

EU Open Digital Ecosystems Consultation Analysis

Domain: security - Complete Analysis

Documented Insights Analysis System

February 2026

Contents

EU Open Digital Ecosystems Consultation	1
Security and Privacy	1
Executive Summary	1
Market Sentiment Overview	1
Term Usage Patterns	2
Sentiment and Advocacy Patterns	3
Related Themes and Context	3
Sub-theme Distribution	4
Policy Considerations	4
Methodology	4
LLM Position Analysis - Security	5

EU Open Digital Ecosystems Consultation

Security and Privacy

Analysis date 06 February 2026
Domain scope Cybersecurity, data protection, vulnerability management, privacy concerns
Commission context NIS2 Directive, GDPR, Cyber Resilience Act, critical infrastructure protection

Executive Summary

This domain received substantial engagement across the consultation, with 613 responses (37.0% of corpus) addressing related themes. Respondents from 42 countries and 11 stakeholder types contributed, indicating broad interest across the EU.

Market Sentiment Overview

Coverage and Engagement

Metric	Value
Matching responses	613
Coverage of corpus	37.0%
Countries represented	42
Stakeholder types	11

Metric	Value
Organisations	219
Responses with attachments	117

Stakeholder Positions

The consultation response was dominated by EU Citizens (59.2%), followed by Companys (19.7%). This distribution suggests strong grassroots interest rather than primarily industry-driven advocacy.

Stakeholder Type	Responses	Countries	Percentage
EU Citizen	363	25	59.2%
Company	121	20	19.7%
NGO	47	16	7.7%
Non EU Citizen	27	18	4.4%
Academic Research Institution	21	10	3.4%
Other	15	10	2.4%
Business Association	8	5	1.3%
Public Authority	7	6	1.1%
Consumer Organisation	2	2	0.3%
Environmental Organisation	1	1	0.2%
Trade Union	1	1	0.2%

Geographic Distribution

Geographic engagement shows concentration in Germany (20.1%), with notable participation from Italy and Netherlands. The distribution across 42 countries indicates EU-wide relevance rather than localised concern.

Country	Responses	Percentage
Germany	123	20.1%
Italy	76	12.4%
Netherlands	72	11.7%
France	62	10.1%
Austria	34	5.5%
Belgium	33	5.4%
Poland	27	4.4%
Spain	21	3.4%
Sweden	19	3.1%
Portugal	17	2.8%
United Kingdom	15	2.4%
United States	14	2.3%
Finland	13	2.1%
Romania	12	2.0%
DNK	11	1.8%

Term Usage Patterns

Analysis of term concentration reveals how strongly specific concepts feature in responses compared to the broader consultation corpus. A strength score above 1.5 indicates the term

appears more frequently in this domain than in general discussion.

attack (strength: 2.5) Moderately concentrated in this domain

Positive framing – Used with: support, benefit, improve

Critical framing – Discussed alongside: limited, lack, problem

privacy (strength: 2.0) Moderately concentrated in this domain

Positive framing – Used with: support, supporting, improve

Critical framing – Discussed alongside: lack, barriers, barrier

vulnerability (strength: 1.8) Moderately concentrated in this domain

Positive framing – Used with: support, enables, enable

Critical framing – Discussed alongside: barriers, lack, limited

breach (strength: 1.6) Moderately concentrated in this domain

Positive framing – Used with: improve, improvement, improvements

Critical framing – Discussed alongside: limited, limits, problem

security (strength: 1.4) Standard usage frequency

Positive framing – Used with: support, supporting, strengthen

Critical framing – Discussed alongside: barriers, lack, limited

Sentiment and Advocacy Patterns

Language analysis reveals the tone and advocacy intensity of responses addressing this domain.

Language Pattern	Percentage of Responses
Action-oriented language	44.5%
Problem-focused language	40.0%
Solution-focused language	45.2%

Strong advocacy for specific actions – Advocacy level: High

Related Themes and Context

Terms that frequently co-occur with domain concepts reveal the broader context in which respondents frame this policy area.

Co-occurring Term	Occurrences	Documents	Document %
open	535	535	87.3%
source	481	481	78.5%
software	465	465	75.9%
security	402	402	65.6%
digital	383	383	62.5%
public	379	379	61.8%
european	364	364	59.4%
support	341	341	55.6%
sovereignty	336	336	54.8%

Co-occurring Term	Occurrences	Documents	Document %
infrastructure	313	313	51.1%
data	302	302	49.3%
open-source	278	278	45.4%
projects	274	274	44.7%
solutions	256	256	41.8%
europe	250	250	40.8%
code	250	250	40.8%
critical	249	249	40.6%
companies	247	247	40.3%
funding	247	247	40.3%
development	245	245	40.0%

Sub-theme Distribution

Responses addressing this domain cluster around distinct sub-themes, revealing specific areas of concern or opportunity. Note that responses may address multiple sub-themes.

Sub-theme	Responses	Percentage
Protection	505	82.4%
Compliance	321	52.4%
Threats	115	18.8%
Supply Chain	22	3.6%
Assessment	11	1.8%

Policy Considerations

Market Structure Signals

- Strong grassroots engagement suggests public concern extends beyond industry advocacy

Advocacy Intensity

- High action-oriented language indicates stakeholders expect policy intervention

Geographic Considerations

- Broad geographic engagement suggests EU-level relevance

Methodology

This analysis examines consultation responses through domain-specific keyword and keyphrase matching. Coverage statistics indicate the proportion of responses addressing the domain. Term usage strength compares domain-specific frequency to corpus-wide frequency. Sentiment analysis identifies language patterns without attributing positions to individual respondents.

Search parameters 46 terms (10 keywords, 36 keyphrases)

Analysis date 06 February 2026

LLM Position Analysis - Security

No position data available yet.

LLM extraction not yet run for this domain.

Run: `make llm-extract DOMAIN=security`