ESRI ECONOMIC & SOCIAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE

ESRI Working Paper No. 742

January 2023

Firm-level attitudes and actions to the "Twin Transition" challenges of digitalisation and climate change

Janez Kren[a,b] and Martina Lawless[a,b*]

a) Economic and Social Research Institute, Dublin, Ireland
b) Trinity College Dublin, Dublin, Ireland

*Corresponding Author:
Dr Martina Lawless
Economic and Social Research Institute,
Whitaker Square, Sir John Rogerson's Quay,
Dublin, Ireland
Email: Martina.Lawless@esri.ie

This work is part of a joint research programme on The Productivity Challenge and its Interaction with Climate, Digitalisation and Human Capital between the ESRI and the Department of Enterprise, Trade and Employment. We would like to thank the members of the steering committee for their input on the research and are grateful to Maurice Dagg and Oisín McGann for their help with the data.

Corresponding author: Martina Lawless, Economic and Social Research Institute, Whitaker Square, Sir John Rogerson's Quay, Dublin 2, Ireland, D02 K138. Email: martina.lawless@esri.ie

Firm-level attitudes and actions to the "Twin Transition" challenges of digitalisation and climate change

Abstract: Mitigating and adapting to climate change is a central global challenge that may incur costs for many businesses but also one that could bring opportunities in terms of productivity and new markets. Increased use of digital technologies is an area where the challenge of climate adaptation and promotion of productivity growth may be bridged. This research uses firm-level evidence from Ireland to examine firm attitudes and the determinants of firm participation in one or both of the "twin transition" elements. The data is drawn from a large-scale survey including novel questions on energy use, climate adaption priorities and digital strategies along with a wide range of firm characteristics. Larger and more productive firms are more likely to have higher degrees of digitalisation and to have climate action plans in place. Firm productivity is also positively linked to active steps such as measuring CO_2 emissions. We find considerable overlap between having a climate and a digital plan in place across firms while controlling for a range of other firm characteristics. At the same time, we find a reasonably large share of firms that have positive attitudes to the importance of climate planning but without reporting corresponding concrete actions, suggesting a gap for policy to address.

1 Introduction

While firms encounter a wide variety of individual challenges across different competitive environments, two long-term structural shifts are being faced by firms both in Ireland and internationally. These are global climate change with the economic adjustments needed to mitigate its impacts and the increasing speed of technological development in the area of digitalisation. While in many ways distinct, the two challenges intersect to the extent that they have been described as a "twin transition" (for example, Revoltella, 2020). Some digital developments are energy-intensive, but many have the potential to reduce reliance on high-carbon sources of energy, either directly through technological shifts or indirectly through efficiency improvements (Bernstein and Madlener, 2010; Dwivedi *et al.,* 2022; Elkerbout *et al.*, 2021). Harnessing digital transformation provides some medium to long term optimism on dealing with the climate challenge. The immediate costs of transitioning to new technologies, and perhaps new skills requirements, could however be substantial (Balsmeier and Woerter, 2019). This research uses firm-level evidence from Ireland to examine the determinants of participation in one or both of these elements of the "twin transition" to examine the extent to which digital investment and climate adaptation can be seen to be complementary strategies at the level of the individual firm. The data is drawn from a large-scale survey including novel questions on energy use, climate adaption priorities and digital strategies.

While the role of technology in averting the worst impacts of changing climate has been highlighted as a key issue, much of the research on firm-level investment in digital technologies and climate adaption have focused on one or the other of the two issues. Given data constraints, there has been relatively limited exploration of the extent to which there is overlap in the determinants of the two strategies and, if so, what the key factors are at a firm-level that can be identified as increasing participation in either digitalisation, climate adaption or both simultaneously. Boone and Revoltella (2019) and Revoltella (2020) argue that there is an important policy gap in incentivising investment in a direction that helps to address climate change. They point to uncertainty as a barrier with firms potentially delaying investments in climate-friendly technologies as they await clarity on the evolution of the technologies, carbon prices, standards and regulation. The need for complementary investments in labour market skills to fully exploit the new technologies is also an important factor in gaining the full productivity benefits both at a firm and national level (Boone and Revoltella, 2019; Balsmeier and Woerter, 2019, Cirillo, Fanti, Mina and Ricci, 2021).

Examining investments in green technologies amongst firms in Ireland's industry sector, Siedschlag and Yan (2020) found that green investments have positive effects on average across a range of performance outcomes. However, the positive benefits were not evenly spread with larger, foreign-owned and more productive firms more likely to gain benefits from investments in green technologies as well as firms in lower-technology industries. They interpret this variation in performance impact as suggesting that there may be complementary factors needed for firms to fully exploit the benefits from green investments

enough to overweigh the associated costs. This parallels the point made by Boone and Revoltella (2019) about digital investments requiring complementary skills investments alongside the direct investment in the technologies themselves for the full benefits to emerge. Looking at green investments from another angle, Siedschlag and Yan (2021) also found that larger firms were more likely to invest in cleaner technologies in the first instance. They found that the incentives for investment are higher for more energy-intensive firms and that there were positive spillover effects evident on likelihood to invest amongst firms in the same industry or the same region. Looking at environmental expenditures as a component of broader corporate social responsibility, Blasi, Caporin and Fontini (2018) find somewhat mixed results on the links between these activities and firm financial performance and suggest further work on heterogeneity across firm types and sectors would be beneficial in understanding these relationships.

The determinants of investment in digital technologies have been fairly extensively investigated across countries. Gal, Nicoletti, Renault, Sorbe and Timiliotis (2019) combine firm-level data from across the OECD and find evidence that digital adoption in an industry is associated with productivity gains at the firm level. They find that the size of the effect tends to be greater for firms that were already more productive and, hence, may be a factor in the increasing dispersion of firm productivity within sectors. They also echo the finding that the firms that benefited the most from digital technologies also invested in other forms of human and organisational capital. Cirillo, Fanti, Mina and Ricci (2021) and DeStefano, De Backer and Moussiegt (2017) also highlight the role of skills and also the variety of potential digital technology options available to firms with smaller firms focusing on single technology types while bundles of different technologies are used by larger firms. DeStefano, De Backer and Moussiegt (2017) find that a focus on investment spend can somewhat mask the constant churning of bundles of digital technologies being used by firms over time including a shift from purchasing of hardware to acquiring technology services. As the same time, they found that many of the firm characteristics driving investment in hardware were similar to those for software use, with larger and more knowledge intensive firms investing more across the range of technology options. The relationship between digital investments and productivity growth is substantial, with Adarov, Klenert, Marschinski and Stehrer (2022) finding that differences in digital capital could account for as much as one-quarter of the overall productivity gap between the EU and USA.

The consistent finding across the research discussed above in relation to the determinants of both green and digital investments that larger firms are more likely to invest and to gain greater benefits from their investments suggest particular challenges of the twin transition for small and medium enterprises (SMEs). In counterpoint to this, George, Merrill and Schillebeeckx (2021) and George and Schillebeeckx (2021) point to some ways in which digitalisation may allow smaller companies to benefit from economies of scale by reducing the costs of coordination and enabling a wider consumer reach through common exchange platforms. Some policy support may be required to support greater engagement of smaller firms with new technologies, with Mollet (2021) suggesting several areas where intervention

may be needed. Accessing finance for intangible asset investment is one particular potential barrier for SMEs, as well as the need for supporting infrastructure and skills investment.

Drawing together the digital and climate strands of the existing research on firm investment, Axenbeck and Niebel (2021) examine the relationship between information technology and energy intensity at the firm level. Using panel data on German manufacturing firms, they find a small but statistically significant negative link between indicators of firm-level digitalisation and the energy intensity of the firm. At a sectoral level, Bernstein and Madlener (2010) also found that the diffusion of information technology appeared to correspond to electrical efficiency improvements, particularly in the manufacturing sector.

This paper draws on a firm survey, the Annual Business Survey of Economic Impact (ABSEI), from the Department of Enterprise, Trade and Employment which in the 2020/21 wave added new questions relating to climate, energy and digitalisation to the long-established survey with wide-ranging set of other firm characteristics. We find that all indicators of digitalisation and climate action plans are significantly related to firm size and productivity. Firms with greater research and development expenditure are considerably more likely to have higher degrees of digital readiness. Firm productivity is also positively linked to climate actions in the case of having a climate plan in place and measuring CO_2 emissions but does not impact how the firm ranks the importance of having a climate plan in place. Energy intensity is significantly related to measurement of emissions and generation of own on-site energy. In terms of the overlap in the different strategies, we find a strong statistically significant link between having a climate and a digital plan while controlling for a range of other firm characteristics although the data do not allow us to infer causation from one to the other. The finding of this overlap in the strategies gives some guidance that policy might be coordinated to achieve both aims of the twin transition simultaneously.

The rest of the paper is organised as follows: Section 2 describes the data source. Section 3 provides summary statistics on the patterns of firm responses on digital and climate plans. Section 4 presents the econometric results on the determinants of the two strategies separately at a firm level and their joint occurrence. Section 5 concludes.

2 Data description

The data we use comes from a wide-ranging firm survey called the Annual Business Survey of Economic Impact (ABSEI), which is collected by the Department of Enterprise, Trade and Employment. This survey covers approximately 4,200 firms in total drawn from a sampling frame of client companies of three enterprise promotion agencies in Ireland: Enterprise Ireland, IDA Ireland and Údarás na Gaeltachta. The survey is used extensively by the Department and agencies to monitor export activity and to provide evidence for strategy development and policymaking. The survey covers firms employing ten or more employees in Ireland in the manufacturing, information and communication and other internationally traded services sectors. There are also some responses from smaller (micro) firms where these are considered as high potential growth firms. As such, the results from micro firms throughout the paper may be less representative of this group in the population than the results from the other size classes. Weights are used to account for non-respondents and are based on NACE sector, ownership, size and region. The data includes some imputations where a large company has not responded and are usually based on their responses to previous surveys. The survey collects information on a range of key firm characteristics, including sales, exports, employment, costs and training. For the purposes of this paper, the key questions of interest relate to climate, energy and digitalisation which were added to the survey in 2021 (referring to activities in 2020):

Q14a How important is having a climate action response for your business?
□ Not important
□ Moderately important
□ Very important

Q14b Have you developed a climate action response for your business?
□ Yes
□ No
□ Don't know

Q14c Does your company measure CO_2 emissions?
□ Yes
□ No
□ Don't know

Q14d Which of the following energy resources does your company use? Yes / No / Don't know
- Natural gas
- Fuel oil, kerosene, gas oil, diesel, LPG
- Other fuels (e.g. coal, petroleum coke)
- Biogas/biomass including renewable waste
- On-site renewable electricity generation (e.g. heat pumps, solar panels, wind)

Q15 Digitalisation is the process of leveraging digital data and technologies to drive business value. How would you assess your readiness for the use of established (e.g. data analytics) and emerging (e.g. Artificial Intelligence) digital technologies to this end? Please tick one of the following options:
□ No digital plan; limited or no digital initiatives in place
□ Tentative plan in place; some experience of exploring and delivering digital initiatives
□ Defined digital plans in place with activities underway
□ Digital Innovation strategy in place with implementation activities underway
□ Digital is fully embedded and optimised across all aspects of our business

Because these questions were only asked once we are limited to cross-sectional data. For most explanatory variables (number of employees, value-added, exporter status, ownership, R&D intensity, and energy intensity) we therefore use data referring to year 2020. For two other variables (long-term turnover growth rates, and long-term change in energy intensity) we take the average growth rate over five years, thereby exploiting the time span of the survey before the digital and climate questions were added. Some of the variables are winsorized to deal with outliers.

The summary statistics for the firms in the survey are shown in Table 1 and the outcome variables discussed further in the following section.

Table 1: Summary statistics

	Observations	**Mean**	**Std. dev.**	**Minimum**	**Maximum**
ln(empl)	3,203	3.485	1.465	0	8.571
VA per empl	2,993	0.101	0.118	0	0.500
Exporter dummy	3,231	0.829	0.376	0	1
Foreign dummy	3,228	0.230	0.421	0	1
5-year growth	3,023	0.121	0.322	-1	1.500
R&D intensity	3,047	0.094	0.163	0	0.500
Energy intensity	2,969	0.023	0.039	0	0.250
5-year energy change	3,031	-0.001	0.007	-0.030	0.030
Digital readiness	2,301	2.581	1.439	1	5
Climate action importance	2,348	2.032	0.692	1	3
Have climate plan	2,637	0.231	0.421	0	1
Measure CO_2	2,648	0.137	0.344	0	1
Have on-site renewables	2,259	0.126	0.332	0	1

3 Descriptive Results

In this section, we describe the patterns of responses to the survey questions on digital readiness and climate plans, looking at how these vary across firm characteristics such as size and sector. The following section will then look more deeply at the determinants of the responses in an econometric framework. This section is arranged to look at digital preparation in the first subsection, then the responses to the questions on climate change with the final subsection looking at the extent of the overlap in the responses.

3.1 Digital preparation

The first question we examine is the extent of digital readiness by the firm. This question had five potential answers ranging from no digital plan to digitalisation being fully embedded in the firm. Figure 1 shows how the intensity of digitalisation varies across firm size groups. For all firms in the sample in 2020, thirty per cent responded that they had no digital plan and a further 27 per cent that a tentative plan was in place. Fifteen per cent reported having fully embedded digitalisation within the firm.

Across size groups, we find some evidence of a U-shaped relationship between digital readiness and firm size. The smallest and largest of our four size groups are the least likely to report having no digital plan. The largest size group have almost 40 per cent of firms reporting plans under way or digital innovations but this size category has the smallest share of firms reporting fully embedded digitalisation. On the other end of the scale, the smallest firms are most likely to report fully embedded digitalisation. A likely explanation of this is that the smaller firms in the survey are more likely to be high-potential start-up firms and, as noted above, some caveats therefore need to be applied to the patterns from this group. The survey does not include a question on firm age so this hypothesis cannot be tested directly. Figure 2 depicts the U-shape between digital readiness and size across the entire size distribution, showing the average score of the 5-point scale across all employment levels.

We also find considerable variation in the degree of digital readiness across sectors but here the pattern is rather more in line with ex ante expectations. Both the food, drink and primary sector and traditional manufacturing have the highest shares of firms – approximately half – with no digital plans in place and only around 2 per cent of firms reporting fully embedded digitalisation. Services sectors in ICT and business and professional services are considerably more likely to report high levels of digitalisation.

Figure 1: Digital readiness by firm size group (% of responses)



Figure 2: Average digital readiness by firm size



Table 2: Digital readiness by sector

	No digital plan	Tentative plan	Defined plan	Digital innovate	Fully embedded	Total
Food, Drink & Primary	48.82	29.63	11.78	7.74	2.02	100
Traditional Manuf.	50.18	31.21	9.75	6.21	2.66	100
Modern Manuf.	34.19	32.91	14.96	11.11	6.84	100
Energy, Water, Waste	30.84	41.12	13.08	12.15	2.80	100
ICT	7.07	18.69	15.15	20.88	38.22	100
Business, Fin. & Prof.	21.78	23.96	18.02	16.04	20.20	100
Total	30.12	26.81	13.91	13.12	16.04	100

3.2 Climate adaption

This section looks at the firms' responses to the questions on climate adaption – including if they have a climate action plan, the importance they attach to having a plan and if they measure CO_2 emissions. A potentially relevant factor in the answers to these questions is the energy intensity of the firm as the greater the share of energy in overall expenditures, perhaps the more incentive there is to develop plans to increase energy efficiency. We therefore begin this subsection by looking at how energy intensity varies across broad sectors.

Figure 3: Variation in energy intensity (share of expenditure) by broad sector



For the majority of firms, energy accounts for less than 2.5 per cent of total expenditures but the distribution plots in Figure 3 shows considerable variation both within and across sectors (the graph is top coded at 25 per cent of expenditures so excludes outliers greater than that level).*

The first question we look at in relation to climate is if the firm had a climate action plan. Approximately 69 per cent of firms responded that they did not with 21 per cent answering yes and a further 10 per cent giving a "don't know" response. Across size categories, Figure 4 shows that a fairly marked increase in the share of firms responding that a climate action plan was in place as we move up the firm size groups. Micro firms were fairly unlikely to have a climate action plan in place with over 80 per cent responding no to this question. The

* It should be noted that this data on expenditure shares pre-dates the increase in energy costs occurring in 2022. The shares are calculated from information on the firm's direct expenditures on energy. They cannot therefore be interpreted as a measure of total exposure of firms to energy price increases as they do not include indirect exposures through energy-intensive intermediate inputs.

negative response reduced to 73 per cent amongst small firm and further to 62 per cent amongst medium firms. For large firms, more than half reported having a climate action plan.

Figure 4: Business climate action plan by firm size group (% of responses)



An interesting contrast emerges between the share of firms with a climate action plan in place and the responses of firms to the next question on if they regard a climate response as being important for their business. A much greater proportion of firms agree with the importance of a climate response than have a current climate action plan in place, as can be seen contrasting Figures 4 and 5. Almost twice as many firms respond that a climate response plan is either very or moderately important than report having a climate action plan in place. This may reflect the relatively small share of energy in expenditures for many firms as shown in Figure 3. The gap between positive attitudes towards the importance of climate plans and the concrete actions being taken by firms mirrors to some extent evidence at the household level from Douenne and Fabre (2020) where a greater percentage of respondents reported positive attitudes to general questions on climate-friendly policies than reported being in favour of specific policy actions such as carbon taxes.

Increases in energy costs that began to build after the period of this survey may change the incentives for more direct action on climate change and will be important from a policy perspective to monitor. Bridging this gap between positive attitude to climate planning and action at a firm level is likely to be a key challenge although the difference in responses does show that firms are aware of the relevance of the issue of climate change even if they have not formulated a plan for how their own individual business should respond to it.

Figure 5: Importance of a climate action response (% of responses)



Figure 6: Does the business measure CO2 emissions? (% of responses)



The distinction between the attitude question and concrete action is also seen in the responses to the question of whether the firm measures CO_2 emissions. Figure 6 shows that direct measurement of emissions is carried out by a minority of firms overall and is rare amongst micro and small firms. However, measurement of emissions is undertaken by a substantial proportion of larger firms, with more reporting that emissions are measured than that report that they are not (albeit with a relatively large number of "don't know" responses. The strong positive relationship between firm size and both having a climate plan and measuring CO_2 emissions is shown across the entire size distribution in Figure 7. This shows that across the whole distribution, having a climate plan is somewhat more common

at all size points than measuring CO_2 emissions. Both follow broadly the same path however, rising fairly sharply as firm size increases.

Figure 7: Probability of having a climate plan and measuring CO2 by firm size



One explanation for the strong link between firm size and climate planning is that larger firms use larger amounts of energy and therefore the benefits to greater energy efficiency are more immediate to them than to smaller (or rather less energy intensive) firms. We look in Figure 8 at the overall probabilities of having a climate plan and measuring emissions across the range of firm energy intensities. In this case, the probability of having a climate plan is relatively flat across most levels of energy intensity until the point at which energy accounts for over twenty percent of expenditures. The relationship between energy intensity and measurement of CO_2 is stronger, beginning to increase steadily once energy begins to account for over one-eighth of expenditures.

Figure 8: Probability of having a climate plan and measuring CO2 by energy intensity



Table 3: Climate actions and attitudes by sector (% of sector responses)

	Food, Drink & Primary	Trad Manuf.	Modern Manuf.	Energy Water, Waste	ICT	Business, Financial & Prof.	Total
Does firm have a climate plan?							
No	51.8	73.1	63.1	65.8	74.0	69.9	68.9
Yes	36.4	18.8	25.5	24.3	14.7	19.2	20.6
Don't know	11.8	8.0	11.4	9.9	11.3	11.0	10.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Climate plan importance to firm							
Not important	6.2	16.4	20.7	13.1	32.3	29.8	22.4
Moderately	47.9	57.6	57.4	54.2	51.6	46.1	52.1
Very	45.9	26.0	21.9	32.7	16.1	24.1	25.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Does firm measure CO_2?							
No	62.2	80.8	68.3	68.5	84.1	80.1	77.5
Yes	21.7	9.4	18.9	18.0	8.4	11.0	12.3
Don't know	16.1	9.8	12.9	13.5	7.5	9.0	10.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Having noted the relationship between energy intensity and climate action plans, we would expect to see a variation in their use across sectors. Table 2 shows how the responses to the three survey questions on climate were answered across broad sector groups. In the responses to whether the firm has a climate action plan in place, however, we find relatively

less variation across sectors than we did across firm size groups. Firms in the food, drink and primary production sector were the most likely to report having a climate action plan with over one-third responding yes. This was followed by modern manufacturing where one-quarter of firms had a climate action plan in place. The relatively high rate of "don't know" responses is informative as it suggests that if a plan is in place in these firms, it may not have a high degree of visibility.

When it comes to attitude towards the importance of having a climate plan in place, we find that firms are much more likely to agree that it is very or moderately important compared to the share reporting that such a plan is currently in place. Climate action importance is particularly strong in the food, drink and primary production sector and reported as relatively less important for firms in services sectors. Likewise, firms in the services sectors (ICT and business/professional services) are amongst the least likely to measure CO_2 emissions.

3.3 Overlap of digital and climate plans

In this section, we look at some summary evidence of the overlap between digitalisation and climate action planning. Figure 9 shows how many firms have either a digital plan only, a climate plan only, both plans or have neither plan in place. In the overall sample, 17% of firms have both plans. Most notably, the overlap is the largest among large business where almost half of them have both plans. There are very few firms with only a climate plan – the majority of firms with climate plans also have a digital plan in place. This shows some indicative evidence that the two strategies are correlated at the firm-level. Having a digital plan without a climate plan is however more common perhaps suggesting that this pillar of the twin transition is more accessible to firms than is climate-related investment. As the data is cross-sectional, we cannot explore if having one plan leads in time to adoption of the other or if decisions are made simultaneously but this is a question that could be investigated in time as more data becomes available.

Figure 9: Overlap between digital and climate plans by sector and size category (% of responses excluding firms with 'Don't know' or missing data in either of two underlying variables)



Figure 10 explores this overlap further by looking how the degree of digitalisation readiness corresponds with whether a climate action plan is in place. A substantially smaller proportion of the firms with a climate action plan in place reported that they had no digitalisation plan. The link is less apparent, however, at the highest degree of digitalisation (fully embedded) where the proportion is approximately equal whether or not the firm has a climate action plan in place. The next section looks more deeply at the potential firm factors linked to both digital and climate actions and the linkages between them.

Figure 10: Digital readiness and climate plan (% of responses)



4 Econometric analysis

In this section, we explore the links between firm characteristics and both digital and climate plans or actions. We first look at each of the two strategies separately and then the interaction between them. We look at several outcome variables on both digital and climate attitudes and actions and then at the determinants of having both plans simultaneously. Given the categorical nature of these variables (with two to five potential outcomes), we use either logit, ordered logit or multinomial logit specifications as the most appropriate for each question structure. For each outcome, we examine the relationship with firm employment (including squared term), productivity (measured as value-added per employee), R&D intensity, 5-year turnover growth and energy intensity), nationality of ownership and sector.

In this section, we present the results as average marginal effects. The corresponding logistic regression coefficients for each table can be found in the appendix. To visually show the relationship with explanatory continuous variables, we calculate predicted values across a range of different values for firm employment, productivity, R&D intensity, turnover growth and energy intensity. These are presented graphically in Figures A1-A13 in appendix. All three sets of results use consistent numbering from 1 to 13.

The average marginal effects for determinants of firm digitalisation are presented in Table 4 with the predictions across different firm characteristics graphed in Figure A1. As the responses to the question on digital readiness were on a 5-point scale, we use an ordered logit specification to examine which characteristics are most associated with increasing levels of digital preparedness. The results for each response category are shown across columns 1a to 1e in Table 4 and were estimated as a single regression. The final column (specification 2) in Table 4 combined the categories of digital readiness into a single indicator of whether the firm has a digital plan or not to apply a binary logit specification. We assign a zero to firms responding that they had no digital plan in place and a 1 to those with any plan, including a tentative one, in place. The predictive margins across different firm characteristics are shown in Figure A2.

For both the five-point scale and the binary outcomes, the results show a significant positive relationship between firm size and the likelihood of having a digital plan in place and of having a higher degree of digital readiness. Higher firm productivity (proxied by value-added per employee) is also positively related to greater digital readiness, although this is more apparent in having some type of digital plan in place than it is for the difference in probabilities across the 5-point scale of digital readiness.

Table 4: Digitalisation regression average marginal effects results

	(1a)	(1b)	(1c)	(1d)	(1e)	(2)
	Digital readiness					
	No plan	Tentative plan	Defined plan	Innovation strategy	Fully embedded	Have any digital plan
ln(empl)	-0.015**	0.002*	0.004***	0.005***	-0.015**	0.030***
	(0.006)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.006)	(0.008)
VA per empl.	0.802*	-0.138*	-0.007	0.022*	0.038*	0.288**
	(0.447)	(0.077)	(0.004)	(0.012)	(0.021)	(0.117)
Exporter dummy	0.367***	-0.065**	-0.000	0.011**	0.018**	0.092***
	(0.141)	(0.025)	(0.001)	(0.005)	(0.007)	(0.028)
Foreign dummy	0.507	-0.082*	-0.012	0.011**	0.022*	0.073
	(0.310)	(0.046)	(0.012)	(0.005)	(0.013)	(0.067)
5-year growth	0.422***	-0.073***	-0.004*	0.012***	0.020***	0.090**
	(0.152)	(0.026)	(0.002)	(0.004)	(0.007)	(0.037)
R&D intensity	2.850***	-0.490***	-0.024**	0.078***	0.134***	0.438***
	(0.359)	(0.062)	(0.009)	(0.013)	(0.018)	(0.094)
Energy intensity	-2.595**	0.446**	0.022	-0.071**	-0.122**	-0.269
	(1.148)	(0.197)	(0.014)	(0.032)	(0.054)	(0.227)
5-year energy change	-13.899**	2.391**	0.118	-0.380**	-0.652**	-1.859
	(6.524)	(1.121)	(0.072)	(0.181)	(0.308)	(1.405)
Food, Drink & Primary	-0.080	0.018	-0.005	-0.005	-0.004	-0.030
	(0.141)	(0.033)	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.008)	(0.036)
Modern Manuf.	0.399**	-0.089**	0.015***	0.026**	0.025**	0.102**
	(0.158)	(0.035)	(0.006)	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.041)
Energy, Water, Waste	0.519***	-0.115***	0.016***	0.033***	0.033***	0.148***
	(0.185)	(0.040)	(0.005)	(0.012)	(0.013)	(0.051)
ICT	2.062***	-0.345***	-0.098***	0.071***	0.141***	0.358***
	(0.135)	(0.022)	(0.014)	(0.008)	(0.012)	(0.027)
Business, Fin. & Prof.	1.384***	-0.267***	-0.025**	0.073***	0.099***	0.244***
	(0.131)	(0.024)	(0.010)	(0.008)	(0.010)	(0.030)
Observations			2,058			2,058
Pseudo R2			0.121			0.169

Robust standard errors in parentheses, *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Firms with greater research and development expenditure (scaled by firm sales) are considerably more likely to have higher degrees of digital readiness. We also control for a longer-term growth trajectory of the firm using average turnover growth between 2015 and 2020, which also shows that higher growth firms are more likely to be more digitally advanced (although the direction of causation may go in both directions here). This question allows us to exploit some of the time series of the survey prior to the introduction of digitalization and climate-related questions in 2020. We also find that the patterns across the sector controls are broadly in line with those noted in the summary statistics even once other firm characteristics are accounted for, with services sector firms considerably more likely to have higher levels of digitalisation in place (relative to the reference sector of traditional manufacturing).

Table 5: Climate action regression average marginal effects results

	(3a)	(3b)	(3c)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	Importance of climate action			Have climate plan	Measure CO_2	On-site renewab.	Important, no action
	Not	Moderate	Very				
ln(empl)	-0.031***	-0.007***	0.038***	0.058***	0.058***	0.028***	-0.036***
	(0.007)	(0.003)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.010)
VA per empl.	0.030	0.004	-0.034	0.293***	0.182***	0.048	-0.180
	(0.081)	(0.010)	(0.091)	(0.072)	(0.056)	(0.073)	(0.142)
Exporter dummy	0.000	0.000	-0.000	0.035	-0.047*	-0.001	0.046
	(0.022)	(0.003)	(0.025)	(0.027)	(0.025)	(0.024)	(0.036)
Foreign dummy	0.050	-0.001	-0.049	0.002	0.043**	-0.073***	-0.212**
	(0.060)	(0.009)	(0.052)	(0.024)	(0.021)	(0.017)	(0.097)
5-year growth	-0.042*	-0.005	0.047*	-0.004	0.029	0.000	0.012
	(0.025)	(0.004)	(0.028)	(0.031)	(0.028)	(0.027)	(0.040)
R&D intensity	-0.014	-0.002	0.015	0.127*	0.054	-0.000	-0.040
	(0.056)	(0.007)	(0.063)	(0.066)	(0.052)	(0.061)	(0.097)
Energy intensity	-0.284	-0.035	0.319	0.155	0.415***	0.291*	-0.032
	(0.182)	(0.025)	(0.204)	(0.245)	(0.146)	(0.161)	(0.305)
5-year energy change	1.048	0.129	-1.177	-2.949**	-1.287	-0.433	2.009
	(1.031)	(0.135)	(1.157)	(1.229)	(0.979)	(1.018)	(1.723)
Food, Drink & Primary	-0.082***	-0.077***	0.160***	0.142***	0.104***	0.075***	-0.172***
	(0.015)	(0.018)	(0.031)	(0.034)	(0.027)	(0.028)	(0.037)
Modern Manuf.	0.015	0.004	-0.019	0.005	0.030	0.057**	0.028
	(0.024)	(0.006)	(0.030)	(0.030)	(0.024)	(0.027)	(0.045)
Energy, Water, Waste	-0.014	-0.006	0.020	0.002	0.035	0.150***	-0.084
	(0.030)	(0.015)	(0.045)	(0.047)	(0.039)	(0.051)	(0.059)
ICT	0.112***	-0.004	-0.108***	-0.065**	-0.028	-0.026	0.011
	(0.024)	(0.007)	(0.022)	(0.026)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.039)
Business, Fin. & Prof.	0.061***	0.007	-0.068***	-0.000	0.020	0.003	-0.035
	(0.023)	(0.005)	(0.025)	(0.028)	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.038)
Observations		2,100		2,311	2,318	2,008	1,658
Pseudo R2		0.041		0.085	0.153	0.066	0.032

Robust standard errors in parentheses, *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

We next examine how these firm characteristics are associated with the different measures of climate adaption action. The average marginal effects are shown in Table 5 with the variation across specific firm characteristics graphed in Figures A2 to A7. Four different dependent variables are examined: a 3-point scale of the importance of climate action (columns 3a-3c, estimated with ordered logit), a binary indicator of if the firm has a climate plan in place (column 4), a binary indicator for if the firm measures their CO_2 emissions (column 5) and an indicator of whether the firm provides some of its own energy through on-site renewables (column 6). The final column (7) looks at the firm characteristics associated with reporting a positive attitude to climate action (agreeing to its importance) but without taking any of the specific actions mention in the survey (no climate plan, not measuring CO_2, no on-site renewables). The first of the specifications in Table 5 is estimated using an ordered logit and the others use a logit specification. The same firm characteristics are used as in the digital estimations.

A number of differences are apparent between the characteristics associated with digitalisation and those associated with the different climate responses. The key point of similarity is in firm size, which is strongly positively related to all of the climate strategies examined. Firm productivity is also positively linked to climate actions in the case of having a climate plan in place and measuring CO_2 emissions but does not impact how the firm ranks the importance of having a climate plan in place. In contrast to the results on digitalisation, R&D intensity is significant only in the case of having a climate plan but not for the other indicators and turnover growth has limited effect. As anticipated, energy intensity is significantly related to measurement of emissions and generation of own on-site energy. More surprisingly, we do not find any link between energy intensity and having a climate plan or ranking climate plans as important to the business once the other firm characteristics have been controlled for.

Examining the characteristics of the group of firms reporting a positive disposition towards the importance of climate action but not having any specific plan in place are shown in the final column of Table 5 and in Figure A7. These are consistently found to be smaller firms and significantly more likely to be Irish-owned. There is little significant variation across sectors with the exception of the food, drink and primary sector, where fewer firms fall into this category.

4.1 Overlap of digital and climate plans

The final element of the analysis is to examine the correlation between having a climate and a digital plan while controlling for a range of other firm characteristics. We approach this question in two separate ways. In first approach, we use multinomial logit with variable with four possible outcomes (no plans, only digital, only climate, both plans) as described in section 3.3. This way we investigate the characteristics of firms based on each outcome. In second approach we use digital readiness index as explanatory variable of climate action to see if more digital firms are more likely to have climate action, while controlling for all other firm characteristics.

The average marginal effects reported in Table 6 and corresponding predictions in Figure A8 show results of the multinomial logit regression. The regression compares firms with neither a digital or climate plan to those with a digital plan only, a climate plan only and firms that have both. This allows for the firm characteristics to vary in their impact for the different options. These results show a strong correlation of both strategies at the firm level, particularly as firm size increases. Where firms have one of a digital or climate plan in place, the digital plan is more likely across a range of firm characteristics. As the data is cross-sectional, we cannot however draw any line of causation from one to the other. The correlation is however one of potential importance in terms of how policy might be coordinated to achieve both aims simultaneously.

Table 6: Overlap of digital and climate plans, average marginal effects results

	(8a)	(8b)	(8c)	(8d)
	Neither	Only digital plan	Only climate plan	Both plans
ln(empl)	-0.030***	-0.016*	0.001	0.044***
	(0.008)	(0.009)	(0.004)	(0.008)
VA per empl.	-0.301**	0.111	0.017	0.173*
	(0.123)	(0.118)	(0.040)	(0.093)
Exporter dummy	-0.080***	0.032	-0.006	0.053**
	(0.029)	(0.032)	(0.015)	(0.026)
Foreign dummy	0.011	-0.197*	-0.041***	0.227**
	(0.085)	(0.104)	(0.005)	(0.109)
5-year growth	-0.078**	0.071**	0.005	0.003
	(0.037)	(0.036)	(0.023)	(0.034)
R&D intensity	-0.307***	0.243***	-0.130	0.194***
	(0.098)	(0.088)	(0.082)	(0.073)
Energy intensity	0.403*	-0.352	-0.041	-0.010
	(0.229)	(0.285)	(0.103)	(0.249)
5-year energy change	1.629	0.466	-0.028	-2.067
	(1.414)	(1.571)	(0.733)	(1.273)
Food, Drink & Primary	-0.011	-0.133***	0.051**	0.093***
	(0.038)	(0.037)	(0.020)	(0.033)
Modern Manuf.	-0.105***	0.123***	0.004	-0.022
	(0.041)	(0.043)	(0.018)	(0.032)
Energy, Water, Waste	-0.142***	0.134**	-0.004	0.011
	(0.051)	(0.057)	(0.021)	(0.043)
ICT	-0.322***	0.378***	-0.035***	-0.022
	(0.028)	(0.034)	(0.012)	(0.028)
Business, Fin. & Prof.	-0.217***	0.215***	-0.030***	0.033
	(0.031)	(0.035)	(0.011)	(0.029)
Observations		1,897		
Pseudo R2		0.130		

Robust standard errors in parentheses, *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Final set of results in Table 7 again looks at climate action outcomes. This table is analogous to Table 5, with addition of four dummies that measure firm's digital readiness. The inclusion of digital readiness does not substantially change the predictions for other covariates. Thus, this section will only focus on how digital readiness correlates with climate action, while controlling for other observable firm characteristics. Because we are limited to cross-sectional data we cannot establish the direction of causality or if some unobserved characteristics is driving both climate and digital action.

The predictions of digital-readiness dummies are shown in Figures 11 and 12. The results show that more digital firms are significantly more likely to say that climate action is very important for their business, more likely to have climate action plan, measure CO_2 and have on-site renewables, even after controlling for other firm characteristics. More digital firms are less likely to say climate action is important, but then do not report any of the three climate actions in the survey. In all five regressions, the probabilities increase rapidly at lower levels of digital readiness, while the highly digital companies are not more involved in climate action compared to moderately digital-ready companies.

Table 7: Digital readiness as corelate of climate action, average marginal effects results

	(9a)	(9b)	(9c)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
	Importance of climate action			Have climate plan	Measure CO_2	On-site renewab.	Important, no action
	Not	Moderate	Very				
Digital tentative plan	-0.087***	0.008*	0.079***	0.119***	0.037**	0.029	-0.090***
	(0.019)	(0.005)	(0.017)	(0.021)	(0.017)	(0.020)	(0.032)
Digital defined plan	-0.140***	-0.009	0.149***	0.180***	0.085***	0.069**	-0.114***
	(0.022)	(0.009)	(0.026)	(0.029)	(0.024)	(0.030)	(0.039)
Digital innovation	-0.150***	-0.016	0.166***	0.248***	0.093***	0.093***	-0.207***
	(0.023)	(0.012)	(0.030)	(0.035)	(0.027)	(0.033)	(0.041)
Digital embedded	-0.121***	-0.000	0.122***	0.249***	0.061**	0.029	-0.189***
	(0.028)	(0.008)	(0.032)	(0.037)	(0.027)	(0.031)	(0.044)
ln(empl)	-0.029***	-0.005*	0.034***	0.038***	0.048***	0.019***	-0.034***
	(0.007)	(0.003)	(0.007)	(0.008)	(0.006)	(0.007)	(0.011)
VA per empl.	0.065	0.008	-0.072	0.112	0.147**	-0.104	-0.170
	(0.081)	(0.010)	(0.091)	(0.094)	(0.074)	(0.103)	(0.147)
Exporter dummy	0.004	0.000	-0.004	0.033	-0.050*	-0.010	0.046
	(0.022)	(0.003)	(0.025)	(0.029)	(0.026)	(0.027)	(0.037)
Foreign dummy	0.066	-0.004	-0.062	0.123	0.246***	-0.075*	-0.207**
	(0.058)	(0.012)	(0.046)	(0.088)	(0.091)	(0.040)	(0.098)
5-year growth	-0.040	-0.005	0.044	-0.015	0.036	-0.012	0.018
	(0.025)	(0.003)	(0.027)	(0.034)	(0.029)	(0.030)	(0.040)
R&D intensity	0.052	0.006	-0.058	-0.033	0.024	-0.040	0.042
	(0.058)	(0.007)	(0.065)	(0.075)	(0.056)	(0.068)	(0.101)
Energy intensity	-0.321*	-0.039	0.360*	0.065	0.328**	0.248	-0.048
	(0.182)	(0.026)	(0.203)	(0.243)	(0.160)	(0.183)	(0.309)
5-year energy change	0.721	0.087	-0.808	-1.704	-1.896**	-1.087	1.261
	(1.045)	(0.129)	(1.170)	(1.350)	(0.959)	(1.117)	(1.747)
Food, Drink & Primary	-0.079***	-0.099***	0.178***	0.167***	0.080***	0.079**	-0.169***
	(0.013)	(0.020)	(0.031)	(0.037)	(0.029)	(0.032)	(0.035)
Modern Manuf.	0.026	0.011	-0.038	-0.036	-0.022	0.025	0.043
	(0.022)	(0.009)	(0.031)	(0.038)	(0.026)	(0.034)	(0.046)
Energy, Water, Waste	0.000	0.000	-0.001	-0.018	0.011	0.145***	-0.064
	(0.029)	(0.017)	(0.046)	(0.049)	(0.037)	(0.054)	(0.059)
ICT	0.168***	-0.008	-0.161***	-0.133***	-0.037*	-0.044*	0.099**
	(0.026)	(0.010)	(0.024)	(0.030)	(0.022)	(0.024)	(0.042)
Business, Fin. & Prof.	0.094***	0.014**	-0.108***	-0.063**	0.004	-0.016	0.013
	(0.023)	(0.007)	(0.025)	(0.031)	(0.023)	(0.025)	(0.039)
Observations		2,054		2,054	2,054	1,888	1,884
Pseudo R2		0.056		0.104	0.144	0.063	0.046

Figure 11: Predictive margins of digital readiness of ordered logit regression on importance of climate action



Figure 12: Predictive margins of digital readiness of logit regressions on climate action



5 Conclusions and policy implications

Firms across the world are facing a "twin transition" in the form of structural shifts in increased digital technologies and in the adaptation to climate change. This paper looks at the how firms in Ireland are undertaking actions to meet these challenges. We examine the extent to which firm characteristics are related to the degree of digital usage and how firms have developed climate plans and actions such as measuring their CO_2 emissions and having on-site renewables like solar panels or heat pumps. A key focus of the paper is how actions to meet these dual challenges are correlated within firms. The potential intersection of the twin transition challenges has been emphasised in much discussion of policy implications, particularly in regard to the potential for digital technologies to help reduce reliance on high-carbon sources of energy. However, data constraints have meant that empirical analysis has tended to examine one or the other of the two challenges.

This research examines this overlap, initially examining actions on both digitalisation and climate actions separately and then exploring if there is evidence suggesting that they are used as complementary strategies at the level of the individual firm. Our most consistent finding relates to the strong relationship between firm size and all measures of digitalisation and of climate action planning. Productivity and R&D expenditure are particularly linked to have higher degrees of digital readiness. Firm productivity is also positively linked to climate actions such as having a climate plan in place and measuring CO_2 emissions but does not impact how the firm ranks the importance of having a climate plan in the first instance. Another factor that appears to strongly motivate climate actions is the proportion of firm expenditures that are allocated to energy.

On the key question of overlap between digitalisation and climate planning, we find a strong correlation between pursuing both strategies simultaneously event while controlling for a range of other firm characteristics such as size which impacts both directly. The correlation is of potential importance to policy design in terms of having a holistic approach to addressing both challenges in a complementary way. One caveat to the analysis is that the short time span of data available did not allow us to infer causation from one strategy to another or to examine the ordering, if any, of the firm's actions.

Specifically on the climate transition challenge, we find a relatively sizeable gap between the share of firms that regard addressing the climate challenge as being important and those that have taken active steps such as developing a climate action plan or measuring CO_2 emissions. Almost twice as many firms respond that a climate response plan is either very or moderately important than report having a climate action plan in place. These are typically smaller firms, suggesting this is a group requiring targeted policy support if the gap between a positive attitude to climate planning and action at a firm level is to be bridged.

The consistent finding that actions on both digitalisation and climate change are less likely amongst smaller firms is a key one for policy development. One area that could guide this

policy development further is a deeper understanding of the extent to which uncertainty is delaying investments, given the rapid evolution of digital and climate-friendly technologies relative to other barriers to general investment such as access to finance.

6 References

Adarov, Amat, David Klenert, Robert Marschinski, and Robert Stehrer (2022). "Productivity drivers: empirical evidence on the role of digital and intangible capital, FDI and integration." *Applied Economics* (2022): 1-17.

Axenbeck, Janna and Niebel, Thomas (2021). "Climate protection potentials of digitalized production processes: Microeconometric evidence?", ZEW Discussion Papers, No. 21-105.

Balsmeier, Benjamin and Martin Woerter (2019). "Is this time different? How digitalization influences job creation and destruction", in *Research Policy* 48 (2019) 103765

Bernstein, R. and Madlener, R. (2010), "Impact of disaggregated ICT capital on electricity intensity in European manufacturing", in *Applied Economics Letters* 17(17), 1691–1695.

Blasi, S., Caporin, M., & Fontini, F. (2018). "A multidimensional analysis of the relationship between corporate social responsibility and firms' economic performance." *Ecological Economics*, *147*, 218-229.

Boone, Laurence and Debora Revoltella (2019) "Policy change needed to accelerate investment in structural transformation" VoxEU Policy Portal 12/12/19.

Cirillo, Valeria, Lucrezia Fanti, Andrea Mina and Anrea Ricci (2021). "Digitalizing firms: Skills, work organization and the adoption of new enabling technologies", LEM Working Paper Series, No. 2021/04.

DeStefano, Timothy, Koen De Backer and Laurent Moussiegt (2017). "Determinants of digital technology use by companies", OECD Science, Technology and Innovation Policy papers, June 2017 No. 40.

Douenne, T., & Fabre, A. (2020). "French attitudes on climate change, carbon taxation and other climate policies", *Ecological Economics*, 169, 106496.

Dwivedi, Yogesh K., Laurie Hughes, Arpan Kumar Kar, Abdullah M. Baabdullah, Purva Grover, Roba Abbas, Daniela Andreini, Iyad Abumoghli, Yves Barlette, Deborah Bunker, Leona Chandra Kruse, Ioanna Constantiou, Robert M. Davison, Rahul De', Rameshwar Dubey, Henry Fenby-Taylor, Babita Gupta, Wu He, Mitsuru Kodama, Matti Mäntymäki, Bhimaraya Metri, Katina Michae, Johan Olaisen, Niki Panteli, Samuli Pekkola, Rohit

Nishant, Ramakrishnan Raman, Nripendra P. Rana, Frantz Rowe, Suprateek Sarker, Brenda Scholtz, Maung Sein, Jeel Dharmeshkumar Shah, Thompson S.H. Teo, Manoj Kumar Tiwari, Morten Thanning Vendelø and Michael Wade (2022). "Climate change and COP26: Are digital technologies and information management part of the problem or the solution? An editorial reflection and call to action" in *International Journal of Information Management*, Vol. 63 (2022) 102456.

Elkerbout, Milan, Christian Egenhofer, Vasileios Rizos and Julie Bryhn (2021). "European Green Deal Towards a Resilient and Sustainable Post-Pandemic Recovery", Centre for European Policy Studies (CEPS) Task Force Working Group Report.

European Union (2021). "Survey on the contribution of ICT to the environmental sustainability actions of EU enterprises" https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/library/survey-contribution-ict-environmental-sustainability-actions-eu-enterprises

Gal, Peter, Giuseppe Nicoletti, Theodore Renault, Stéphane Sorbe, Christina Timiliotis (2019), "Digitalisation and productivity: In search of the holy grail – Firm-level empirical evidence from EU countries", OECD Economics Department Working Papers, No. 1533, OECD Publishing, Paris.

George, Gerard, Ryan K. Merrill and Simon J. D. Schillebeeckx (2021). "Digital Sustainability and Entrepreneurship: How Digital Innovations Are Helping Tackle Climate Change and Sustainable Development" in *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 45(5) 999–1027.

George, Gerard and Simon J. D. Schillebeeckx (2021). "Digital sustainability and its implications for finance and climate change" Lee Kong Chian School of Business 4-2021.

Mollet, Frederico (2021). "How to get European businesses to digitalise", European Policy Centre Policy Brief 14/7/21.

Revoltella, Debora (2020). "COVID-19 and the Twin Transition: How the Recovery Can Boost Sustainable and Inclusive Growth" in *Intereconomics,* Vol. 55, Iss. 6, pp. 352-355, http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10272-020-0931-z.

Schulte, P., Welsch, H. and Rexhäuser, S. (2016). "ICT and the demand for energy: Evidence from OECD countries", in *Environmental and Resource Economics* 63(1), 119–146

Siedschlag, Iulia and Weijie Yan (2020). “Green investments and firm performance”, ESRI Working Paper No. 672.

Siedschlag, Iulia and Weijie Yan (2021). “Firms’ green investments: What factors matter?” in *Journal of Cleaner Production* 310, 127554.

Figure A1: Predictive margins of ordered logit regression for degree of digital readiness with 95% confidence intervals



Figure A2: Predictive margins of logit regression for having a digital plan with 95% confidence intervals



Figure A3: Predictive margins of ordered logit regression for importance of climate action with 95% confidence intervals



Figure A4: Predictive margins of logit regression for having a climate plan with 95% confidence intervals



Figure A5: Predictive margins of logit regression for firm measuring CO_2 emissions with 95% confidence intervals



Figure A6: Predictive margins of logit regression for firm having on-site renewable energy with 95% confidence intervals



Figure A7: Predictive margins of logit regression for firm not making climate action, despite saying it is important with 95% confidence intervals



Figure A8: Predictive margins of multinomial logit regression for firm having climate and/or digital plan with 95% confidence intervals



Figure A9: Predictive margins of ordered logit regression for importance of climate action with 95% confidence intervals (regression with digital readiness dummies)



Figure A10: Predictive margins of logit regression for having a climate plan with 95% confidence intervals (regression with digital readiness dummies)



Figure A11: Predictive margins of logit regression for firm measuring CO2 emissions with 95% confidence intervals (regression with digital readiness dummies)



Figure A12: Predictive margins of logit regression for firm having on-site renewable energy with 95% confidence intervals (regression with digital readiness dummies)



Figure A13: Predictive margins of logit regression for firm not making climate action, despite saying it is important with 95% confidence intervals (regression with digital readiness dummies)



Table A: Regression coefficients corresponding to marginal effects reported in Table 4

	(1) Digital readiness (ordered logit)	(2) Any digital plan (logit)
ln(empl)	-0.290**	-0.313
	(0.127)	(0.191)
ln(empl) squared	0.056***	0.073***
	(0.017)	(0.027)
VA per empl.	0.817*	1.673**
	(0.440)	(0.687)
Exporter dummy	0.409***	0.514***
	(0.138)	(0.153)
Foreign dummy	0.445	0.452
	(0.313)	(0.443)
5-year growth	0.463***	0.526**
	(0.151)	(0.215)
R&D intensity	2.812***	2.549***
	(0.358)	(0.559)
Energy intensity		-1.564
		(1.323)
5-year energy change		-10.810
		(8.179)
Food, Drink & Primary	-0.088	-0.130
	(0.141)	(0.155)
Modern Manuf.	0.417***	0.461**
	(0.157)	(0.186)
Energy, Water, Waste	0.561***	0.685***
	(0.185)	(0.249)
ICT	2.095***	2.202***
	(0.134)	(0.205)
Business, Fin. & Prof.	1.424***	1.222***
	(0.129)	(0.157)
/cut1	0.292	
	(0.286)	
/cut2	1.757***	
	(0.289)	
/cut3	2.587***	
	(0.292)	
/cut4	3.578***	
	(0.296)	
Constant		-0.540
		(0.380)
Observations	2,068	2,058
Pseudo R2	0.119	0.169

Robust standard errors in parentheses, *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table B: Regression coefficients corresponding to marginal effects reported in Table 5

	(3) Climate importance (ordered logit)	(4) Have climate plan (logit)	(5) Measure CO_2 (logit)	(6) On-site renewables (logit)	(7) Important, but no action (logit)
ln(empl)	0.053	-0.286**	-0.224	-0.401**	0.096
	(0.128)	(0.136)	(0.199)	(0.172)	(0.158)
ln(empl) squared	0.023	0.087***	0.098***	0.088***	-0.038*
	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.024)	(0.022)	(0.022)
VA per empl.	-0.187	1.787***	1.759***	0.446	-0.773
	(0.503)	(0.445)	(0.544)	(0.687)	(0.610)
Exporter dummy	-0.000	0.219	-0.414**	-0.008	0.200
	(0.138)	(0.180)	(0.205)	(0.224)	(0.159)
Foreign dummy	-0.290	0.014	0.385**	-0.813***	-1.049*
	(0.327)	(0.145)	(0.174)	(0.227)	(0.602)
5-year growth	0.261*	-0.025	0.276	0.002	0.053
	(0.156)	(0.192)	(0.266)	(0.254)	(0.173)
R&D intensity	0.086	0.774*	0.519	-0.001	-0.172
	(0.352)	(0.405)	(0.506)	(0.570)	(0.415)
Energy intensity	1.768	0.943	4.011***	2.726*	-0.139
	(1.130)	(1.491)	(1.420)	(1.507)	(1.311)
5-year energy change	-6.527	-17.969**	-12.427	-4.055	8.625
	(6.423)	(7.512)	(9.443)	(9.532)	(7.406)
Food, Drink & Primary	0.715***	0.724***	0.834***	0.622***	-0.769***
	(0.136)	(0.169)	(0.206)	(0.217)	(0.172)
Modern Manuf.	-0.097	0.026	0.280	0.492**	0.116
	(0.155)	(0.179)	(0.219)	(0.227)	(0.186)
Energy, Water, Waste	0.099	0.013	0.322	1.069***	-0.355
	(0.217)	(0.280)	(0.343)	(0.298)	(0.255)
ICT	-0.637***	-0.427**	-0.320	-0.306	0.044
	(0.133)	(0.172)	(0.222)	(0.235)	(0.159)
Business, Fin. & Prof.	-0.373***	-0.003	0.196	0.035	-0.147
	(0.139)	(0.165)	(0.210)	(0.224)	(0.158)
/cut1	-1.021***				
	(0.283)				
/cut2	1.484***				
	(0.287)				
Constant		-1.898***	-2.774***	-1.942***	-0.112
		(0.347)	(0.468)	(0.407)	(0.330)
Observations	2,100	2,311	2,318	2,008	1,658
Pseudo R2	0.0413	0.0848	0.153	0.0656	0.0323

Robust standard errors in parentheses, *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table C: Regression coefficients corresponding to marginal effects reported in Table 6

	(8a) Only digital	(8b) Only climate plan	(8c) Both plans
ln(empl)	-0.453**	-0.396	-0.340
	(0.227)	(0.397)	(0.252)
ln(empl) squared	0.084***	0.084	0.106***
	(0.032)	(0.053)	(0.034)
VA per empl.	1.657**	1.622	2.342***
	(0.798)	(1.193)	(0.908)
Exporter dummy	0.428**	0.135	0.676***
	(0.178)	(0.376)	(0.244)
Foreign dummy	-0.604	-13.388***	0.785
	(0.629)	(0.484)	(0.554)
5-year growth	0.536**	0.411	0.377
	(0.227)	(0.639)	(0.303)
R&D intensity	2.141***	-2.092	2.565***
	(0.594)	(2.227)	(0.707)
Energy intensity	-2.714*	-2.576	-1.900
	(1.559)	(2.862)	(1.973)
5-year energy change	-6.349	-7.472	-18.990*
	(9.422)	(20.175)	(10.994)
Food, Drink & Primary	-0.423**	0.794***	0.466**
	(0.211)	(0.305)	(0.214)
Modern Manuf.	0.614***	0.400	0.195
	(0.210)	(0.411)	(0.279)
Energy, Water, Waste	0.779***	0.359	0.535
	(0.287)	(0.546)	(0.352)
ICT	2.387***	0.218	1.557***
	(0.225)	(0.633)	(0.280)
Business, Fin. & Prof.	1.293***	-0.299	1.018***
	(0.180)	(0.479)	(0.226)
Constant	-0.349	-1.992**	-2.120***
	(0.446)	(0.851)	(0.550)
Observations		1,888	
Pseudo R2		0.130	

Estimates relative to neither digital nor climate plan.
Robust standard errors in parentheses, *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table D: Regression coefficients corresponding to marginal effects reported in Table 7

	(9) Climate importance (ordered logit)	(10) Have climate plan (logit)	(11) Measure CO_2 (logit)	(12) On-site renewables (logit)	(13) Important, but no action (logit)
Digital tentative plan	0.495***	0.967***	0.486**	0.302	-0.386***
	(0.110)	(0.175)	(0.225)	(0.202)	(0.139)
Digital defined plan	0.868***	1.320***	0.953***	0.633**	-0.489***
	(0.147)	(0.205)	(0.255)	(0.255)	(0.173)
Digital innovation	0.951***	1.673***	1.019***	0.807***	-0.920***
	(0.164)	(0.220)	(0.270)	(0.259)	(0.193)
Digital embedded	0.729***	1.680***	0.738**	0.297	-0.832***
	(0.180)	(0.237)	(0.305)	(0.304)	(0.207)
ln(empl)	0.121	0.084	-0.055	-0.378**	0.024
	(0.132)	(0.174)	(0.257)	(0.190)	(0.163)
ln(empl) squared	0.010	0.024	0.078**	0.079***	-0.026
	(0.018)	(0.023)	(0.033)	(0.026)	(0.023)
VA per empl.	-0.410	0.725	1.621**	-0.954	-0.743
	(0.514)	(0.612)	(0.821)	(0.942)	(0.641)
Exporter dummy	-0.023	0.220	-0.492**	-0.093	0.203
	(0.141)	(0.207)	(0.232)	(0.235)	(0.165)
Foreign dummy	-0.384	0.694	1.685***	-0.937	-1.027*
	(0.311)	(0.443)	(0.455)	(0.725)	(0.597)
5-year growth	0.252	-0.100	0.400	-0.111	0.078
	(0.156)	(0.223)	(0.322)	(0.273)	(0.176)
R&D intensity	-0.329	-0.217	0.264	-0.364	0.181
	(0.369)	(0.486)	(0.622)	(0.631)	(0.439)
Energy intensity	2.042*	0.426	3.607**	2.282	-0.211
	(1.152)	(1.582)	(1.775)	(1.681)	(1.349)
5-year energy change	-4.579	-11.077	-20.857**	-10.010	5.498
	(6.636)	(8.788)	(10.551)	(10.277)	(7.619)
Food, Drink & Primary	0.785***	0.832***	0.683***	0.599***	-0.795***
	(0.137)	(0.183)	(0.234)	(0.230)	(0.174)
Modern Manuf.	-0.190	-0.212	-0.260	0.213	0.183
	(0.157)	(0.229)	(0.307)	(0.282)	(0.192)
Energy, Water, Waste	-0.004	-0.103	0.110	0.975***	-0.281
	(0.224)	(0.287)	(0.371)	(0.312)	(0.262)
ICT	-0.973***	-0.939***	-0.451*	-0.493*	0.415**
	(0.146)	(0.211)	(0.273)	(0.269)	(0.177)
Business, Fin. & Prof.	-0.597***	-0.386**	0.039	-0.160	0.054
	(0.143)	(0.190)	(0.246)	(0.251)	(0.164)
/cut1	-0.723**				
	(0.294)				
/cut2	1.839***				
	(0.300)				
Constant		-2.881***	-3.401***	-1.891***	0.227
		(0.428)	(0.579)	(0.431)	(0.346)
Observations	2,054	1,888	1,884	1,651	1,622
Pseudo R2	0.056	0.104	0.144	0.063	0.046

Robust standard errors in parentheses, *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1