors [40]. In parallel with ongoing technological trends in digitization and Artificial Intelligence [8, 1], the low-carbon transition reshapes labour markets, by reallocating workers towards low-carbon activities whilst skills demanded by high-carbon activities may be lost with job displacement. The political imperative of delivering jobs [28] and supporting a "just transition" that addresses the needs of workers and communities of high-carbon industries is a key priority to enhance the political acceptability of climate action [45].

Yet understanding the skill content and other characteristics of low-carbon jobs vis-à-vis high-carbon or generic jobs remains a challenge, owing to the fundamental problem of identifying low-carbon jobs with precision. High-carbon jobs linked to fossil fuels extraction and production are easily identified, but conceptual issues and data limitations make it significantly more difficult to define the jobs that will benefit from ambitious climate policies. While the transition will create some new occupations, in the majority of cases, the greening of jobs is happening within established occupations as the job content is altered with the adoption of new green technologies or new green production methods [47] e.g. automobile engineers adapting to hybrid, electric or hydrogen technologies. Because of the lack of agreed definition of what a green job is, the discourse has tended to narrowly focus on segments of the green economy such as renewable energy [18] or traditional environmental sectors like waste and water. Consequently, public debate exaggerates the job killing argument while downplaying the job creation effect of the low-carbon transition [45]. Moreover, the evidence is largely silent on reallocation costs associated with workers' reskilling [47] and earning losses [49], which are often ignored when evaluating labour market impacts of environmental policies [26, 36, 30, 27, 33, 16, 32].

Recent studies made substantial progress by combining insights from the task-based approach to labour markets [8, 1] with occupation-level data on task and skill requirements from the Green Economy Program of the Occupational information network (O*NET) [46, 17, 47, 14, 48, 44] to measure occupation level exposure to green technologies and productions. Using this approach [47] shows that greener occupations require more technical & engineering and managerial skills. Yet isolating and comparing greening jobs from similar non-green jobs in the same occupation has not been possible with occupational level data.

Here we gain job-level perspectives by developing a new three step procedure to accurately isolate low-carbon activities in online job vacancy data (see Figure 1 and Methods), combining natural language processing and expert survey. Following the recent literature on labour market adjustments to technological change [20, 29, 21, 10, 2], we use the comprehensive online job ads data from Lightcast (formerly Emsi Burning Glass), covering the near-universe of online job vacancies posted in the US between 2010 and 2019.



Figure 1: Identifying low carbon jobs using job ads data

Taking advantage of the high density of low-carbon job ads in particular occupations, our approach allows us to reveal precisely how low-carbon jobs compare in terms of geographical distribution, skill requirements and wages vis-à-vis fossil fuel or similar jobs within occupational groups, such as engineers or construction workers. In doing so, we provide a very accurate characterisation of the potential skill gaps and hiring difficulties emerging in specific labour markets concerned by the low-carbon transition. The methodology is transparent and flexible, and can be easily replicated in different country contexts, offering a toolkit for policymakers to design targeted retraining and reskilling policies within green deal packages. The adaptability is key given the nature of green jobs is likely to continue to change through the diffusion of green technology in the economy as the low carbon transition advances.

Results

Evolution of demand for low-carbon jobs

In contrast to the general rise in renewable power production jobs [39], the share of overall low-carbon vacancies in total online job vacancies first increased (from 1.32% in 2010 to 1.44% in 2012 coinciding with the job creation effect of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, ARRA) [3, 39], then declined below 1.3% in the central period, and increased again from 2017 onwards (Figure 2). Importantly, job ad shares captures the flow of labour demand rather than the stock of workers in low-carbon positions. Here, low carbon job ads are re-weighted using BLS employment shares to improve representativeness (See Methods and Table SI.6), yielding estimates that are consistent with previous measures of green employment shares [48].

Our disaggregated data and broad definition of low-carbon jobs reveals divergent decennial trends between high- skilled occupations (such as managers or engineers) that decline from 0.36% to 0.30%, and low-skill occupations (such as manual workers) that grow from 0.97% to 1.12% (see Figures 2A and Table SI.10 in the SI). Such trends resonate with the job creation effect of green ARRA spending that was concentrated in manual occupations [39], and suggests that green recovery plans could help to offset secular deterioration of the labour market conditions for unskilled workers. The emerging patters are rather small in absolute terms but statistically significant (see Table SI.12 in the SI).

Our broad definition identifies low-carbon jobs across most sectors, especially service sectors such as public transport and professional services (Table SI.11). In terms of occupations, six 2-digit SOC groups stand out: Business and Finance 3.6%; Architecture and Engineering

4.1%; Life, Physical and Social Science; Construction and Extraction 4.1%; Installation, Maintenance and Repair 2.6% and Transportation 7.3% (Table SI.7 and Figure SI.3). The latter is due to public transportation and bus driving being included in our list of low-carbon identifiers. Except for transport, these occupations are also the most green-task intensive using O*NET data [48]. Looking more closely, five high-skilled occupations defined at the more narrow 3-digit SOC level have particularly high shares of low-carbon ads (Business Specialists, Architects, Engineers, Technicians, Physical Scientists) (Table SI.8). We examine difference between low-carbon and generic jobs in these 3-digit occupation. For low-skilled occupations instead, we consider three 2-digit SOC groups with high intensity of low-carbon ads (Construction and Extraction; Installation and Maintenance; Transportation). This is because worker mobility is higher for low-skilled workers across 3-digit occupations that require few months of retraining, while high-skilled workers require substantial formal education (i.e. from biology to physics) to switch between 3-digit occupations.

The data shows varying trends across the eight key low-carbon intensive occupations (Figure 2B). Small declines in low-carbon intensity are statistically significant for Business Specialists (from 2.9% to 1.9%), Architects (from 5.4% to 4.6%) and Engineers (from 5.2% to 3.9%) but not for Technicians and Physical Scientists (See Table SI.13 in the SI). The increase in the low-carbon job share in Construction (from 3.5% to 4.6%) and Installation (from 2% to 3.1%) is statistically significant while in Transportation the share is flat. The unweighted (dotted) share of low-carbon ads is smaller than the weighted for most occupations, but trends are quite smooth despite increased coverage of Lightcast data over time.

Figure 2: Evolution of low-carbon ads in the US (2010-2019)

Notes: In panels a) and b) the intensity of low-carbon ads is first calculated at the 6-digit SOC occupation level as the ratio between the number of low-carbon ads and the total ads in a specific 6-digit occupation, then averaged for each reported occupational grouping weighing by 6-digits employment obtained from the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Panel a) represents the evolution of the share of low-carbon ads in the entire sample, in the aggregate and for low and high skill occupations. The high skill group includes SOC codes from 11 to 29; the low skill group includes codes above 29. Each subpanel in panel b) represents the evolution of the share of low-carbon ads *within* each of the main eight low-carbon occupational groups. The solid line represent the low-carbon share weighted by BLS employment, while the dotted line represent the unweighted share directly calculated from the sample.

Spatial variation in demand for low- and high-carbon manual jobs

One of the key challenges in delivering a "just transition" and neutralising the job killing arguments deployed by fossil fuel lobbies and climate deniers [45, 50] is to ensure that displaced workers in energy or pollution intensive industries, particularly those in low-skilled (mostly manual) occupations, find new jobs with similar pay and working conditions. The rise in the share of low-carbon vacancies fow low-skilled workers is encouraging, however, the spatial distribution is less so.

Our data shows that high-carbon manual jobs are extremely spatially concentrated around centres of coal, crude oil, gas and shale oil & gas extraction including Wyoming, West Virginia, Oklahoma and Texas and the Appalachian region, echoing previous findings [39]. This holds whether mapping average share of high-carbon vacancies (Figure 3A) or high-carbon employment shares (Figure 3B). The former better captures shale fields where there is still on-going job creation while the latter better captures jobs in constantly declining sectors/ regions like coal. Borrowing from the literature on adverse deindustrialization shocks [9, 6], the spatial concentration of fossil fuel activities amplifies the negative effects of climate policies on fossil fuel communities through negative multiplier effects.

In contrast, low-carbon vacancies are more dispersed. Locational Gini coefficient estimates are twice as high for high-carbon (0.68) as it is for low-carbon ads (0.34) (Table SI.18). Particularly in renewables generation, job location reflects natural resource endowment. We observe higher green job shares in areas with high solar (e.g. California and Nevada) and wind (e.g. Minnesota to Texas wind corridor) power potential. Studies on renewable energy report high degree of spatial concentration in green and low-carbon manual activities [47, 39] suggesting the spatial dispersion found here is driven by low-carbon jobs in areas such as buildings or transport. Low-carbon jobs in Michigan, for example, are driven by bus drivers (Table SI.1).

We document limited overlap between locations of low-carbon job creation and where job destruction is more likely to be concentrated. Table SI.16 reports that the correlation between the shares of high- and low-carbon ads is 0.122 and statistically significant at conventional level, but it halves and becomes statistically insignificant when weighted it by local population levels.

This spatial mismatch between low- and high-carbon activities implies higher reallocation costs than previously thought when focusing on renewable energy jobs only [42].

Overall, our results concur with previous evidence [50, 39] that low-carbon transition has the potential to exacerbate existing regional inequalities, because high-carbon jobs tend to cluster in poorer regions, whereas low-carbon vacancies tend to be in wealthier areas (a 1% increase in average per capita income is associated with an 0.2% increase in the low-carbon ad share and a 0.1% fall in high-carbon ads (Tables SI.14 and SI.15).

Limited employment prospects for workers in communities that are vulnerable in the face of climate change imply high reallocation costs than previously thought, but this does not necessarily undermine a "just transition". Such workers can find jobs in other sectors or jobs indirectly created by the low-carbon transition. Still, our descriptive evidence lends support to the widespread idea that distressed fossil-fuel communities may require targeted place based policies, including retraining and reskilling policies, to successfully accomplish such transition [11].



Figure 3: Spatial distribution of low-carbon vacancies and high-carbon vacancies (A) and jobs (B) in low skilled occupations

Notes: low-carbon vacancies and high-carbon vacancies and employment are presented for low-skilled occupations only (SOCs 31 to 53). Commuting zone level values for 2010-2019 average shares of unweighted low-carbon job ads in green shades. Commuting zones are USDA ERS delineation (2000). Hashed orange overlay indicates the commuting zones with a high share of high-carbon vacancies in panel A (top 15%, corresponding to a greater than 0.4% share of high-carbon vacancies); and high share of high-carbon employment in panel B (top 15%, 2000-2017 average, corresponding to a greater than 1.4% share of high-carbon employment. Data as used by [39] from the BLS's Occupational Employment and Wage Statistics).

Differences in skill requirements

Previous studies examining skill similarity between occupations [25] in the green context highlight the importance of technical and managerial skills for the adoption of clean technologies [47]. To measure the skill gap more precisely, we extend this approach to the job level and assess the relative skill intensity of low-carbon vis-á-vis fossil fuel and other ads. We document low-carbon skill gaps that are larger and broader than previously found.

We focus on five broad skill groups: cognitive, IT, management, social and technical skills. These are in high demand and time-consuming to acquire: cognitive, social and managerial skills are more difficult to replace with machines [8], while IT skills complement digital technologies in the workplace [22]. Skills are classified into the five groups using a set of keywords provided by [20] except for IT skills where the Lightcast IT skill family is used (see Table SI.23) and technical skills that uses [47]. Figure 4 shows the share of low-carbon, high-carbon and generic vacancies that contain at least one (extensive margin) or more than one skill (intensive margin)(see also Table SI.20 in SI). Consistently across all 8 key occupations, low-carbon job vacancies are more likely to require skills in these 5 groups than generic jobs. The skill gap is found both at the extensive and intensive margin meaning that low-carbon ads are not only more likely to contain these skills, but also contain more of them. The low-carbon skill gap is particularly pronounced for technical, managerial, and to a lesser extent, social skills. While this confirms a technical-skill bias for green activities previously found in the literature [47, 32], our data reveal that filling gaps in IT and cognitive skills is also important for the low-carbon transition at least for a subset of occupations. The differences in skill intensity of low-carbon jobs are in most cases statistically significant at conventional levels, when regressing the low-carbon skill gaps across Commuting Zones (Table SI.21). High-carbon jobs are also more likely to require these skill types than generic jobs, hence the skill gap is relatively narrower between low- and high-carbon ads. Still, low-carbon vacancies ask for a more complex skill portfolio than high-carbon ones for engineers (see also Table SI.21).

This study uncovers substantial heterogeneity across occupational groups that previous analyses were unable to detect. Some occupations do not follow the general pattern. Except for technical skills, no significant gaps are found for construction workers and business specialists and transportation workers. Other occupations present larger gaps, such as engineering technicians and installation and maintenance workers, indicating possible difficulties in filling low-carbon vacancies in these occupational groups. For some skills like cognitive and social, the requirement is lower for low-carbon jobs. This indicates that if low-carbon jobs are created locally, retraining coal miners to be roofer or weatherization technicians may not be exceedingly costly.

Reskilling paths vary considerably across occupational groups. To explore further heterogeneity, we use two measures of skill coreness: the green skill coreness if high indicates that a skill is relatively more important in low-carbon ads than in other ads within a given occupation, while the generic skill coreness measures how important a skills is in a particular occupation relative to other occupations (see Methods). Plotting the two indexes in Figure 5), we find a positive correlation for Engineers and Scientists indicates that reskilling paths needed to shift towards green activities in these occupations require further specialization. Further, skills contained in both low-carbon and high-carbon engineering ads belong to the core set of skills for this occupation, implying that the switch to green is easy requiring only incremental retraining. In contrast, the negative correlation for business operation specialists combined with the previous results on skill gaps suggests that here, moving into low-carbon likely involves diversifying the skill set by acquiring new technical, management or social skills that are beyond core curricula in business. No specialization-diversification patterns are found for construction workers, architects, technicians, installation workers and transport workers, even though larger skill gaps were found for technicians and installation workers (Figure 4). This suggests that, for most of the key occupations in the low-carbon transition, retraining is likely to be highly context- and technology-specific, requiring cooperation among social actors, including trade unions, industrial associations, technical and vocational schools, to find the appropriate solutions.

Figure 4: Differences in broad skills by occupation

Notes: Each panel represents the share of ads for a given occupation and category (generic, low or high-carbon) that contains *exactly one* (1) or *two or more* (2+) skills pertaining to any of the five broad skill categories listed. Percentages reported correspond to unweighted shares of ads obtained directly from the sample. The *Cognitive*, *Management*, *Social* and *Technical* broad skills are defined using sets of keywords obtained from [20]. The *IT* broad skill corresponds to the eponymous Lightcast skill cluster family.



Figure 5: Specialization vs diversification by occupation

Notes: Relationship between the relative prevalence of a given skill in low (resp. high) carbon ad – low (resp. high) carbon coreness on the *y axis* – and its relative prevalence in the entire sample – skill coreness, *x axis* (see formulas below for a precise definition). Each dot represents one skill; only the 400 most frequent skills are plotted for each occupation. ρ reports the correlation between these two corenesses, obtained from a regression weighted by the share of each skill in generic ads. A significant $\rho > 0$ indicates *specialization*: skills more prevalent in low (resp. high) carbon ads tend to be core skills of the occupation. Conversely, a significant $\rho < 0$ indicates *diversification*: skills important in low- (resp. high-) carbon ads are not part of the occupation's core skillset.

The low-carbon wage premium

The wage premium depends on both labour and skill demand and supply [7]. Wage offerings thus signal potential skill mismatches and hiring difficulties, as well as the attractiveness of low-carbon jobs. Previous occupational level analyses find green jobs command a positive wage premium in the US [48] indicating that meeting higher skill requirements can yield higher earnings in greener occupations. Here, the key novelty is that we can estimate wage regressions separately for each major occupational group (see Methods).

Figure 6 reports the low-carbon wage premium for the eight occupational groups, stacking the first (2010-2012) and the last three years together (2017-2019). Importantly, what we call low-carbon wage premium only reflects a wage offer (the demand-side) and may differ from the paid wage which is an equilibrium outcome that also accounts for supply-side factors such as the availability of candidates with required competences. Table SI.24 shows that results are qualitatively similar in richer specifications with additional covariates.

In the earlier period, there is a positive and statistically significant low-carbon wage premium coinciding with a climate policy boom associated with the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, for all occupations except architects (17-1). We find very large premium for technicians (13%) and transport workers (16%), and a high (7%) for both installation workers and physical scientists, for which we also observe the largest skill gaps, and for business specialists (6%), possibly reflecting the difficulties to fill the gap in technical skills in such profession. For engineers, a modest (2%) premium is observed significant only at the 10% level, while a positive and non-significant premium is found for green construction vacancies.

The low-carbon premia, however, experienced a widespread and pronounced decline in more recent years. Resonating with the political turnaround in the US green policies during the Trump's era, with the withdrawal from the Paris agreement and the repeal of the Clean Power Plan, the low-carbon wage premium becomes negative and significant at the 10% level for construction workers (-2%), engineers (-4%) and transport workers (-6%). A large decline is also observed for technicians, though a positive and significant low-carbon premium is maintained in the second period (+4%). Low-carbon installation workers experience lesser reductions which may reflect the fact that repairing and maintenance tasks are in high demand after construction activities financed by the Obama era green fiscal push. Wage offers for low-carbon architects rise bucking the trend, but uncertainty is high with few low-carbon architect vacancies.

Wage premiums in high-carbon jobs are historically high due for example to resource rents and strong unions [37, 15] in contrast to low-carbon workers that are spread across the economy (see Table SI.11). We document that in both construction and engineering jobs, high-carbon premium were indeed significantly higher than the wage offers for low-carbon ads in similar occupations at above 20%, and also declined less in the second period to around 8% for engineers and 16% for extraction workers (see SI). This is problematic for the just transition in several ways. Highly talented engineers may be absorbed by high-carbon industries, reducing the talent pool available for solving climate change problems through innovation. Even if the skill gaps can be addressed and local job opportunities are available, lower wage rates that make workers worse off will still lead to opposition to climate action.



Figure 6: Wage gap between low, high-carbon and generic job ads by period

Notes: The logarithm of annual wage reported in a job ad is regressed on an indicator of whether the ad is low (resp. high) carbon while controlling for time dummies, 6-digits SOC occupation code dummies, commuting zone dummies and 2-digits NAICS industry dummies. Wages are observed in 22.5% of the ads for the 8 occupations listed, while wages and NAICS codes are observed in 10.2% – 3.2% of which are low-carbon.

Discussion

To win support for climate policies, politicians continue to promise abundant high quality low-carbon jobs, implying improvements labour market conditions for low-skilled workers to offset some of the impacts of the ongoing digital transformation and offshoring, and selling the green transition as a vehicle to tackle rising aggregate inequality and job polarization. Yet there is scant evidence supporting such claims, in part due to the lack of credible definitions and measures of low-carbon jobs.

We offer a robust, transparent and flexible approach to accurately isolate low-carbon jobs and quantify emerging skill and wage gaps using job ads data, overcoming many of the issues with using sector or occupation-based definitions. While the backdrop of our study is that of very modest climate action – US emissions fell 8% from 5,594 to 5,144 $MtCO_2$ during our study period 2010-2019 [43] – the precise assessment of skill requirements of low-carbon activities will become even more important as massive labour reallocation towards low-carbon activities is expected under ambitious decarbonization scenarios [27, 16]. Policymakers can use our approach to monitor skill gaps associated with specific technologies and sectors that are relevant for the local economy, thus improving the effectiveness and the targeting of retraining programs. In addition, the improved evidence base on reallocation costs should be used to calibrate integrated assessment and computational general equilibrium models used to assess macroeconomic impacts of climate change mitigation.

Our most clear finding is that low-carbon vacancies systematically differ in their skill requirements. Low-carbon vacancies exhibit higher frequency of skills in all occupations, suggesting they are more skills intensive than generic job ads than previously thought [47]. Skill gaps and reskilling paths appear highly heterogeneous, suggesting that finding retraining solutions will be complex, and may need to be tailored to meet the specific needs of the companies hiring these workers, particularly for occupational groups such as engineering technicians and installation workers.

Overall, our results suggest that reallocation cost are higher than previously considered. In addition to skill gaps, the limited geographic overlap found between low- and high-carbon jobs suggests the labour market effects of the low-carbon transition could compound existing regional disparities if low-skilled displaced workers face limited alternative employment opportunities locally. To prevent manual fossil workers being left behind, there may be a potential role for targeted place-based policies for these communities and their labour markets to adjust towards a carbon neutral world. Interpretation of our descriptive results, however, should be cautious given how little is know around the speed, extent and nature of green jobs creation in local labour markets.

We show the share of low-carbon jobs among low-skilled occupations increased during the period 2010-2019 and fell among high-skilled occupations, tentatively suggesting that the low-carbon transition could contribute to offset secular deterioration of the labour market conditions for unskilled workers. Yet low-carbon jobs no longer yield a wage premia to compensate for higher skill requirements. Reconciling this gap is a neglected but important issue for managing the low-carbon transition.

High-carbon jobs demand a similar set and high level of skills but offer markedly higher wages, and tend to be located in relatively poorer regions with strong political opposition to ambitious climate policies [42, 50]. Because demand for low-carbon activities is primarily driven by policy, the widespread decline in green wage premia in the last decade may reflect the sudden boom and bust in US climate policy. Further research is needed to uncover factors driving the inadequate wage premium found for low-carbon vacancies, to ensure a workforce fit for the low-carbon transition.

Methods

Identifying low-carbon ads

Accurately identifying low-carbon jobs ads is an important step to compare low-carbon and non low-carbon job ads within the same occupation. In this section we describe the three step procedure developed to identify low-carbon job ads from the near-universe sample of US online job ad data collected by Lightcast.

Step 1: selecting low-carbon keywords

In a first step, drawing from [4], we select a set of valid tokenized low-carbon keywords from pre-existing and widely utilised classifications. First, the Occupational Information Network (O*NET) dataset provides information on specific task contents of narrowly defined occupations (867 BLS Standard Occupational Classification (SOC) occupations), indicating tasks that are considered 'green'. Examples of the textual descriptions of tasks include:

- "Prepare or present technical or project status reports."
- "Calibrate vehicle systems, including control algorithms or other software systems."
- "Measure and mark cutting lines on materials, using a ruler, pencil, chalk, and marking gauge."

The definition of 'green' tasks, which was added to the dataset under the Green Economy Program of 2009, covers not only climate change related tasks, but also tasks that contribute towards non-climate environmental problems such as waste management, remediation activities, and activities associated with local air and water pollution[1]. We utilise a complementary sector classification (SOC 6-digit level) to isolate the tasks relevant to CO_2 mitigation or adaptation, from general green activities. Specifically, we select only a subset of green specific

[1] See https://www.onetcenter.org/reports/GreenTask.html for more details.

tasks performed in the following green sectors: "Agriculture and Forestry", "Energy and Carbon Capture and Storage", "Energy Efficiency", "Energy Trading", "Environment Protection", "Governmental and Regulatory Administration", "Green Construction", "Manufacturing", "Renewable Energy Generation", "Research, Design, and Consulting Services", "Transportation". Examples of low-carbon green tasks in O*NET include:

- "Calculate potential for energy savings."
- "Fabricate prototypes of fuel cell components, assemblies, or systems."
- "Test wind turbine components, by mechanical or electronic testing."

while non low-carbon green tasks include:

- "Monitor and adjust irrigation systems to distribute water according to crop needs and to avoid wasting water."
- "Prepare hazardous waste manifests or land disposal restriction notifications."
- "Advise land users, such as farmers or ranchers, on plans, problems, or alternative conservation solutions."

'To extract keywords from these O*NET task descriptors, we first tokenize them, keeping only nouns, adjectives, verbs and adverbs. We then apply natural language processing (NLP) using the term frequency–inverse document frequency (TF-IDF) algorithm [34] on the low-carbon and non low-carbon subsets of tasks in O*NET. This yields a score indicating how relevant each word is to low-carbon tasks and products.. For each keyword in the low-carbon subset, we then take the difference in the relevance score obtained within the low-carbon subset of tasks (s_g) and the one obtained in the non low-carbon subset (s_{ng}), normalizing to a zero score for words that only appear in one of the two lists. This step provides us with a low-carbon likelihood (LCL) for each keyword appearing in the O*NET task descriptions. In particular, $LCL = s_g - s_{ng}$. The LCL measures the extent to which each keyword is specific to low-carbon tasks rather than being a general characteristic describing the occupational task content. Obviously, negative value of the LCL index are assigned to keywords not characterising low-carbon activities, while positive LCL are indicates relevance for such activities.

We apply a similar approach to the PRODCOM classification by contrasting the textual descriptions of climate change mitigation relevant products identified by [13] with that of other products.

Examples of low-carbon products in PRODCOM include:

- "Frames and forks, for bicycles"
- "Multiple-walled insulating units of glass"
- "Vehicles with an electric motor"

We then combine the two lists and sort them by the LCL index defined above. We keep the top 250 of these to get a set of *low-carbon* (climate-related) keywords. The LCL index is distributed as a steeply decreasing power law, becoming essentially flat beyond rank 30. Thus the exact choice of cutoff does not substantially affect the results of our classification exercise. Limiting the total number of keywords used to 250 is further motivated by computational considerations, as matching against a list of keywords increases quadratically with the number of words in the list.

Step 2: Mapping low-carbon keywords with Lightcast job identifiers

We proceed to map our list of 250 low-carbon keywords against the 16,059 unique skills present in the Lightcast dataset, to identify a subset of low-carbon skills /job identifiers. To do so, we use the natural language processing algorithm Word2Vec [41] to semantically match each job identifier word against our 250 low-carbon keywords, yielding a “low-carbon matching score” for each job identifier.

Semantic matching with word embeddings (such as Word2Vec) is more robust than more naïve, string-based / fuzzy matching approaches (e.g. using ‘wind*’ to match both ‘wind power’ and ‘wind mill’). For example, ‘solar’ and ‘photovoltaics’ are recognized as being semantically similar, even though they would be considered unrelated with naïve fuzzy matching. Word embeddings rely on a language model trained on a corpus of text to identify semantic similarities between words, based on their patterns of co-occurrence with other words (e.g. the model will pick up from observing ”The king rules the country”, ”The queen rules the land”, and ”The prince governs the county” that ’king’, ’queen’ and ’prince’ are close semantically). Each word is thus represented as a vector in this feature space. The generalized cosine distance in that vector space measures semantic proximity. Here we use the pre-trained word embedding model provided by Google for the English language, Word2Vec, trained on the Google News dataset, which comprises around 100 billion words. At a mathematical level, each word is projected onto a number of dimensions (called the feature space, numbering a few hundreds in the case of Word2Vec). The power of this approach resides in the fact that, like many deep learning techniques, it is unsupervised: the feature space doesn’t need to be designed by the implementer, and is instead built endogenously by the model.

To increase the robustness of the procedure against the choice of cutoff in the first step, we re-weight the matching score using the individual keywords’ LCL. We automatically retain those Lightcast job identifiers that achieve a direct string match against one of the top 20 low-carbon keywords collected in the first step. For instance, the keyword ‘solar’ matches the Lightcast identifier ‘Solar Engineering’ directly. These form our initial 396 low-carbon job identifiers and this unsupervised portion of our classification algorithm excludes 15,063 potential identifiers that match none of our low-carbon keywords. This leaves 600 ambiguous matches with a high yet imperfect matching score. These cases cannot be settled by our unsupervised classifier. We therefore turn to an expert survey.

Step 3: Expert survey

To resolve ambiguous cases, we asked experts in the field of climate change to classify job identifiers as low-carbon or not through an online survey. Responses were obtained from 50 climate experts at leading institutions including Oxford University, the London School of Economics, the OECD and the University of Venice (invitation email presented below).

Each expert was tasked to designate 120 job identifiers as low-carbon or non-low-carbon. Of these job identifiers, 100 were randomly sampled from the set of 600 ambiguous identifiers described above, while 20 were sampled from the 396 low-carbon identifiers found through a perfect match with our low-carbon keywords. The latter subset was included to verify the quality of the expert's classification skills as well as to corroborate the previous step of the procedure.

We exclude responses from experts that did not correctly classify at least 40% of these placebo identifiers. We then combine these returns to calculate an average low-carbon score for each identifier surveyed using the following scoring scheme: 1 for 'Yes', 0.25 for a blank response, and 0 for 'No'. We finally apply a threshold score of 0.9 to obtain a further 49 low-carbon job identifiers.

This three-steps procedure gives a list of 445 low-carbon skills that we use as low-carbon job identifiers. A vacancy posing is considered low-carbon if it contains at least one low-carbon job identifier. The list of low-carbon related skills is made available with this publication to advance research and analyses in this area.

The Lightcast dataset

Lightcast uses web scraping to collect data on job posting from approximately 50,000 online job boards as well as company websites [31], removes duplicates and parses into a systematic, usable format. For each job ad, Lightcast extracts job characteristics information including occupation, educational qualifications requirements, skills, employer characteristics, location and wage. Lightcast data thus allows us to observe changes in skill requirement at the job level, and compare similar jobs within the same occupation, improving the granularity of analysis relative to previous work looking at changes in the task content at the occupation level.

Lightcast extracts around 16,000 unique skills (job identifiers) from job ads, which is a canonicalised version of skills contained in the job ads. A large portion of these skills (6,959 or 44%) are also assigned a skill cluster (groupings of skills that have similar functionality) and a skill cluster family (the most general layer of the Lightcast skill taxonomy). For example, the skill "smart grid" belongs to the skill cluster "electrical construction" in the skill family "architecture and construction".

Figure SI.1 shows the average number of skills listed per job ad over time and job category (generic, high-carbon and low-carbon). The number of skills per position advertised has trended upwards over the period of observation across all job categories, with the median skill count growing from 6 to 8 from 2010 to 2019. The number of skills contained in low-carbon vacancies has been consistently higher over the entire decade, reaching a median value of 12 skills per low-carbon ads in 2019, compared with 8 for generic ads and 9 for high-carbon ads.

Variation in skill vector length in general, and the longer skill vector length for low-carbon job ads specifically may be attributed to a number of factors. First, more complex jobs contain more skills in ads. It could also be attributed to marketing strategies of firms trying to attract talent to low-carbon jobs by providing excessively detailed job descriptions to partly offset low wage offers – which we do not observe. More skills may be found in postings for new job types – new, unfamiliar low-carbon positions may be described in more detail to ensure a good candidate match, compared to the average job.

Figure SI.2 highlights the heterogeneity in skill vector lengths across major occupational groups. As expected, on average in 2019, more skills are contained in high skilled job ads (e.g. 17 - Architects & Engineers and 19 - Scientists) with a median of 10 skills per ad, than in low skilled job ads (e.g. 47 - Construction & Extraction and 49 - Installation, Maintenance & Repair) with a median of 7 skills per ad.

Wage regressions

We estimate wage regressions [35] separately for each major occupational group to retrieve the low-carbon wage premium, we estimate the following equation at the job ad level (i) separately for the first (2010-2012) and the last period (2017-2019), and by the eight main occupational groups considered in our analysis:

$$\log\left(w_{it}\right) = \beta_{lc}\mathbb{1}\{i \in lc\} + \sum_{k} \mu_k + \alpha_t + \varepsilon_i$$

where w_it is the annual wage as posted in the ad. Wage is logged to mitigate the influence of outliers. We are interested in estimating the returns to low-carbon ad in a specific occupation, that is: β_{lc}, conditional on a set of controls. Controls μ_k include occupation (6-digit SOC), industry (2-digit NAICS) and commuting zones, respectively. These controls purge the low-carbon wage premium from the influence of obvious confounders, such as unobserved industry-level and regional shocks. Moreover, we control flexibly for the length of the skill vector in the job ad using a set of five dummy variables for a corresponding number of skill vector length bins (1-4, 5-8, 9-12, 13-16, 17+). Together with a set of dummies indicating the education level required in the ad, these controls capture both the complexity of the job post and the differences in advertising styles across companies.

Wage information are available for approximately 20% of job ads, thus, to mitigate concerns related to the representativeness of our estimation sample, we weight regressions by the BLS employment of the 6-digit occupation. Unfortunately, the number of job ads with missing information on education and sector is very large reducing the size of the estimation sample by 65% and 55%, respectively. We thus use a parsimonious specification with only years, occupation, CZ and job length dummies in the main specification, while testing the robustness of our results to the inclusion of additional controls. Finally, to limit the influence of outliers, we exclude ads comprising more than 100 skills.

Slightly abusing of terminology, what we call low-carbon wage premium only reflects a wage offer (the demand-side) and may differ from the actually paid wage which is an equilibrium outcome that also accounts for supply-side factors such as the availability of candidates with required competences. [20] and [5] circumvent this problem by combining BLS wage data with skill data extracted from job ads at the occupational level. However, such approach would only allow estimating an average low-carbon wage premium, exploiting cross-occupational variation in green tasks as in [48]. To complement such approach, we thus decide to estimate occupational-specific differences in wage offers between low-carbon and generic job ads.

Our estimate of the low-carbon wage premium cannot be interpret as a causal impact of switching to low-carbon activities on wages. Because we only observe the wage posted in the ad and not the actual wage paid when the vacancy is filled, unobserved workers' skills are not a main additional source of estimation bias here. In turn, we are well aware that unobserved firm characteristics are highly correlated with the wage offered, but including firm fixed effects is unfeasible since it implies dropping too many observations from a relatively small sample. If larger companies are more likely to advertise low-carbon ads and have market power so pay higher wages on average, the low-carbon premium is an upper bound. Vice versa, the low-carbon premium is a lower bound if green companies are smaller than non-green companies. While there is some evidence that wind and solar generation is concentrated in small and medium sized establishments [38], it is not enough to argue that our estimates of the low-carbon wage premium are downwardly biased.

Data availability statement. The job ads data used in this research was provided by Lightcast. The contractual agreement restricts public posting of the data set. The dataset can however be purchased from Lightcast.

Code availability statement. Code for data cleaning and analysis is provided as part of the replication package. It will be uploaded on the Corresponding Author's Github public profile once the paper has been conditionally accepted. [INSERT LINK HERE CONDITIONAL ON PAPER BEING ACCEPTED.]

References

[1] D. Acemoglu and D. Autor. Chapter 12 - skills, tasks and technologies: Implications for employment and earnings. In D. Card and O. Ashenfelter, editors, *Handbook of Labor Economics*, volume 4, pages 1043 – 1171. Elsevier, 2011. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-7218(11)02410-5. URL http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0169721811024105.

[2] D. Acemoglu, D. Autor, J. Hazell, and P. Restrepo. Ai and jobs: Evidence from online vacancies. Technical report, National Bureau of Economic Research, 2020.

[3] J. E. Aldy. Policy monitor a preliminary assessment of the american recovery and reinvestment act's clean energy package. *Review of Environmental Economics and Policy*, 7 (1):136–155, 2013.

[4] E. Atalay, P. Phongthiengtham, S. Sotelo, and D. Tannenbaum. The evolution of work in the united states. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 12(2):1–34, 2020.

[5] E. Atalay, P. Phongthiengtham, S. Sotelo, and D. Tannenbaum. The evolution of work in the united states. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, Forthcoming. URL https://www.aeaweb.org/articles?id=10.1257/app.20190070.

[6] D. Autor, D. Dorn, and G. H. Hanson. On the persistence of the china shock. Technical report, National Bureau of Economic Research, 2021.

[7] D. H. Autor. Skills, education, and the rise of earnings inequality among the "other 99 percent". *Science*, 344(6186):843–851, 2014.

[8] D. H. Autor, F. Levy, and R. J. Murnane. The skill content of recent technological change: An empirical exploration. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 118(4):1279–1333, 11

2003. ISSN 0033-5533. doi: 10.1162/00335530332255280l. URL https://doi.org/10.1162/00335530332255280l.

[9] D. H. Autor, D. Dorn, and G. H. Hanson. The china shock: Learning from labor-market adjustment to large changes in trade. *Annual Review of Economics*, 8(1):205–240, 2016. doi: 10.1146/annurev-economics-080315-015041. URL https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-economics-080315-015041.

[10] J. Azar, I. Marinescu, M. Steinbaum, and B. Taska. Concentration in us labor markets: Evidence from online vacancy data. *Labour Economics*, 66:101886, 2020.

[11] T. J. Bartik. Using place-based jobs policies to help distressed communities. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 34(3):99–127, 2020. ISSN 08953309, 19447965. URL https://www.jstor.org/stable/26923543.

[12] R. A. Becker and R. J. Shadbegian. Environmental Products Manufacturing: A Look inside the Green Industry. *The B.E. Journal of Economic Analysis & Policy*, 9(1):1–25, 2009.

[13] F. Bontadini, F. Vona, et al. *Anatomy of Green Specialization: Evidence from EU Production Data, 1995-2015*. OFCE, 2020.

[14] A. Bowen, K. Kuralbayeva, and E. L. Tipoe. Characterising green employment: The impacts of 'greening' on workforce composition. *Energy Economics*, 72:263 – 275, 2018. ISSN 0140-9883. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eneco.2018.03.015. URL http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0140988318300963.

[15] S. Carley and D. M. Konisky. The justice and equity implications of the clean energy transition. *Nature Energy*, 5(8):569–577, 2020. doi: 10.1038/s41560-020-0641-6. URL https://doi.org/10.1038/s41560-020-0641-6.

[16] K. A. Castellanos and G. Heutel. Unemployment, labor mobility, and climate policy. Technical report, National Bureau of Economic Research, 2019.

[17] D. Consoli, G. Marin, A. Marzucchi, and F. Vona. Do green jobs differ from non-green jobs in terms of skills and human capital? *Research Policy*, 45(5):1046–1060, 2016.

[18] E. M. Curtis and I. Marinescu. Green energy jobs in the us: What are they, and where are they? Working Paper 30332, National Bureau of Economic Research, August 2022.

[19] S. J. Davis, R. J. Faberman, and J. Haltiwanger. Labor market flows in the cross section and over time. *Journal of monetary economics*, 59(1):1–18, 2012. ISSN 0304-3932.

[20] D. Deming and L. B. Kahn. Skill requirements across firms and labor markets: Evidence from job postings for professionals. *Journal of Labor Economics*, 36(S1):S337–S369, 2018. doi: 10.1086/694106. URL https://doi.org/10.1086/694106.

[21] D. Deming and K. Noray. Earnings dynamics, changing job skills, and stem careers. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 135(4):1965–2005, 2020.

[22] D. J. Deming. The growing importance of social skills in the labor market. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 132(4):1593–1640, 2017.

[23] R. J. Elliott and J. K. Lindley. Environmental jobs and growth in the united states. *Ecological Economics*, 132:232–244, 2017.

[24] T. M. Gabe and J. R. Abel. Specialized knowledge and the geographic concentration of occupations. *Journal of Economic Geography*, 12(2):435–453, 2012. ISSN 14682702, 14682710. URL http://www.jstor.org/stable/26158155.

[25] C. Gathmann and U. Schönberg. How general is human capital? a task-based approach. *Journal of Labor Economics*, 28(1):1–49, 2010. doi: 10.1086/649786. URL `https://doi.org/10.1086/649786`.

[26] M. Greenstone. The Impacts of Environmental Regulations on Industrial Activity: Evidence from the 1970 and 1977 Clean Air Act Amendments and the Census of Manufactures. *Journal of Political Economy*, 110(6):1175–1219, 2002.

[27] M. A. Hafstead and R. C. Williams III. Unemployment and environmental regulation in general equilibrium. *Journal of Public Economics*, 160:50–65, 2018.

[28] R. Hanna, Y. Xu, and D. G. Victor. After covid-19, green investment must deliver jobs to get political traction. *Nature*, 582:178–180, 2020.

[29] B. Hershbein and L. B. Kahn. Do recessions accelerate routine-biased technological change? evidence from vacancy postings. *American Economic Review*, 108(7):1737–72, 2018.

[30] M. E. Kahn and E. T. Mansur. Do local energy prices and regulation affect the geographic concentration of employment? *Journal of Public Economics*, 101(C):105–114, 2013.

[31] V. A. Lancaster, D. Mahoney-Nair, and N. Ratcliff. Review of burning glass job-ad data. Proceedings of the Biocomplexity Institute 2021-013, Biocomplexity Institute, 2021.

[32] G. Marin and F. Vona. Climate policies and skill-biased employment dynamics : evidence from EU countries. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, 98:102253, 2019.

[33] G. Marin, M. Marino, and C. Pellegrin. The impact of the european emission trading

scheme on multiple measures of economic performance. *Environmental and Resource Economics*, 71(2):551–582, 2018.

[34] R. Mihalcea and P. Tarau. Textrank: Bringing order into text. In *Proceedings of the 2004 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing*, pages 404–411, 2004.

[35] J. Mincer. Schooling and earnings. In *Schooling, experience, and earnings*, pages 41–63. NBER, 1974.

[36] R. D. Morgenstern, W. A. Pizer, and J.-S. Shih. Jobs versus the environment: an industry-level perspective. *Journal of environmental economics and management*, 43(3):412–436, 2002.

[37] G. Muttitt and S. Kartha. Equity, climate justice and fossil fuel extraction: principles for a managed phase out. *Climate Policy*, 20(8):1024–1042, 2020. doi: 10.1080/14693062.2020.1763900. URL `https://doi.org/10.1080/14693062.2020.1763900`.

[38] D. Popp, J. Pless, I. Hascic, and N. Johnstone. Innovation and entrepreneurship in the energy sector. In *The Role of Innovation and Entrepreneurship in Economic Growth*. University of Chicago Press, 2020.

[39] D. Popp, F. Vona, G. Marin, and Z. Chen. The employment impact of a green fiscal push: Evidence from the american recovery and reinvestment act. *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity, Fall. 1-49*, 2021.

[40] J. Rockström, O. Gaffney, J. Rogelj, M. Meinshausen, N. Nakicenovic, and H. J. Schellnhuber. A roadmap for rapid decarbonization. *Science*, 355(6331):1269–1271, 2017. doi: 10.1126/science.aah3443.

[41] X. Rong. word2vec parameter learning explained. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1411.2738*, 2014.

[42] J. W. K. Tomer, Adie and C. George. How renewable energy jobs can uplift fossil fuel communities and remake climate politics. Technical report, Brookings, 2021.

[43] U.S. Energy Information Administration. U.S. energy-related carbon dioxide emissions, 2020. Technical report, U.S. EIA, 2021. URL https://www.eia.gov/environment/emissions/carbon/.

[44] A. Valero, J. Li, S. Muller, V. Nguyen-Tien, and M. Draca. Are 'green' jobs good jobs? how lessons from the experience to-date can inform labour market transitions of the future. Technical report, Grantham Research Institute on Climate Change and the Environment, October 2021.

[45] F. Vona. Job losses and political acceptability of climate policies: why the 'job-killing'argument is so persistent and how to overturn it. *Climate Policy*, 19(4):524–532, 2019.

[46] F. Vona, G. Marin, D. Consoli, and D. Popp. Green skills. Technical report, National Bureau of Economic Research, 2015.

[47] F. Vona, G. Marin, D. Consoli, and D. Popp. Environmental Regulation and Green Skills: An Empirical Exploration. *Journal of the Association of Environmental and Resource Economists*, 5(4):713–753, May 2018. ISSN 2333-5955. doi: 10.1086/698859. URL https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/abs/10.1086/698859.

[48] F. Vona, G. Marin, and D. Consoli. Measures, drivers and effects of green employment: evidence from US local labor markets, 2006–2014. *Journal of Economic Geography*, 19 (5):1021–1048, 07 2019. ISSN 1468-2702. doi: 10.1093/jeg/lby038. URL https://doi.org/10.1093/jeg/lby038.

[49] W. R. Walker. The transitional costs of sectoral reallocation: Evidence from the clean air act and the workforce. *The Quarterly journal of economics*, 128(4):1787–1835, 2013.

[50] J. G. Weber. How should we think about environmental policy and jobs? an analogy with trade policy and an illustration from us coal mining. *Review of Environmental Economics and Policy*, 14(1):44–66, 2020.

Acknowledgments

We wish to thank Davor Miskulin and Bledi Taska of Lightcast for their advice and suggestions. We would also like to thank the experts who participated in the low-carbon job identifier selection survey. Finally, we wish to thank Timothy Besley, Xavier Ragot, Olivier Deschenes, Ulrich Wagner and seminar participants at LSE, Sciences Po, University-College Dublin, University Paris-Saclay, along with participants to the 8th IZA Workshop on Environment, Health and Labor Markets 26th and 27th Annual Conference of the European Association of Environmental and Resource Economists and the 2021 Conference of the Association of Environmental and Resource Economists, EEA-ESEM 2022 conference, Brighton University Workshop on the systematic analysis of job vacancy data. All remaining errors are ours. Sato and Saussay gratefully acknowledges financial support from the Grantham Foundation and from the Economic and Social Research Council Centre for Climate Change Economics and Policy grant (ES/R009708/1), ESRC/JPI Climate SOLSTICE project JUST-DEARB (ES/V013971/1), and PRINZ (ES/W010356/1). They also acknowledge support from the British Academy/Leverhulme Small Research Grant (SRG21/211229). Finally, Saussay gratefully acknowledges the Leverhulme Trust for his Early Career Fellowship ECF/2021/536.

Supplementary Information

Definition of low-carbon ads

The three-step process described yields 445 low-carbon identifiers in total. We define low-carbon job ads as those that contain *at least* one of the 445 low-carbon job identifiers.

Table SI.1 presents examples of low-carbon job ads and informations contained in it including location, degree and annual wage. The last column contains examples of Lightcast skills, highlighting the low-carbon identifier in bold. Non low-carbon skills are important for the analysis of section where we compare the skill sets of low-carbon to other ads within the same occupation.

To give some intuitive insights on the methodology, Table SI.2 lists the top 50 low-carbon identifiers. Besides bus driving, insulation, energy efficiency (or conservation) and renewable energy stand out as the most frequent identifiers. Note the inclusion of several identifiers related to building retrofitting and weatherization that were heavily subsidized under the green ARRA program [39].

Table SI.1: Example of low-carbon ads

Title	SOC	Location	Degree	Annual wage	Skills
Senior Planner	13-1121 - Meeting, Convention, and Event Planners	Upper Marlboro, Maryland	Master's	51k - 88k	**Bicycle Planning**, Editing, Environmental Science, Grant Applications, Planning, Transit-Oriented Development, Writing
Facilities Planner	17-1011 - Architects, Except Landscape and Naval	Tallahassee, Florida	Bachelor's	35k - 40k	**Green Building**, Budgeting, Capital Planning, Construction Management, Planning, Project Management, Spreadsheets, Urban Planning
Chemical Engineer	17-2041 - Chemical Engineers	Houston, Texas	Bachelor's	180k - 200k	**Energy Efficiency**, Business Acumen, Chemical Engineering, Performance Appraisals, Process Modeling, Project Management, Simulation, Technical Support
Printer/Electronics Technician	17-3023 - Electrical and Electronics Engineering Technicians	Denver, Colorado	Associate's	51k - 51k	**Retrofitting**, AC/DC Drives and Motors, Break/Fix, Computer Literacy, Description and Demonstration of Products, Fault Codes, Lifting Ability, Mechanical Repair, Microsoft Office, Printers, Repair, Troubleshooting
Post-Doctoral Research Scholar-Chemical Engineering	19-2011 - Astronomers	Richmond, Virginia	PhD	59k - 85k	**Green Chemistry**, Chemical Engineering, Chemistry, Communication Skills, Design of experiments (DOE), High-Performance Liquid Chromatography (HPLC), Lab Safety, Laboratory Safety And Chemical Hygiene Plan, Mentoring, Research, Teamwork / Collaboration, Writing
Lead Solar Installer	47-2231 - Solar Photovoltaic Installers	Rancho Cuca-monga, California	High School	37k - 41k	**Solar Installation**, Customer Contact, Electrical Experience, Fall Protection, Operations Management, Physical Abilities, Roofing, Scheduling
Maintenance Mechanic	49-9099 - Installation, Maintenance, and Repair Workers, All Other	Battle Creek, Michigan	High School	19k - 26k	**Energy Efficiency**, Commercial Driving, Repair, Troubleshooting Technical Issues
Driver	53-3032 - Heavy and Tractor-Trailer Truck Drivers	Sterling Heights, Michigan	High School	120k - 120k	**Bus Driving**, Over The Road, Repair, Truck Driving

Table SI.2: Top 50 low-carbon identifiers most commonly observed in job ads

Low carbon identifier	Ad count	Low carbon identifier	Ad count
Bus Driving	210,459	Efficient Transportation	21,115
Insulation	177,865	Public Transit Systems	20,825
Energy Efficiency	156,830	Emissions Testing	20,335
Energy Conservation	128,151	Pollution Control	20,247
Renewable Energy	127,146	Fuel Cell	19,596
Retrofitting	89,088	Electric Vehicle	19,281
Solar Energy	58,834	Energy Reduction	18,412
Climate Change	43,228	Insulation Installation	18,066
Clean Energy	37,395	Alternative Fuels	16,793
Solar Sales	36,795	Clean Air Act	16,546
Pollution Prevention	32,959	Geothermal	16,480
Environmental Sustainability	32,856	Greenhouse Gas	15,521
Air Emissions	31,452	Solar Installation	14,725
Wind Power	31,272	Federal Railroad Administration	14,647
Wind Turbines	29,202	Sustainable Energy	13,922
Photovoltaic (PV) Systems	26,249	Green Energy	13,462
Alternative Energy	25,997	Energy Conservation Measures	13,200
Smart Grid	25,725	Solar Systems	12,980
Sustainable Design	24,826	Weatherization	12,842
Fuel Efficiency	24,550	Air Permitting	12,750
Solar Panels	24,316	Biomass	12,081
Air Pollution Control	24,184	Energy Policy	11,558
Ethanol	23,026	Solar Consultation	10,630
Light Rail	21,560	Clean Technology	10,466
Green Building	21,442	Emissions Management	10,092

Expert survey email

Dear [Expert name],

With [coauthor] and [coauthor], I am currently working on a project to identify the competencies necessary in the transition to a zero-carbon economy from an exhaustive dataset of all online job vacancies in the US over the past decade.

One major step involves the definition of what is a low-carbon job ad among millions of possible job vacancies. We have applied Natural Language Processing techniques to automate the selection of low-carbon job vacancies starting from a predefined set of clean energy keywords from previous research on the topic. By "low-carbon" we mean an activity that reduces GHG emissions in several sectors: agriculture and forestry; power generation, storage and distribution; energy efficiency; manufacturing; transport; building and construction; engineering; research, design & consulting; regulation.

However, we need an expert review for a subset of identifiers that are ranked by the algorithm as "low-carbon", but only marginally so.

Would you be willing to review the attached list of 125 attributes of a job vacancy and label those you consider to be "low-carbon" according to your own expert knowledge?

Many thanks for your help!

Kind regards,

Table SI.3: low-carbon job identifiers/ low-carbon skills

Air Emissions	Biomass Research	Building Energy Modeling (BEM)
Air Permitting	Biomass Thermochemical Conversion	Direct Methanol Fuel Cells
Air Pollution Control	Biomass Transformation	Directed Energy Systems
Air Quality Control	Biorefinery	Dressing Changing
Air Quality Regulations	Building Energy Codes	EPA Regulation
Air Quality Remediation	Building Energy Modeling Software	Efficient Transportation
Air Quality Standards	Building Envelope Evaluation	Electric Car Industry Knowledge
Alternative Air Conditioning	Bus Driving	Electric Vehicle
Alternative Energy	Bus Industry Knowledge	Emission Reduction Projects
Alternative Energy Design	Bus Kneeling Systems	Emissions Analysis
Alternative Energy Evaluation	Bus Safety	Emissions Analyzer Operation
Alternative Fuel Vehicles	Carbon Accounting	Emissions Analyzers
Alternative Fuels	Carbon Asset Management	Emissions Control Systems
Alternative Transportation	Carbon Dioxide Flooding	Emissions Inspection
Automatic Insulation Strippers	Carbon Emissions Reduction	Emissions Inventories
Automotive Energy Management	Carbon Footprint	Emissions Management
Bicycle Planning	Carbon Footprint Reduction	Emissions Mitigation
Bike Industry Knowledge	Carbon Management	Emissions Monitoring
Bike Repair	Carbon Offsets	Emissions Reduction
Biodiesel	Carbon Reduction	Emissions Reduction Strategy
Biodiesel Development	Clean Air Act	Emissions Standards
Biodiesel Industry Knowledge	Clean Energy	Emissions Testing
Biodiesel Production	Clean Technology	Energy - Efficient Systems
Biodiesel Research	Clean Technology Investment Opportunities	Energy Conservation
Biodiesel Technology	Cleantech Products	Energy Conservation Measures
Biofuel Product Development	Climate Analysis	Energy Cost Reduction
Biofuel Production	Climate Change	Energy Efficiency
Biofuels Applications	Climate Change Analysis	Energy Efficiency Analysis
Biofuels Development	Climate Change Impact	Energy Efficiency Assessment
Biofuels Extraction	Climate Change Mitigation Intiatives	Energy Efficiency Consultation
Biofuels Plant Safety	Climate Change Policies	Energy Efficiency Improvement
Biofuels Processing	Climate Change Principles	Energy Efficiency Products
Biofuels Processing Equipment	Climate Change Processes	Energy Efficiency Research
Biofuels Production Adjustment	Climate Change Programs	Energy Efficiency Services
Biofuels Production Management	Climate Change Research	Energy Efficiency Supervision
Biofuels Quality Assessment	Climate Change Simulations	Energy Efficiency Technologies
Biofuels Research	Climate Data Analysis	Energy Efficient Building
Biofuels Research and Development	Climate Information	Energy Efficient Home Improvement
Biofuels Technology	Climate Management Research	Energy Efficient Lighting
Biomass	Climate Outreach	Energy Efficient Operations
Biomass Conversion	Climate Policy	Energy Efficient Transportation
Biomass Determination	Climate Prediction	Energy Loss Reduction
Biomass Equipment	Climate Research	Energy Measurement Devices
Biomass Feedstock Measurement	Climate Systems	Energy Policy
Biomass Fuel Gasification Systems	Climate Theory	Energy Reduction
Biomass Gasification Processes	Commercial Solar Projects	Energy Saving Plumbing Systems
Biomass Plant Equipment	Commercial Solar Sales	Energy Saving Products
Biomass Power Production	Concentrated Photovoltaic Technology	Energy Savings Calculations
Biomass Processing Equipment	Cooling Efficiency	Energy Star Documentation
Biomass Production	Dam Construction	Energy Supply Side Savings

Table SI.4: low-carbon job identifiers/ low-carbon skills (cont.)

Energy Usage Tracking	Green Energy Promotion	Light Rail
Energy-Efficient Appliances	Green Job Development	Light Rail Transit Systems
Environmental Sustainability	Green Manufacturing	Locomotive Engineering
Ethanol	Green Marketing	Locomotive Inspection
FRET (Fluorescence Resonance Energy Transfer)	Green Plumbing	Locomotive Safety
Federal Railroad Administration	Green Plumbing Equipment Installation	Loose Insulation
Federal Transit Administration	Green Procurement	Low Carbon Projects
Fuel Cell	Green Real Estate	Low Carbon Solutions
Fuel Cell Analysis	Green Retail	Low Energy Buildings
Fuel Cell Applications	Green Retrofitting	Mass Transit Industry Knowledge
Fuel Cell Assembly	Green Roof Design	Methane Gas Collection System
Fuel Cell Design	Green Roof Installation	Methane Monitors
Fuel Cell Development	Green Roofing	Mitigation Projects
Fuel Cell Engineering	Green Stocks	Monorail
Fuel Cell Generator	Green Strategy	Non-Point Source Pollution
Fuel Cell Modeling	Green Supplier	Organic Photovoltaics (OPV)
Fuel Cell Performance Improvement	Green Techniques	PV System Design and Drafting
Fuel Cell Research	Green Technology	Photovoltaic (PV) Energy Production
Fuel Cell System Design	Green Transportation	Photovoltaic (PV) Equipment
Fuel Cell Testing	Green Walls	Photovoltaic (PV) Systems
Fuel Cell Testing Equipment	Greenhouse Gas	Photovoltaic Energy
Fuel Cell Theory	Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions	Photovoltaic Solutions
Fuel Cell Validation	Greenhouse Gas Accounting	Photovoltaic System Design
Fuel Cell Vehicles	Hazardous Energy Control	Photovoltiac (PV) Module Evaluation
Fuel Efficiency	Heat Pump Installation	Pipe Insulation
Geothermal	Heat Pump Maintenance	Plumbing Pipe Insulation
Geothermal Energy Plants	Heat Pump Repair	Pollution Control
Geothermal Heat Systems	Heavy Rail	Pollution Control Equipment
Geothermal Loop Systems	Heavy Rail Transit Systems	Pollution Control Systems
Geothermal Plant Equipment	High Speed Rail	Pollution Prevention
Geothermal Plant Operations	Home Energy Assessment	Pollution Regulation
Geothermal Production	Home Energy Rating	Pollution Source Identification
Geothermal Production Management	Hybrid Buses	Pollution Underwriting
Geothermal Sales	Hybrid Vehicle	Polymer Electrolyte Membrane Fuel Cells
Global Warming	Hydroelectric Power	Public Transit Operations
Global Warming Pollution	Hydrogen Production	Public Transit Systems
Green Architecture	Hydropower	Public Transportation
Green Automotive Technologies	Hydropower Plant Equipment	Public Transportation System
Green Building	Hydropower Technology	Rail Bridge Design
Green Building Standards	Installing LED Lighting	Rail Equipment Maintenance
Green Certified Construction Practices	Insulation	Rail Equipment Repair
Green Chemistry	Insulation Efficiency	Rail Industry Knowledge
Green Chemistry Methods	Insulation Installation	Rail Operations
Green Communities	Landfill Design	Rail Safety
Green Contractor	Landfill Gas Collection	Rail-Track Laying
Green Design	Landfill Gas Collection System Operation	Railroad Conducting
Green Distributor	Landfill Inspection	Railroad Design
Green Education	Landfill Operations	Railroad Engineering
Green Energy	LEED	Railroad Law
Green Energy Marketing	LEED Rating System	Railroad Operating Rules

Table SI.5: low-carbon job identifiers/ low-carbon skills (cont.)

Railroad Safety	Solar Farm	Sustainable Living
Railway Signaling	Solar Heat Absorption Reduction	Sustainable Manufacturing
Railway Systems	Solar Heating	Sustainable Materials
Renewable Energy	Solar Hot Water Heating Systems	Sustainable Packaging
Renewable Energy Consultation	Solar Installation	Sustainable Systems
Renewable Energy Development	Solar Manufacturing	Tidal Power
Renewable Energy Equipment	Solar Module Assembly	Trams
Renewable Energy Industry Knowledge	Solar Panel Assembly	Waste - to - Energy Conversion Systems
Renewable Energy Installation	Solar Panel Attachment	Waste-to-energy
Renewable Energy Markets	Solar Panel Fitting	Water Pollution Control
Renewable Energy Supply	Solar Panels	Water Pollution Source Identification
Renewable Energy Systems	Solar PV Generation Systems	Weatherization
Renewable Resources	Solar PV Hot Water Heating Systems	Weatherization Installation
Renewable Sales	Solar Photovoltaic Business Development	Wind Commissioning
Residential Energy Auditing	Solar Photovoltaic Design	Wind Consultation
Residential Energy Conservation	Solar Photovoltaic Engineering	Wind Energy Engineering
Residential Energy Efficiency	Solar Photovoltaic Installation	Wind Energy Industry Knowledge
Residential Energy Sales	Solar Photovoltaic Panels	Wind Energy Operations
Retrofitting	Solar Photovoltaic Performance Improvement	Wind Energy Operations Management
Roof Insulation Surfaces	Solar Photovoltaic Research	Wind Energy Project Management
Rubber Dam Placement	Solar Photovoltaic Technology	Wind Energy Project Planning
Rubber Dam Removal	Solar Power Electrical Work	Wind Farm Analysis
Self-Adjusting Insulation Stripper	Solar Power Purchase Agreement Sales	Wind Farm Construction
Silicon Solar Cell	Solar Power System Design	Wind Farm Design
Smart Grid	Solar Products	Wind Field Operations
Smoke Emissions Reduction	Solar Purchasing Management	Wind Generator Assembly
Solar Application	Solar Roofing System Installation	Wind Integration Studies
Solar Array Production Calculation	Solar Roofs	Wind Measurement
Solar Boilers	Solar Sales	Wind Power
Solar Cell	Solar Sales Management	Wind Power Development
Solar Cell Design	Solar Start Ups	Wind Project Construction
Solar Cell Equipment	Solar Systems	Wind Project Development
Solar Cell Manufacturing	Solar Technology	Wind Project Engineering
Solar Cell Manufacturing Equipment	Solar Thermal Installation	Wind River
Solar Collector Installation	Solar Thermal Systems	Wind Turbine Construction
Solar Consultation	Solar and Wind Energy	Wind Turbine Control System
Solar Contractor	Spray Foam (Insulation)	Wind Turbine Equipment
Solar Design	Sungard Energy	Wind Turbine Equipment Testing
Solar Development	Sustainability Campaigns	Wind Turbine Fabrication
Solar Electric Installation	Sustainability Consulting	Wind Turbine Performance Improvement
Solar Energy	Sustainability Evaluation	Wind Turbine Production
Solar Energy Components	Sustainability Improvement	Wind Turbine Service
Solar Energy Industry Knowledge	Sustainability Marketing	Wind Turbine Technology
Solar Energy Installation Management	Sustainability Procedures	Wind Turbines
Solar Energy System Development	Sustainability Research	Zero- Energy Buildings
Solar Energy System Installation	Sustainable Agriculture	
Solar Energy Systems	Sustainable Architecture	
Solar Energy Systems Engineering	Sustainable Design	
Solar Engineering	Sustainable Energy	
Solar Equipment	Sustainable Engineering	

Representativeness of the Lightcast dataset

Burning Glass data aims to be a near-universe of online job postings and is increasingly used in research. However, it is also well known that it over-represents growing firms [19] and certain occupations such as business & financial, computer & mathematical, and healthcare occupations and under-represents construction, public administration& government, mining & logging, and accommodation & food services[31]. Further, online job vacancies data capture changes in labour demand, rather than the stock of employment population. A 1.35% share of new low-carbon vacancies is equal to a steady state stock of low-carbon jobs only if: i. The job filling rate is equal to 1; ii. The job destruction rate is the same for low-carbon and non low-carbon occupations.

Growing firms or occupations are over-represented and many jobs are not posted online, including self-employment. In our analyses, we partially restore representativeness by re-weighting low-carbon jobs using BLS employment shares (Table SI.6). Our estimate on low-carbon jobs are in the ballpark of previous estimates of the share of green jobs [12, 23, 48, 39] though on the lower end, which can be attributed to the focus on low-carbon activities excluding green activities such as water and waste.

Table SI.6: Representativeness of Burning Glass Technologies ads dataset vs. BLS employment

SOC major group	Ad count	Unweighted ad share	BLS employment share
11 - Management	22,716,404	12.0%	5.0%
13 - Business and Financial Operations	13,035,329	6.9%	5.1%
15 - Computer and Mathematical	22,438,181	11.9%	2.9%
17 - Architecture and Engineering	6,073,207	3.2%	1.8%
19 - Life, Physical, and Social Science	1,946,038	1.0%	0.8%
21 - Community and Social Service	2,178,888	1.2%	1.4%
23 - Legal	1,572,981	0.8%	0.8%
25 - Education, Training, and Library	5,119,425	2.7%	5.8%
27 - Arts, Design, Entertainment, Sports, and Media	4,629,983	2.5%	1.3%
29 - Healthcare Practitioners and Technical	23,327,278	12.4%	5.9%
31 - Healthcare Support	4,025,828	2.1%	2.9%
33 - Protective Service	2,016,089	1.1%	2.5%
35 - Food Preparation and Serving Related	6,985,491	3.7%	9.1%
37 - Building and Grounds Cleaning and Maintenance	2,441,462	1.3%	3.2%
39 - Personal Care and Service	3,691,927	2.0%	3.1%
41 - Sales and Related	22,709,208	12.0%	10.6%
43 - Office and Administrative Support	19,903,972	10.5%	16.1%
45 - Farming, Fishing, and Forestry	126,592	0.1%	0.3%
47 - Construction and Extraction	1,998,832	1.1%	3.9%
49 - Installation, Maintenance, and Repair	5,909,063	3.1%	3.9%
51 - Production	4,897,885	2.6%	6.6%
53 - Transportation and Material Moving	10,994,453	5.8%	6.9%

Low carbon job ads descriptive statistics

In this article, we use the common definition for high and low skilled occupations within the SOC classification: occupational major groups 11 to 29 are labeled high skilled, while major groups 31 to 53 are labeled low skilled.



Figure SI.1: Distribution of the number of skills per job ad by category over time

High skilled occupations
11 - Management Occupations
13 - Business and Financial Operations Occupations
15 - Computer and Mathematical Occupations
17 - Architecture and Engineering Occupations
19 - Life, Physical, and Social Science Occupations
21 - Community and Social Service Occupations
23 - Legal Occupations
25 - Educational Instruction and Library Occupations
27 - Arts, Design, Entertainment, Sports, and Media Occupations
29 - Healthcare Practitioners and Technical Occupations
Low skilled occupations
31 - Healthcare Support Occupations
33 - Protective Service Occupations
35 - Food Preparation and Serving Related Occupations
37 - Building and Grounds Cleaning and Maintenance Occupations
39 - Personal Care and Service Occupations
41 - Sales and Related Occupations
43 - Office and Administrative Support Occupations
45 - Farming, Fishing, and Forestry Occupations
47 - Construction and Extraction Occupations
49 - Installation, Maintenance, and Repair Occupations
51 - Production Occupations
53 - Transportation and Material Moving Occupations



Figure SI.2: Distribution of the number of skills per job ad – Heterogeneity across occupations

Table SI.7: Share of low-carbon ads by SOC major group (2-digits), weighted by BLS employment

SOC major group	Low carbon ads	Share within occupation
11 - Management	256,515	1.3%
13 - Business and Financial Operations	95,727	1.7%
15 - Computer and Mathematical	121,578	0.6%
17 - Architecture and Engineering	233,436	4.1%
19 - Life, Physical, and Social Science	50,355	3.6%
21 - Community and Social Service	5,083	0.3%
23 - Legal	9,033	0.6%
25 - Education, Training, and Library	31,610	0.6%
27 - Arts, Design, Entertainment, Sports, and Media	21,404	0.5%
29 - Healthcare Practitioners and Technical	34,293	0.1%
31 - Healthcare Support	9,363	0.2%
33 - Protective Service	18,720	1.0%
35 - Food Preparation and Serving Related	13,797	0.2%
37 - Building and Grounds Cleaning and Maintenance	13,107	0.5%
39 - Personal Care and Service	12,284	0.3%
41 - Sales and Related	142,877	0.4%
43 - Office and Administrative Support	90,492	0.4%
45 - Farming, Fishing, and Forestry	913	0.9%
47 - Construction and Extraction	94,725	4.1%
49 - Installation, Maintenance, and Repair	170,476	2.6%
51 - Production	46,594	0.9%
53 - Transportation and Material Moving	201,263	7.4%
Total	1,673,645	1.4%

Table SI.8 highlights the heterogeneity in the intensity of low-carbon ads within 2-digit SOC occupations. For instance, among the Business and Finance occupations (SOC 13), only Business Specialists (SOC 13-2) have a high share of low-carbon ads. Among Life, Physical and Social Science (SOC 19), all scientists are low-carbon intensive with respect to the global average, but Physical Scientists (SOC 19-2) stand out with a share of 8%. Among Architecture and Engineering (SOC 17), Architects (SOC 17-1), Engineers (SOC 17-2) and Technicians (SOC 17-3) have all an intensity of low-carbon ads well above 3%.



Figure SI.3: Low-carbon ads intensity by occupation (2010-2019)

Table SI.8: Share of low-carbon ads by SOC minor group (3-digits), weighted by BLS employment

SOC minor group	Low carbon ads	Share within occupation
13-1 - Business Operations Specialists	78,545	2.5%
13-2 - Financial Specialists	17,182	0.4%
17-1 - Architects, Surveyors, and Cartographers	10,473	4.3%
17-2 - Engineers	180,294	4.3%
17-3 - Engineering and Mapping Technicians	42,669	3.5%
19-1 - Life Scientists	10,379	2.3%
19-2 - Physical Scientists	20,064	8.0%
19-3 - Social Scientists and Related Workers	8,588	2.3%
19-4 - Life, Physical, and Social Science Technicians	11,324	2.1%
Total	1,673,645	1.4%

Table SI.9: Share of high-carbon ads by SOC minor group (3-digits), weighted by BLS employment

SOC minor group	High carbon ads	Share within occupation
17-2 - Engineers	99,572	4.1%
47-1 - Supervisors of Construction and Extraction Workers	3,658	3.2%
47-2 - Construction Trades Workers	12,356	0.8%
47-3 - Helpers, Construction Trades	82	0.2%
47-4 - Other Construction and Related Workers	3,612	2.1%
47-5 - Extraction Workers	90,530	100.0%
Total	209,810	0.3%

Table SI.10: Share of low-carbon ads by year, weighted by BLS employment (2010-2019)

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Overall										
All	1.32%	1.42%	1.44%	1.30%	1.20%	1.34%	1.28%	1.39%	1.40%	1.42%
Overall - High skill										
All	0.36%	0.41%	0.37%	0.30%	0.30%	0.32%	0.29%	0.29%	0.30%	0.30%
13-1 - Business Operations Specialists	0.09%	0.13%	0.10%	0.07%	0.07%	0.07%	0.07%	0.06%	0.07%	0.06%
17-2 - Engineers	0.06%	0.07%	0.05%	0.05%	0.05%	0.05%	0.05%	0.05%	0.05%	0.05%
17-3 - Engineering and Mapping Technicians	0.02%	0.02%	0.02%	0.02%	0.02%	0.02%	0.02%	0.02%	0.02%	0.02%
Others	0.18%	0.20%	0.20%	0.16%	0.17%	0.18%	0.16%	0.16%	0.17%	0.17%
Overall - Low skill										
All	0.97%	1.01%	1.06%	1.00%	0.90%	1.02%	0.98%	1.10%	1.10%	1.12%
47 - Construction and Extraction	0.14%	0.15%	0.14%	0.14%	0.15%	0.19%	0.18%	0.19%	0.18%	0.18%
49 - Installation, Maintenance, and Repair	0.08%	0.09%	0.09%	0.10%	0.08%	0.10%	0.10%	0.12%	0.12%	0.12%
53 - Transportation and Material Moving	0.54%	0.51%	0.54%	0.53%	0.44%	0.47%	0.47%	0.53%	0.54%	0.55%
Others	0.21%	0.26%	0.30%	0.23%	0.23%	0.26%	0.24%	0.26%	0.26%	0.27%
Within occupation group										
13-1 - Business Operations Specialists	2.95%	4.00%	3.22%	2.24%	2.08%	2.32%	2.05%	1.94%	2.06%	1.90%
17-1 - Architects, Surveyors, and Cartographers	3.30%	4.15%	3.20%	2.84%	5.81%	7.31%	4.75%	3.42%	3.99%	4.20%
17-2 - Engineers	5.19%	5.60%	4.63%	3.92%	3.85%	4.05%	3.97%	3.94%	3.87%	3.89%
17-3 - Engineering and Mapping Technicians	3.68%	4.11%	3.30%	3.09%	3.53%	3.34%	3.43%	3.65%	3.45%	3.61%
19-2 - Physical Scientists	8.15%	8.95%	8.12%	7.73%	7.86%	8.75%	7.14%	7.33%	8.52%	7.85%
47 - Construction and Extraction	3.52%	3.72%	3.62%	3.45%	3.70%	4.77%	4.62%	4.96%	4.48%	4.56%
49 - Installation, Maintenance, and Repair	2.01%	2.42%	2.24%	2.64%	2.18%	2.61%	2.50%	3.04%	3.05%	3.09%
53 - Transportation and Material Moving	7.78%	7.44%	7.80%	7.65%	6.43%	6.88%	6.78%	7.73%	7.83%	8.00%

Notes: Table SI.10 presents the annual share low-carbon ads for each of the SOC occupational groups harboring the most low-carbon positions. low-carbon shares are calculated at the SOC 6-digit level then weighted using mean employment by 6-digits occupation for the period 2010-2019 obtained from the BLS Occupational Employment and Wage Statistics.

Table SI.11: Share of low-carbon ads by NAICS sector (unweighted averages, 2010-2019)

	Ad count			Unweighted ad share		
NAICS2	Generic	Low carbon	High carbon	Generic	Low carbon	High carbon
11 - ”Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting”	99,584	1,968	149	97.9%	1.9%	0.1%
21 - ”Mining, Quarrying, and Oil and Gas Extraction”	474,446	8,440	70,808	85.7%	1.5%	12.8%
22 - Utilities	483,609	69,603	6,593	86.4%	12.4%	1.2%
23 - Construction	1,598,110	64,288	3,931	95.9%	3.9%	0.2%
311 - Food Manufacturing	577,092	5,114	131	99.1%	0.9%	0.0%
312 - Beverage and Tobacco Product Manufacturing	347,768	2,072	1,291	99.0%	0.6%	0.4%
313 - Textile Mills	691	8	0	98.9%	1.1%	0.0%
314 - Textile Product Mills	41,297	397	14	99.0%	1.0%	0.0%
315 - Apparel Manufacturing	79,365	103	2	99.9%	0.1%	0.0%
316 - Leather and Allied Product Manufacturing	5,585	6	1	99.9%	0.1%	0.0%
321 - Wood Product Manufacturing	90,915	3,409	322	96.1%	3.6%	0.3%
322 - Paper Manufacturing	83,421	651	78	99.1%	0.8%	0.1%
323 - Printing and Related Support Activities	83,422	245	67	99.6%	0.3%	0.1%
324 - Petroleum and Coal Products Manufacturing	112,773	5,033	21,616	80.9%	3.6%	15.5%
325 - Chemical Manufacturing	1,540,097	12,637	1,094	99.1%	0.8%	0.1%
326 - Plastics and Rubber Products Manufacturing	74,002	698	6	99.1%	0.9%	0.0%
327 - Nonmetallic Mineral Product Manufacturing	173,885	3,121	994	97.7%	1.8%	0.6%
331 - Primary Metal Manufacturing	121,384	1,632	784	98.0%	1.3%	0.6%
332 - Fabricated Metal Product Manufacturing	215,079	1,641	150	99.2%	0.8%	0.1%
333 - Machinery Manufacturing	761,968	13,694	489	98.2%	1.8%	0.1%
334 - Computer and Electronic Product Manufacturing	1,568,119	19,823	756	98.7%	1.2%	0.0%
335 - ”Electrical Equipment, Appliance, and Component Manufacturing”	127,518	4,277	69	96.7%	3.2%	0.1%
336 - Transportation Equipment Manufacturing	1,339,451	23,786	802	98.2%	1.7%	0.1%
337 - Furniture and Related Product Manufacturing	76,814	2,787	84	96.4%	3.5%	0.1%
339 - Miscellaneous Manufacturing	388,605	1,416	48	99.6%	0.4%	0.0%
42 - Wholesale Trade	1,280,032	17,196	875	98.6%	1.3%	0.1%
441 - Motor Vehicle and Parts Dealers	1,295,983	9,693	29	99.3%	0.7%	0.0%
442 - Furniture and Home Furnishings Stores	324,729	434	62	99.8%	0.1%	0.0%
443 - Electronics and Appliance Stores	660,228	413	11	99.9%	0.1%	0.0%
444 - Building Material and Garden Equipment and Supplies Dealers	1,339,121	3,891	8	99.7%	0.3%	0.0%
445 - Food and Beverage Stores	1,580,339	2,752	156	99.8%	0.2%	0.0%
446 - Health and Personal Care Stores	1,370,651	5,786	32	99.6%	0.4%	0.0%
447 - Gasoline Stations	383,477	449	582	99.7%	0.1%	0.2%
448 - Clothing and Clothing Accessories Stores	1,838,975	3,166	84	99.8%	0.2%	0.0%
451 - ”Sporting Goods, Hobby, Book, and Music Stores”	801,183	12,043	64	98.5%	1.5%	0.0%
452 - General Merchandise Stores	3,730,762	3,214	606	99.9%	0.1%	0.0%
453 - Miscellaneous Store Retailers	979,777	5,288	116	99.5%	0.5%	0.0%
454 - Nonstore Retailers	458,809	4,240	203	99.0%	0.9%	0.0%
481 - Air Transportation	273,811	1,381	44	99.5%	0.5%	0.0%
482 - Rail Transportation	66,015	11,662	418	84.5%	14.9%	0.5%
483 - Water Transportation	32,239	297	18	99.0%	0.9%	0.1%
484 - Truck Transportation	3,135,767	22,411	466	99.3%	0.7%	0.0%
485 - Transit and Ground Passenger Transportation	107,803	64,296	28	62.6%	37.4%	0.0%
486 - Pipeline Transportation	50,036	2,426	7,733	83.1%	4.0%	12.8%
487 - Scenic and Sightseeing Transportation	948	29	0	97.0%	3.0%	0.0%
488 - Support Activities for Transportation	222,317	2,060	338	98.9%	0.9%	0.2%
491 - Postal Service	41,827	225	0	99.5%	0.5%	0.0%
492 - Couriers and Messengers	494,113	37,468	47	92.9%	7.0%	0.0%
493 - Warehousing and Storage	88,641	612	30	99.3%	0.7%	0.0%
51 - Information	5,124,341	27,940	9,484	99.3%	0.5%	0.2%
52 - Finance and Insurance	11,360,815	24,748	1,759	99.8%	0.2%	0.0%
53 - Real Estate and Rental and Leasing	2,650,165	24,766	580	99.1%	0.9%	0.0%
54 - ”Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services”	12,387,922	154,572	14,101	98.7%	1.2%	0.1%
55 - Management of Companies and Enterprises	221,745	2,066	98	99.0%	0.9%	0.0%
56 - Administrative and Support and Waste Management and Remediation Services	7,359,522	70,788	3,822	99.0%	1.0%	0.1%
61 - Educational Services	8,312,462	91,904	620	98.9%	1.1%	0.0%
62 - Health Care and Social Assistance	21,620,327	42,922	5,645	99.8%	0.2%	0.0%
71 - ”Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation”	1,141,376	8,114	245	99.3%	0.7%	0.0%
72 - Accommodation and Food Services	9,169,235	63,964	1,424	99.3%	0.7%	0.0%
81 - Other Services (except Public Administration)	2,480,178	32,245	582	98.7%	1.3%	0.0%
92 - Public Administration	4,460,420	87,344	3,244	98.0%	1.9%	0.1%

Table SI.12: Evolution of the share of low-carbon ads, 2010-2012 vs 2017-2019

	All	Low skilled	High skilled
2017-19 vs 2010-12	0.000	0.001***	−0.001***
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Constant	0.014***	0.010***	0.004***
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Observations	1.416	1.416	1.416
R^2	0	0.01	0.05

Notes: We obtain the distribution of the share of low-carbon ads across commuting zones by year and low (high) skilled occupations. Table SI.12 regresses this low-carbon share on a dummy indicator for the period 2017-2019, contrasting with the 2010-2012 baseline for (1) All occupations; (2) Low skilled occupations and (3) High skilled occupations. Thus, a coefficient of 0.001 in column (2) indicates that the share of low-carbon ads in low-skilled occupations was 0.1% higher in 2017-2019 than in 2010-2012.

Table SI.13: Evolution of in selected SOC groups, 2010-2012 vs 2017-2019

	13-1	17-1	17-2	17-3	19-2	47	49	53
2017-19 vs 2010-12	−0.015***	−0.008**	−0.013***	−0.003	−0.008	0.008***	0.007***	−0.001
	(0.001)	(0.004)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.005)	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.003)
Constant	0.035***	0.054***	0.053***	0.040***	0.096***	0.040***	0.023***	0.079***
	(0.002)	(0.004)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.007)	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.003)
Observations	845	338	1.062	889	639	1.082	1.197	1.267
R^2	0.13	0.01	0.08	0	0	0.03	0.06	0

Notes: Table SI.13 applies the same approach as Table SI.12 in each of the SOC groups we focus on in the present article. For reference: 13-1 - Business Operations Specialists; 17-1 - Architects, Surveyors, and Cartographers; 17-2 - Engineers; 17-3 - Engineering and Mapping Technicians; 19-2 - Physical Scientists; 47 - Construction and Extraction; 49 - Installation, Maintenance, and Repair; 53 - Transportation and Material Moving.

Spatial correlation between low and high-carbon vacancies and income levels

Table SI.14: Correlation between the share of low-carbon ads and annual personal income

	Low skill		
	Unweighted	Weighted by ad count	Weighted by population
$\log(inc_{cz})$	0.006***	0.002*	0.002**
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
Observations	685	685	685
R2	0.03	0.01	0.02
AIC	−4.974	−4.960	−4.961

Notes: Table SI.14 presents estimates of β_{lc}^{inc} in $\log(1 + s_{lc,cz}) = \beta_{lc}^{inc} \log(inc_{cz}) + \varepsilon_{cz}$. $s_{lc,cz}$ is the average share of low-carbon ads in low skilled occupations between 2010 and 2019 in each CZ. inc_{cz} is the mean income per capita between 2010 and 2019 in each CZ. Column (1) presents unweighted results, while column (2) provides results weighted by the average number of job ads between 2010 and 2019 in each CZ and column (3) weighted by the average population per CZ between 2010 and 2019. Standard errors clustered by CZ are provided in parentheses.

Table SI.15: Correlation between the share of high-carbon ads and annual personal income

	Low skill		
	Unweighted	Weighted by ad count	Weighted by population
$\log(inc_{cz})$	0.007***	−0.001**	−0.001***
	(0.002)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Observations	647	647	647
R2	0.03	0.01	0.01
AIC	−4.522	−4.456	−4.459

Notes: Table SI.15 presents estimates of β_{hc}^{inc} in $\log(1+s_{hc,cz}) = \beta_{hc}^{inc} \log(inc_{cz})+\varepsilon_{cz}$. $s_{hc,cz}$ is the average share of high-carbon ads in low skilled occupations between 2010 and 2019 in each CZ. inc_{cz} is the mean income per capita between 2010 and 2019 in each CZ. Column (1) presents unweighted results, while column (2) provides results weighted by the average number of job ads between 2010 and 2019 in each CZ and column (3) weighted by the average population per CZ between 2010 and 2019. Standard errors clustered by CZ are provided in parentheses.

Table SI.16: Correlation between the share of low and high-carbon ads

	Low skill		
	Unweighted	Weighted by ad count	Weighted by population
$\log(1+s_{hc,cz})$	0.122**	0.065	0.067
	(0.057)	(0.045)	(0.052)
Observations	650	650	646
R2	0.02	0.00	0.00
AIC	−4.760	−4.757	−4.728

Notes: Table SI.16 presents estimates of $\beta_{lc,hc}$ in $\log(1+s_{lc,cz}) = \beta_{lc,hc}\ \log(1+s_{hc,cz}) + \varepsilon_{cz}$. $s_{lc,cz}$ is the average share of low-carbon ads in low skilled occupations between 2010 and 2019 in each CZ. $s_{hc,cz}$ is the average share of high-carbon ads in low skilled occupations between 2010 and 2019 in each CZ. Column (1) presents unweighted results, while column (2) provides results weighted by the average number of job ads between 2010 and 2019 in each CZ and column (3) weighted by the average population per CZ between 2010 and 2019. Standard errors clustered by CZ are provided in parentheses.

Table SI.17: Correlation between the share of low-carbon ads and high-carbon employment

	Low skill		
	Unweighted	Weighted by ad count	Weighted by population
$\log(1+s^{emp}_{hc,cz})$	0.096***	0.020	0.017
	(0.028)	(0.020)	(0.022)
Observations	687	687	685
R2	0.03	0.00	0.00
AIC	−5.011	−4.996	−4.981

Notes: Table SI.17 presents estimates of $\beta^{emp}_{lc,hc}$ in $\log(1 + s_{lc,cz}) = \beta^{emp}_{lc,hc} \log(1 + s^{emp}_{hc,cz}) + \varepsilon_{cz}$. $s_{lc,cz}$ is the average share of low-carbon ads in low skilled occupations between 2010 and 2019 in each CZ. $s^{emp}_{hc,cz}$ is the average share of high-carbon employment in low skilled occupations between 2010 and 2017 in each CZ, according to the American Community Survey (ACS). Column (1) presents unweighted results, while column (2) provides results weighted by the average number of job ads between 2010 and 2019 in each CZ and column (3) weighted by the average population per CZ between 2010 and 2019. Standard errors clustered by CZ are provided in parentheses.

Table SI.18: Locational Gini

	Low carbon ads	High carbon employment	High carbon ads		Generic ads
Low skill	0.33	0.98	0.69	Construction & Extraction	0.23

Notes: Table SI.18 presents the Locational Gini for share of low-carbon ads per CZ, share of high-carbon employment per CZ, share of high-carbon ads per CZ and share of Construction & Extraction ads (SOC 47) per CZ. The Gini locational coefficient is calculated following [24] using our own job ads dataset and data on employment by occupation and commuting zone from the American Community Survey adapted from [39]. For any of variables presented in the four columns listed above, indexed by k, it can be expressed as:

$$LocGini_k = \Delta/4u$$

$$\begin{array}{lrcl}
\text{where} & \Delta & = & \{1/[n(n-1)]\} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} |x_i - x_j| \\
 & i, j & = & \text{US commuting zones } (i \neq j) \\
 & \text{n} & = & \text{Total number of CZ under ERS 2000 (709)} \\
 & u & = & \text{mean of the share variable } k \text{ across all CZ} \\
 & x_{i(j)} & = & \text{(1) [CZ } i\text{'s (}j\text{'s) share of low-carbon ads] / [CZ } i\text{'s (}j\text{'s) share of all ads]} \\
 & & & \text{(2) [CZ } i\text{'s (}j\text{'s) share of high-carbon emp.] / [CZ } i\text{'s (}j\text{'s) share of all emp.]} \\
 & & & \text{(3) [CZ } i\text{'s (}j\text{'s) share of high-carbon ads] / [CZ } i\text{'s (}j\text{'s) share of all ads]} \\
 & & & \text{(4) [CZ } i\text{'s (}j\text{'s) share of SOC 47 ads] / [CZ } i\text{'s (}j\text{'s) share of all ads]}
\end{array}$$

Table SI.19: Top low-carbon job identifiers by state

State	Most freq. low carbon	2^{nd} most freq.	3^{rd} most freq.
Alabama	Insulation	Bus Driving	Energy Conservation
Alaska	Insulation	Bus Driving	Pollution Control
Arizona	Bus Driving	Insulation	Renewable Energy
Arkansas	Insulation	Bus Driving	Energy Efficiency
California	Energy Efficiency	Renewable Energy	Bus Driving
Colorado	Renewable Energy	Energy Efficiency	Insulation
Connecticut	Energy Efficiency	Bus Driving	Insulation
Delaware	Bus Driving	Insulation	Energy Efficiency
Florida	Insulation	Energy Conservation	Bus Driving
Georgia	Insulation	Energy Conservation	Bus Driving
Hawaii	Bus Driving	Energy Conservation	Renewable Energy
Idaho	Clean Energy	Bus Driving	Insulation
Illinois	Bus Driving	Energy Efficiency	Insulation
Indiana	Insulation	Bus Driving	Energy Efficiency
Iowa	Ethanol	Insulation	Bus Driving
Kansas	Bus Driving	Insulation	Environmental Sustainability
Kentucky	Insulation	Bus Driving	Solar Panels
Louisiana	Insulation	Energy Efficiency	Energy Conservation
Maine	Bus Driving	Insulation	Renewable Energy
Maryland	Insulation	Energy Efficiency	Bus Driving
Massachusetts	Energy Efficiency	Renewable Energy	Energy Conservation
Michigan	Bus Driving	Fuel Efficiency	Insulation
Minnesota	Bus Driving	Insulation	Energy Conservation
Mississippi	Insulation	Energy Efficiency	Bus Driving
Missouri	Bus Driving	Insulation	Energy Conservation
Montana	Bus Driving	Insulation	Energy Conservation
Nebraska	Insulation	Ethanol	Bus Driving
Nevada	Bus Driving	Energy Conservation	Insulation
New Hampshire	Bus Driving	Insulation	Energy Efficiency
New Jersey	Bus Driving	Energy Efficiency	Insulation
New Mexico	Bus Driving	Insulation	Renewable Energy
New York	Energy Efficiency	Renewable Energy	Bus Driving
North Carolina	Insulation	Bus Driving	Energy Efficiency
North Dakota	Insulation	Wind Power	Wind Turbines
Ohio	Insulation	Bus Driving	Energy Efficiency
Oklahoma	Insulation	Bus Driving	Energy Efficiency
Oregon	Energy Efficiency	Bus Driving	Insulation
Pennsylvania	Bus Driving	Insulation	Energy Efficiency
Rhode Island	Bus Driving	Insulation	Energy Efficiency
South Carolina	Insulation	Bus Driving	Energy Conservation
South Dakota	Ethanol	Bus Driving	Insulation
Tennessee	Insulation	Energy Conservation	Energy Efficiency
Texas	Insulation	Bus Driving	Energy Efficiency
Utah	Energy Conservation	Insulation	Bus Driving
Vermont	Bus Driving	Energy Efficiency	Insulation
Virginia	Insulation	Energy Efficiency	Bus Driving
Washington	Insulation	Energy Efficiency	Bus Driving
West Virginia	Insulation	Bus Driving	Clean Air Act
Wisconsin	Bus Driving	Insulation	Energy Efficiency
Wyoming	Efficient Transportation	Insulation	Bus Driving

Skill gap

Table SI.20: Skill gap

	Cognitive		IT		Management		Social		Technical	
	1	2+	1	2+	1	2+	1	2+	1	2+
13-1 - Business Operations Specialists										
Generic	25.2%	9.9%	21.1%	28.7%	26.0%	22.4%	28.0%	28.2%	16.2%	2.1%
Low carbon	26.3%	10.9%	20.7%	27.4%	26.3%	28.7%	27.9%	33.7%	21.2%	8.8%
17-1 - Architects, Surveyors, and Cartographers										
Generic	18.1%	3.9%	15.9%	24.3%	24.9%	14.9%	25.6%	18.5%	16.9%	7.3%
Low carbon	22.7%	10.5%	28.1%	16.1%	31.4%	26.5%	28.6%	32.4%	27.3%	16.0%
17-2 - Engineers										
Generic	25.2%	7.2%	19.7%	26.8%	24.3%	13.8%	26.0%	20.0%	25.6%	20.1%
High carbon	23.7%	5.5%	21.3%	15.9%	28.1%	13.8%	29.0%	19.6%	26.7%	22.3%
Low carbon	26.9%	7.8%	22.7%	25.0%	29.9%	21.4%	31.0%	25.0%	29.7%	28.3%
17-3 - Engineering and Mapping Technicians										
Generic	16.6%	3.1%	15.4%	16.4%	13.7%	5.4%	20.3%	11.7%	19.5%	9.0%
Low carbon	20.6%	4.5%	18.7%	21.1%	23.9%	11.9%	28.9%	18.9%	28.2%	16.2%
19-2 - Physical Scientists										
Generic	33.5%	16.9%	15.6%	11.5%	19.9%	10.1%	25.0%	21.1%	15.4%	3.3%
Low carbon	35.9%	12.6%	17.9%	19.0%	26.1%	29.8%	27.0%	27.3%	22.1%	7.6%
47 - Construction and Extraction										
Generic	6.3%	1.2%	5.2%	2.5%	8.2%	3.0%	11.4%	4.2%	12.3%	3.1%
High carbon	14.3%	1.6%	10.9%	12.2%	10.7%	4.4%	19.7%	8.6%	14.1%	3.1%
Low carbon	9.9%	1.6%	10.9%	3.9%	14.6%	5.0%	15.0%	11.8%	13.6%	5.2%
49 - Installation, Maintenance, and Repair										
Generic	12.3%	1.8%	9.1%	7.3%	13.0%	6.5%	20.5%	9.5%	13.2%	3.3%
Low carbon	11.6%	2.3%	12.2%	8.6%	24.4%	8.3%	28.6%	14.4%	24.6%	5.4%
53 - Transportation and Material Moving										
Generic	5.2%	0.4%	2.8%	1.1%	4.7%	1.4%	7.5%	2.7%	1.7%	0.1%
Low carbon	5.1%	0.5%	2.7%	1.2%	4.9%	1.5%	14.4%	5.2%	4.6%	0.2%

Notes: Within each occupation and ad category (generic or low-carbon), the value listed reports the unweighted sample share of ads containing exactly one, or 2 or more skills in each of the five broad skill categories. E.g. 25.2% of generic Business and Operations Specialists ads require exactly one Cognitive skill.

Table SI.21: Skill gap magnitude across commuting zones

(a) Extensive margin

SOC group	Cognitive	IT	Management	Social	Technical
a) Low carbon vs Generic ads					
13-1 - Business Operations Specialists	1.30% *	-0.30%	0.50%	-0.10%	5.10% ***
17-1 - Architects, Surveyors, and Cartographers	5.50% ***	13.90% ***	7.10% ***	4.10% ***	11.20% ***
17-2 - Engineers	1.70% ***	3.10% ***	5.50% ***	5.00% ***	4.20% ***
17-3 - Engineering and Mapping Technicians	4.40% ***	3.80% ***	10.80% ***	8.90% ***	9.10% ***
19-2 - Physical Scientists	2.80% ***	2.70% ***	6.80% ***	2.50% ***	7.20% ***
47 - Construction and Extraction	4.00% ***	6.10% ***	6.70% ***	3.90% ***	1.40% ***
49 - Installation, Maintenance, and Repair	-0.60% *	3.20% ***	11.60% ***	8.20% ***	11.70% ***
53 - Transportation and Material Moving	0.20%	0.10%	0.40%	7.10% ***	3.10% ***
b) High carbon vs Generic ads					
17-2 - Engineers	-1.40% *	1.70% ***	3.90% ***	3.20% ***	1.30% *
47 - Construction and Extraction	8.30% ***	6.00% ***	2.80% ***	8.50% ***	2.00% ***
c) Low carbon vs High carbon ads					
17-2 - Engineers	3.10% ***	1.30% **	1.60% **	1.80% **	2.90% ***
47 - Construction and Extraction	-4.40% ***	0.10%	4.00% ***	-4.70% ***	-0.60%

(b) Intensive margin

SOC group	Cognitive	IT	Management	Social	Technical
a) Low carbon vs Generic ads					
13-1 - Business Operations Specialists	1.30% **	-1.20% *	6.50% ***	5.70% ***	6.90% ***
17-1 - Architects, Surveyors, and Cartographers	8.00% ***	-7.10% ***	12.50% ***	14.70% ***	10.30% ***
17-2 - Engineers	0.80% **	-1.70% *	7.60% ***	5.20% ***	8.30% ***
17-3 - Engineering and Mapping Technicians	2.20% ***	5.30% ***	7.10% ***	8.10% ***	8.00% ***
19-2 - Physical Scientists	-3.50% ***	8.20% ***	20.10% ***	6.90% ***	4.90% ***
47 - Construction and Extraction	0.70% ***	1.70% ***	2.30% ***	8.20% ***	2.40% ***
49 - Installation, Maintenance, and Repair	0.60% ***	1.40% ***	1.90% ***	5.10% ***	2.30% ***
53 - Transportation and Material Moving	0.20% **	0.30% **	0.30% **	2.80% ***	0.30% ***
b) High carbon vs Generic ads					
17-2 - Engineers	-1.40% ***	-10.70% ***	0.20%	-0.10%	2.60% **
47 - Construction and Extraction	0.80% ***	10.00% ***	1.60% ***	4.80% ***	0.20%
c) Low carbon vs High carbon ads					
17-2 - Engineers	2.20% ***	9.00% ***	7.40% ***	5.30% ***	5.70% ***
47 - Construction and Extraction	0.00%	-8.30% ***	0.80% **	3.50% ***	2.20% ***

Notes: Similarly to Table SI.20, we compute for each occupation and ad category (generic, low- or high-carbon), the unweighted share of ads containing exactly one (extensive margin), or 2 or more skills (intensive margin) in each of the five broad skill categories. We repeat this calculation in each commuting zone as defined in section . We then use the resulting distribution to test the statistical significance of the skill gap magnitude between each ad category pair. Panel a) reports the difference between low-carbon and generic ads in each occupation. A positive (resp. negative) value indicates that low-carbon ads require the particular broad skill considered more (resp. less) frequently. *E.g.* the share of low-carbon Engineers ads requiring exactly one technical skill is 4.2% higher than their generic counterparts, while the share requiring two or more technical skills is 8.3% higher. Stars indicate the statistical significance of this difference, with three stars corresponding to the 1% threshold. Similarly, Panel b) compares the skill intensity of high-carbon and generic ads (a positive value indicates that high-carbon ads require more of the skill considered), and Panel c) compares the skill intensity of low and high-carbon ads (a positive value indicates that low carbon ads require more of the skill considered).

Table SI.22: Difference in skill gap between 2010-2012 and 2017-2019, across commuting zones

(a) Extensive margin

SOC group	Cognitive	IT	Management	Social	Technical
a) Low carbon vs Generic ads					
13-1 - Business Operations Specialists	2.10% **	3.30% ***	1.40%	1.80% **	0.00%
17-1 - Architects, Surveyors, and Cartographers	-2.70%	2.30%	-0.50%	-3.10%	2.80%
17-2 - Engineers	-1.90% ***	0.10%	-1.50% **	3.40% ***	3.20% ***
17-3 - Engineering and Mapping Technicians	0.40%	1.70% *	1.30%	2.70% **	5.90% ***
19-2 - Physical Scientists	-0.80%	0.70%	-2.00%	-2.90% *	1.60%
47 - Construction and Extraction	2.00% ***	-2.00% ***	-5.80% ***	-1.50% *	-1.60% **
49 - Installation, Maintenance, and Repair	-2.30% ***	-0.80% *	-6.80% ***	-3.10% ***	-5.10% ***
53 - Transportation and Material Moving	-1.10% **	0.80% ***	-0.40%	6.10% ***	0.30%
b) High carbon vs Generic ads					
17-2 - Engineers	-1.20%	-2.10% *	-2.20%	-2.00% *	-2.00% *
47 - Construction and Extraction	-1.30% **	-2.40% ***	-4.20% ***	-1.80% ***	-3.40% ***
c) Low carbon vs High carbon ads					
17-2 - Engineers	-0.70%	2.20% *	0.70%	5.40% ***	5.20% ***
47 - Construction and Extraction	3.20% ***	0.40%	-1.50%	0.30%	1.80% **

(b) Intensive margin

SOC group	Cognitive	IT	Management	Social	Technical
a) Low carbon vs Generic ads					
13-1 - Business Operations Specialists	1.10% **	5.20% ***	2.40% ***	7.40% ***	0.80%
17-1 - Architects, Surveyors, and Cartographers	9.80% ***	0.20%	0.50%	3.80% *	0.80%
17-2 - Engineers	-0.40%	-3.70% ***	0.50%	2.20% ***	2.70% ***
17-3 - Engineering and Mapping Technicians	-1.20% **	-0.10%	-1.50%	1.80%	-1.60%
19-2 - Physical Scientists	2.30% **	-1.90%	4.40% ***	1.40%	0.80%
47 - Construction and Extraction	-0.70% ***	-0.90% **	-2.80% ***	0.10%	-1.30% **
49 - Installation, Maintenance, and Repair	-3.50% ***	-2.50% ***	-0.90% ***	9.70% ***	-3.40% ***
53 - Transportation and Material Moving	0.10%	-0.70% ***	-1.00% ***	2.80% ***	-0.40% ***
b) High carbon vs Generic ads					
17-2 - Engineers	0.90%	-0.10%	6.20% ***	0.00%	0.10%
47 - Construction and Extraction	-1.00% ***	6.90% ***	-0.90%	-3.30% ***	-0.70% **
c) Low carbon vs High carbon ads					
17-2 - Engineers	-1.40%	-3.60% **	-5.70% ***	2.20%	2.60% *
47 - Construction and Extraction	0.20%	-7.80% ***	-1.90% **	3.50% ***	-0.60%

Notes: We now turn to the evolution of the skill gap between job categories over time. We implement the approach described in Table SI.21 to compute the distribution of the skill gap between pairs of job categories across CZs in the periods 2010-12 and 2017-19. We then compare its evolution by regressing the skill gap over an indicator variable valued at 0 for the years 2010-12 and 1 over 2017-19. Thus a positive (resp. negative) value indicates a reduction (resp. increase) in the skill gap over time.

Low and high-carbon skill coreness index

To analyse whether the skill requirements of low-carbon jobs represent a specialisation or diversification of skills sets, we analyse the correlation between two indices : a generic skill coreness index G_s^{SOC} and a low (resp. high) carbon skill coreness index C_s^{SOC}. These indices are defined within each SOC occupational groups (at the 2- or 3-digit level) as follows:

$$G_s^{SOC} = \frac{g_s^{SOC} - 1}{g_s^{SOC} + 1} \qquad g_s^{SOC} = \frac{n_s^{SOC}}{n^{SOC}} / \frac{n_s}{n}$$

$$C_s^{SOC} = \frac{c_s^{SOC} - 1}{c_s^{SOC} + 1} \qquad c_s^{SOC} = \frac{n_s^{c,SOC}}{n^{c,SOC}} / \frac{n_s^{SOC}}{n^{SOC}}$$

where n_s^{SOC} is the number of ads requiring skill s in occupational group SOC
n^{SOC} is the number of ads in occupational group SOC
n_s is the number of ads requiring skill s in the entire sample
n is the total number of ads in the sample
$n_s^{c,SOC}$ is the number of low (resp. high) carbon ads requiring skill s in occupational group SOC
$n^{c,SOC}$ is the number of low (resp. high) carbon ads in occupational group SOC
n_s^{SOC} is the number of ads requiring skill s in occupational group SOC
n^{SOC} is the number of ads in occupational group SOC

The generic skill coreness index g_s^{SOC} compares skill s's importance or coreness in SOC j to its coreness across all occupations. A value of g_s^{SOC}above 1 indicates that skill s's coreness in SOC j is greater than its coreness across all occupations, indicating it is more in demand by SOC. The low- (or high-) carbon skill coreness index c_s^{SOC} compares skill s's coreness in low- (or high-)carbon jobs in SOC j to its coreness in SOC j overall including generic jobs. A value of c_s^{SOC}above 1 indicates that skill s's coreness in low-(or high-) carbon jobs in SOC j is greater than its coreness across all jobs in SOC j, indicating it is more in demand by low- (or high-)

carbon jobs within SOC j.

The distribution of G_s^{SOC} and C_s^{SOC} symmetrically ranges from -1 to +1 with 0 being the neutral point.

If and only if:

$$corr(G_s^{SOC}, C_s^{SOC}) > 0$$

then the skills required for low-carbon jobs in occupation j belong to the core set of skill sets demanded by that occupation, thus indicating that a transition to low-carbon jobs will require workers to expand their skill profile by further specialisation in their area of work.

Conversely, if and only if:

$$corr(G_s^{SOC}, C_s^{SOC}) < 0$$

then the increase in skill requirements of low-carbon jobs in occupation j instead demands workers to diversify their skill-sets and acquire new skills that don't belong to the usual skill profile of their occupation.

Table SI.23: Keywords defining broad skills

Broad skill	Keywords
Cognitive	problem solving, research, analytical, critical thinking, math, statistics
IT	*Burning Glass Technologies Information Technology skill cluster family*
Management	project management, system analysis, system evaluat*, updat* kno*, using know*, consultation* advice*, supervisory, leadership, management, mentoring, staff
Social	communication, teamwork, collaboration, negotiation, presentation
Technical	engineer*, technolog*, design, build*, construct*, mechanic*, draft, lay* out, specfiy* techn* part*, specfiy* techn* devic*, specify*, techn* equip*, estimat* quant* character*, technic*

Wage regressions robustness

Table SI.24: Wage gap robustness

	Main specification				Control for degree				Control for industry			
	Weighted		Unweighted		Weighted		Unweighted		Weighted		Unweighted	
	2010-2012	2017-2019	2010-2012	2017-2019	2010-2012	2017-2019	2010-2012	2017-2019	2010-2012	2017-2019	2010-2012	2017-2019
13-1 - Business Operations Specialists												
Job ad is low carbon	0.062***	0.044*	0.063***	0.034	0.027	0.047**	0.026	0.042**	0.080***	0.087***	0.083***	0.073**
	(0.017)	(0.022)	(0.019)	(0.020)	(0.026)	(0.017)	(0.023)	(0.015)	(0.025)	(0.030)	(0.027)	(0.027)
Total ads	237,257	716,067	237,257	716,067	123,559	429,527	123,559	429,527	115,215	318,274	115,215	318,274
Low carbon ads	3,048	7,855	3,048	7,855	1,735	4,273	1,735	4,273	1,613	3,686	1,613	3,686
R2	0.204	0.218	0.195	0.209	0.255	0.267	0.250	0.265	0.225	0.237	0.225	0.236
17-1 - Architects, Surveyors, and Cartographers												
Job ad is low carbon	-0.241***	-0.087*	-0.247***	-0.101	-0.185***	-0.093***	-0.188***	-0.094**	-0.178***	-0.073**	-0.153**	-0.079**
	(0.021)	(0.035)	(0.013)	(0.050)	(0.022)	(0.014)	(0.005)	(0.020)	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.042)	(0.021)
Total ads	6,122	18,958	6,122	18,958	2,714	10,815	2,714	10,815	3,073	8,072	3,073	8,072
Low carbon ads	238	678	238	678	161	483	161	483	123	308	123	308
R2	0.355	0.216	0.394	0.254	0.414	0.250	0.468	0.304	0.416	0.258	0.458	0.290
17-2 - Engineers												
Job ad is low carbon	0.023*	-0.043*	0.017	-0.038	0.030*	-0.013**	0.019	-0.006	-0.029*	-0.018*	-0.034**	-0.008
	(0.013)	(0.020)	(0.013)	(0.025)	(0.017)	(0.005)	(0.016)	(0.009)	(0.017)	(0.010)	(0.014)	(0.016)
Total ads	138,328	205,682	138,328	205,682	91,005	149,391	91,005	149,391	52,030	80,412	52,030	80,412
Low carbon ads	7,287	10,057	7,287	10,057	5,556	7,614	5,556	7,614	3,402	4,899	3,402	4,899
R2	0.137	0.104	0.143	0.106	0.102	0.112	0.108	0.112	0.164	0.149	0.161	0.153
17-3 - Engineering and Mapping Technicians												
Job ad is low carbon	0.130***	0.038***	0.109***	0.041***	0.104**	0.031	0.079***	0.031	0.102***	0.031**	0.094***	0.033**
	(0.030)	(0.008)	(0.022)	(0.010)	(0.038)	(0.020)	(0.025)	(0.019)	(0.022)	(0.011)	(0.018)	(0.011)
Total ads	83,875	199,662	83,875	199,662	39,976	104,238	39,976	104,238	32,773	69,193	32,773	69,193
Low carbon ads	1,732	3,745	1,732	3,745	1,034	2,337	1,034	2,337	791	1,790	791	1,790
R2	0.185	0.140	0.204	0.159	0.312	0.231	0.335	0.258	0.280	0.205	0.293	0.223
19-2 - Physical Scientists												
Job ad is low carbon	0.071***	-0.029	0.071***	-0.011	0.048	0.006	0.050**	0.014	0.070***	0.032	0.070***	0.045
	(0.004)	(0.021)	(0.008)	(0.038)	(0.027)	(0.016)	(0.020)	(0.026)	(0.013)	(0.021)	(0.010)	(0.029)
Total ads	16,775	25,707	16,775	25,707	10,994	18,955	10,994	18,955	10,416	13,912	10,416	13,912
Low carbon ads	1,151	2,473	1,151	2,473	836	1,909	836	1,909	700	1,195	700	1,195
R2	0.249	0.191	0.254	0.213	0.265	0.230	0.272	0.252	0.293	0.250	0.284	0.259
47 - Construction and Extraction												
Job ad is low carbon	0.044	-0.021*	0.040	-0.014	-0.013	-0.002	0.011	0.006	0.065	-0.013	0.064	-0.004
	(0.053)	(0.012)	(0.038)	(0.011)	(0.029)	(0.018)	(0.025)	(0.017)	(0.061)	(0.021)	(0.046)	(0.016)
Total ads	98,200	269,768	98,200	269,768	22,389	65,878	22,389	65,878	41,870	120,945	41,870	120,945
Low carbon ads	3,976	13,261	3,976	13,261	1,263	4,347	1,263	4,347	1,956	5,956	1,956	5,956
R2	0.267	0.291	0.256	0.264	0.359	0.419	0.349	0.386	0.294	0.270	0.296	0.255
49 - Installation, Maintenance, and Repair												
Job ad is low carbon	0.067***	0.040***	0.050*	0.035***	0.085***	0.042***	0.067**	0.043***	0.039	0.018	0.008	0.030*
	(0.025)	(0.006)	(0.030)	(0.009)	(0.019)	(0.005)	(0.029)	(0.009)	(0.049)	(0.014)	(0.060)	(0.017)
Total ads	213,923	567,184	213,923	567,184	73,780	235,624	73,780	235,624	104,123	285,440	104,123	285,440
Low carbon ads	5,757	15,376	5,757	15,376	2,411	6,651	2,411	6,651	3,155	8,439	3,155	8,439
R2	0.149	0.133	0.172	0.163	0.263	0.202	0.284	0.237	0.197	0.156	0.240	0.195
53 - Transportation and Material Moving												
Job ad is low carbon	0.157***	-0.064*	0.108*	-0.030	-0.044	0.202***	-0.033	0.154***	-0.098	-0.100***	-0.005	-0.046
	(0.045)	(0.034)	(0.063)	(0.037)	(0.078)	(0.015)	(0.033)	(0.038)	(0.059)	(0.022)	(0.066)	(0.044)
Total ads	349,336	1,489,698	349,336	1,489,698	74,384	282,924	74,384	282,924	151,313	652,591	151,313	652,591
Low carbon ads	10,155	35,860	10,155	35,860	4,149	17,915	4,149	17,915	8,124	26,236	8,124	26,236
R2	0.359	0.394	0.341	0.388	0.261	0.288	0.334	0.299	0.410	0.370	0.401	0.400
17-2 - Engineers												
Job ad is high carbon	0.239***	0.074***	0.201***	0.049**	0.176***	0.049*	0.145***	0.021	0.219***	0.061***	0.190***	0.041**
	(0.029)	(0.017)	(0.047)	(0.020)	(0.013)	(0.025)	(0.025)	(0.025)	(0.047)	(0.012)	(0.046)	(0.017)
Total ads	138,328	205,682	138,328	205,682	91,005	149,391	91,005	149,391	52,030	80,412	52,030	80,412
High carbon ads	2,802	1,703	2,802	1,703	1,817	1,216	1,817	1,216	1,577	1,123	1,577	1,123
R2	0.139	0.104	0.144	0.105	0.103	0.112	0.109	0.112	0.167	0.150	0.163	0.153
47 - Construction and Extraction												
Job ad is high carbon	0.202**	0.161***	0.152*	0.094	0.156*	0.099**	0.233***	0.114***	0.183**	0.133***	0.150*	0.064
	(0.077)	(0.046)	(0.085)	(0.058)	(0.085)	(0.046)	(0.072)	(0.039)	(0.080)	(0.037)	(0.083)	(0.057)
Total ads	98,200	269,768	98,200	269,768	22,389	65,878	22,389	65,878	41,870	120,945	41,870	120,945
High carbon ads	3,018	6,822	3,018	6,822	1,028	3,078	1,028	3,078	1,597	3,907	1,597	3,907
R2	0.267	0.291	0.256	0.264	0.360	0.419	0.350	0.386	0.295	0.271	0.296	0.255
Fixed effects												
Year	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Commuting Zone	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
6-digits SOC	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Degree	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No

Table SI.25: Wage sample balance

	Full sample								
	Ad count	Skills count		Education		Experience		Salary	
		Mean	St. Dev.	Mean	St. Dev.	Mean	St. Dev.	Mean	St. Dev.
13-1 - Business Operations Specialists									
Generic	8,049,595	11.2	7.6	13.6	5.2	3.8	2.6	51,907	28,456
Low carbon	78,518	14.7	8.5	13.9	5.0	4.2	2.9	56,544	28,608
17-1 - Architects, Surveyors, and Cartographers									
Generic	220,494	9.9	7.8	13.0	6.2	5.5	3.2	61,833	32,227
Low carbon	10,473	15.4	7.9	14.2	4.6	5.1	3.5	60,217	26,033
17-2 - Engineers									
Generic	3,622,206	11.5	7.6	15.1	4.0	5.1	3.1	69,908	29,486
High carbon	99,572	10.2	6.7	15.6	2.7	6.0	3.5	91,247	46,603
Low carbon	180,262	16.0	8.5	15.3	3.7	5.3	3.2	68,407	25,775
17-3 - Engineering and Mapping Technicians									
Generic	1,897,103	9.0	6.9	11.5	5.1	3.7	2.7	40,981	20,903
Low carbon	42,653	14.3	8.1	12.6	4.4	4.3	2.9	46,951	21,085
19-2 - Physical Scientists									
Generic	343,905	10.7	6.8	16.1	3.9	4.3	3.2	57,392	31,584
Low carbon	20,059	15.5	8.5	16.0	3.9	4.4	3.2	55,245	23,128
47 - Construction and Extraction									
Generic	1,793,801	5.9	5.6	6.9	6.2	3.7	2.5	39,470	22,710
High carbon	110,232	7.5	6.2	10.9	4.8	3.1	2.6	43,132	25,198
Low carbon	94,710	10.0	7.3	8.3	5.9	3.4	2.4	42,603	24,160
49 - Installation, Maintenance, and Repair									
Generic	5,738,508	8.1	6.4	9.5	5.3	3.1	2.3	39,648	22,171
Low carbon	170,465	13.0	7.5	9.0	5.6	3.0	2.4	43,841	21,256
53 - Transportation and Material Moving									
Generic	10,793,119	2.9	3.5	6.7	6.1	2.1	2.2	49,595	38,542
Low carbon	201,256	4.7	4.5	9.3	5.1	2.4	2.1	40,273	29,481

	Has wage information											
	Ad count	Skills count			Education			Experience			Salary	
		Mean	St. Dev.	t-test	Mean	St. Dev.	t-test	Mean	St. Dev.	t-test	Mean	St. Dev.
13-1 - Business Operations Specialists												
Generic	1,430,951	10.3	7.2	-0.849***	12.2	6.4	-1.42***	3.2	2.4	-0.574***	51,907	28,456
Low carbon	16,915	14.0	8.7	-0.699***	11.9	6.8	-1.95***	3.3	2.6	-0.893***	56,544	28,608
17-1 - Architects, Surveyors, and Cartographers												
Generic	37,012	10.0	7.8	0.0913**	12.0	6.8	-1.04***	4.5	2.9	-0.99***	61,833	32,227
Low carbon	1,463	15.9	8.2	0.488**	13.6	5.5	-0.585***	4.4	3.1	-0.734***	60,217	26,033
17-2 - Engineers												
Generic	521,104	10.8	7.5	-0.637***	14.7	4.5	-0.41***	4.5	3.0	-0.689***	69,908	29,486
High carbon	7,548	8.7	6.9	-1.51***	15.1	3.9	-0.509***	6.0	3.6	-0.0536	91,247	46,603
Low carbon	27,409	16.2	9.3	0.167***	14.9	4.2	-0.373***	4.3	3.2	-0.967***	68,407	25,775
17-3 - Engineering and Mapping Technicians												
Generic	435,558	8.3	6.5	-0.707***	10.2	5.8	-1.37***	3.1	2.5	-0.632***	40,981	20,903
Low carbon	8,470	13.7	9.1	-0.583***	11.4	5.3	-1.24***	3.6	2.6	-0.743***	46,951	21,085
19-2 - Physical Scientists												
Generic	65,362	10.3	6.9	-0.371***	15.2	4.9	-0.889***	3.1	2.7	-1.2***	57,392	31,584
Low carbon	6,480	16.7	9.0	1.18***	15.2	4.8	-0.746***	3.1	2.5	-1.31***	55,245	23,128
47 - Construction and Extraction												
Generic	530,065	5.8	5.5	-0.099***	5.6	6.2	-1.33***	3.5	2.4	-0.227***	39,470	22,710
High carbon	14,620	6.0	5.6	-1.45***	8.6	6.1	-2.31***	3.2	2.6	0.15***	43,132	25,198
Low carbon	27,894	9.5	7.8	-0.483***	6.9	6.2	-1.35***	3.1	2.2	-0.261***	42,603	24,160
49 - Installation, Maintenance, and Repair												
Generic	1,162,640	7.8	6.2	-0.311***	7.9	6.0	-1.6***	3.0	2.2	-0.091***	39,648	22,171
Low carbon	33,261	12.9	8.4	-0.173***	8.4	5.8	-0.624***	3.3	2.4	0.255***	43,841	21,256
53 - Transportation and Material Moving												
Generic	3,146,085	2.6	3.0	-0.352***	4.9	6.0	-1.82***	2.2	2.2	0.0705***	49,595	38,542
Low carbon	72,108	4.7	4.8	0.0168	8.8	5.4	-0.51***	2.3	2.2	-0.0805***	40,273	29,481

FONDAZIONE ENI ENRICO MATTEI WORKING PAPER SERIES

"NOTE DI LAVORO"

Our Working Papers are available on the Internet at the following address:
https://www.feem.it/pubblicazioni/feem-working-papers/

"NOTE DI LAVORO" PUBLISHED IN 2022

1. 2022, Daniele Crotti, Elena Maggi, Evangelia Pantelaki, Urban cycling tourism. How can bikes and public transport ride together for sustainability?
2. 2022, Antonio Acconcia, Sergio Beraldo, Carlo Capuano, Marco Stimolo, Public subsidies and cooperation in research and development. Evidence from the lab
3. 2022, Jia Meng, ZhongXiang Zhang, Corporate Environmental Information Disclosure and Investor Response: Empirical Evidence from China's Capital Market
4. 2022, Mariagrazia D'Angeli, Giovanni Marin, Elena Paglialunga, Climate Change, Armed Conflicts and Resilience
5. 2022, Davide Antonioli, Claudia Ghisetti, Massimiliano Mazzanti, Francesco Nicolli, The economic returns of circular economy practices
6. 2022, Massimiliano Mazzanti, Francesco Nicolli, Stefano Pareglio, Marco Quatrosi, Adoption of Eco and Circular Economy-Innovation in Italy: exploring different firm profiles
7. 2022, Davide Antonioli, Claudia Ghisetti, Stefano Pareglio, Marco Quatrosi, Innovation, Circular economy practices and organisational settings: empirical evidence from Italy
8. 2022, Ilenia Romani, Marzio Galeotti, Alessandro Lanza, Besides promising economic growth, will the Italian NRRP also produce fewer emissions?
9. 2022, Emanuele Ciola, Enrico Turco, Andrea Gurgone, Davide Bazzana, Sergio Vergalli, Francesco Menoncin, Charging the macroeconomy with an energy sector: an agent-based model
10. 2022, Emanuele Millemaci, Alessandra Patti, Nemo propheta in Patria: Empirical Evidence from Italy
11. 2022, Daniele Valenti, Andrea Bastianin, Matteo Manera, A weekly structural VAR model of the US crude oil market
12. 2022, Banchongsan Charoensook, On Efficiency and Stability in Two-way Flow Network with Small Decay: A note
13. 2022, Shu Guo, ZhongXiang Zhang, Green credit policy and total factor productivity: Evidence from Chinese listed companies
14. 2022, Filippo Bontadini, Francesco Vona, Anatomy of Green Specialisation: Evidence from EU Production Data, 1995-2015
15. 2022, Mattia Guerini, Fabio Vanni, Mauro Napoletano, *E pluribus, quaedam*. Gross domestic product out of a dashboard of indicators
16. 2022, Cinzia Bonaldo, Fulvio Fontini, Michele Moretto, The Energy Transition and the Value of Capacity Remuneration Mechanisms
17. 2022, Giovanni Marin, Francesco Vona, Finance and the Reallocation of Scientific, Engineering and Mathematical Talent
18. 2022, Anna Laura Baraldi, Erasmo Papagni, Marco Stimolo, Neutralizing the Tentacles of Organized Crime. Assessment of Anti-Crime Measure in Fighting Mafia Violence
19. 2022, Alexander Golub, Jon Anda, Anil Markandya, Michael Brody, Aldin Celovic, Angele Kedaitiene, Climate alpha and the global capital market
20. 2022, Jlenia Di Noia, Agent-Based Models for Climate Change Adaptation in Coastal Zones. A Review
21. 2022, Alberto Gabino Martínez-Hernández, System Dynamics modelling and Climate Change Adaptation in Coastal Areas: A literature review
22. 2022, Pietro De Ponti, Matteo Romagnoli, Financial Implications of the EU Emission Trading System: an analysis of wavelet coherence and volatility spillovers
23. 2022, Laura Cavalli, Mia Alibegovic, Davide Vaccari, Andrea Spasiano, Fernando Nardi, Sustainability assessment of the public interventions supported by the ReSTART project in the CITI4GREEN framework
24. 2022, Filippo Maria D'Arcangelo, Giulia Pavan, Sara Calligaris, The Impact of the European Carbon Market on Firm Productivity: Evidence from Italian Manufacturing Firms.
25. 2022, Enrico Turco, Davide Bazzana, Massimiliano Rizzati, Emanuele Ciola, Sergio Vergalli, Energy prices shocks and macroeconomic stabilization policies in the MATRIX model
26. 2022, Mario Gilli, Filippo Giorgini, Citizens Protests: causes and consequences. A Research on Regime Change and Revolutionary Entrepreneurs

"NOTE DI LAVORO" PUBLISHED IN 2022

27. 2022, Filippo Maria D'Arcangelo, Marzio Galeotti, Environmental Policy and Investment Location: The Risk of Carbon Leakage in the EU ETS
28. 2022, Italo Colantone, Livio Di Lonardo, Yotam Margalit, Marco Percoco, The Political Consequences of Green Policies: Evidence from Italy
29. 2022, Filippo Belloc, Edilio Valentini, Digging into the Technological Dimension of Environmental Productivity
30. 2022, ZhongXiang Zhang, China's Carbon Market: Development, Evaluation, Coordination of Local and National Carbon Markets and Common Prosperity
31. 2022, Aurélien Saussay, Misato Sato, Francesco Vona, Layla O'Kane, Who's fit for the low-carbon transition? Emerging skills and wage gaps in job and data

Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei
Corso Magenta 63, Milano – Italia

Tel. +39 02 403 36934

E-mail: letter@feem.it
www.feem.it

FONDAZIONE ENI ENRICO MATTEI