EU Open Digital Ecosystems Consultation Analysis

Domain: taxation - Complete Analysis

Documented Insights Analysis System

February 2026

Contents

EU Open Digital Ecosystems Consultation

Taxation and Fiscal Measures

Analysis date 07 February 2026
Domain scope Tax policy, levies, and fiscal incentives for open digital ecosystems
Commission context State aid framework, digital services tax, R&D tax credits for innovation

Executive Summary

This domain received substantial engagement across the consultation, with 422 responses (25.5% of corpus) addressing related themes. Respondents from 39 countries and 9 stakeholder types contributed, indicating broad interest across the EU.

Market Sentiment Overview

Coverage and Engagement

Metric	Value
Matching responses	422
Coverage of corpus	25.5%
Countries represented	39
Stakeholder types	9

Metric	Value
Organisations	155
Responses with attachments	83

Stakeholder Positions

The consultation response was dominated by EU Citizens (60.0%), followed by Companys (18.0%). This distribution suggests strong grassroots interest rather than primarily industry-driven advocacy.

Stakeholder Type	Responses	Countries	Percentage
EU Citizen	253	27	60.0%
Company	76	15	18.0%
NGO	39	14	9.2%
Academic Research Instittution	16	9	3.8%
Non EU Citizen	12	9	2.8%
Other	12	10	2.8%
Business Association	9	6	2.1%
Public Authority	4	4	0.9%
Trade Union	1	1	0.2%

Geographic Distribution

Geographic engagement shows concentration in Germany (26.5%), with notable participation from France and Italy. The distribution across 39 countries indicates EU-wide relevance rather than localised concern.

Country	Responses	Percentage
Germany	112	26.5%
France	44	10.4%
Italy	38	9.0%
Netherlands	36	8.5%
Belgium	23	5.5%
Poland	21	5.0%
Spain	18	4.3%
Austria	18	4.3%
Sweden	13	3.1%
Romania	9	2.1%
United Kingdom	9	2.1%
Portugal	9	2.1%
Finland	9	2.1%
DNK	8	1.9%
United States	7	1.7%

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.

tariff (strength: 3.9) Highly concentrated in this domain (appears 3x+ more than in general corpus)

Positive framing – Used with: improve

Critical framing – Discussed alongside: prevented

fiscal (strength: 3.2) Highly concentrated in this domain (appears 3x+ more than in general corpus)

Positive framing – Used with: support, supporting, enable

Critical framing – Discussed alongside: barriers, lack, prevent

tax (strength: 3.2) Highly concentrated in this domain (appears 3x+ more than in general corpus)

Positive framing – Used with: support, benefit, benefits

Critical framing – Discussed alongside: barriers, lack, problem

taxation (strength: 2.8) Moderately concentrated in this domain

Positive framing – Used with: support, strengthen, improve

Critical framing – Discussed alongside: limited, difficult, challenges

levy (strength: 2.6) Moderately concentrated in this domain

Positive framing – Used with: promote, support, benefit

Critical framing – Discussed alongside: insufficient, lacks, unlimited

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	49.3%
Problem-focused language	46.7%
Solution-focused language	52.4%

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	377	377	89.3%
funding	357	357	84.6%
source	340	340	80.6%
software	320	320	75.8%
public	297	297	70.4%
digital	273	273	64.7%
european	269	269	63.7%

Co-occurring Term	Occurrences	Documents	Document %
support	261	261	61.8%
projects	255	255	60.4%
infrastructure	235	235	55.7%
sovereignty	233	233	55.2%
security	213	213	50.5%
open-source	211	211	50.0%
development	196	196	46.4%
data	189	189	44.8%
companies	184	184	43.6%
solutions	181	181	42.9%
critical	176	176	41.7%
proprietary	175	175	41.5%
europe	171	171	40.5%

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
Revenue	75	17.8%
Levies	27	6.4%
Incentives	5	1.2%
Barriers	0	0.0%

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
- Concentration in Germany may reflect national policy priorities or industrial structure

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 31 terms (11 keywords, 20 keyphrases)
Analysis date 07 February 2026

LLM Position Analysis - Taxation

Generated: Sat Feb 7 00:01:57 2026

Stakeholder Positions

LLM Processing Status: 382 responses analysed across all domains (23.0% complete, 1249 remaining). **This domain**: 382 responses. Results are partial and will update as processing continues.

Analysis of positions extracted through LLM analysis of consultation responses. Extracted 1071 positions across 20 categories.

Position Overview

Position Category	Support	Oppose	Neutral/Mixed	Total
Public Funding	365	18	2	385
Tax Incentive	133	70	21	224
Digital Services Tax	135	44	4	183
Procurement Preference	141	6	2	149
Vat Exemption	57	11	7	75
State Aid	35	6	0	41
Regulatory Uncertainty	0	1	0	1
Taxation Policy	0	1	0	1
Vendor Lock In Reduction	1	0	0	1
Regulatory Support	1	0	0	1
Tax Havens	0	1	0	1
Education	1	0	0	1
Short Termism	0	1	0	1
Standards Leadership	1	0	0	1
Adversarial Interoperability	1	0	0	1
Digital Sovereignty	1	0	0	1
Extraterritorial Restrictions	0	1	0	1
Public Goods	1	0	0	1
Regulatory Clarity	1	0	0	1
Taxation Framework	0	0	1	1

Detailed Position Analysis

Public Funding

Total responses 385 positions extracted across 3 distinct responses
Support position 365 responses (94.8%), 47.4% express strong advocacy
Primary stakeholders (support) EU Citizens (178), Companies (95), NGOs (43)
Core arguments (support) Higher education institutions and research organisations have long formed the backbone of Europes open-source landscape, combining development, operation, and knowledge transfer with deep experience in open standards and federated models.; The EU should support open, independent browser engine alternatives through sustained and serious public funding to reduce systemic dependencies and ensure core internet infrastructure aligns with European values.
Opposition position 18 responses (4.7%), 22.2% express strong opposition

Core arguments (oppose) Throwing money at the problems won't change anything, as Big Tech will always spend more on lobbyists and pressure campaigns.; Die EU-Kommission verweigert seit über 20 Jahren eine Rechtsgrundlage für gemeinnützige Stiftungen in Europa.

Specific proposals mentioned dedicated maintenance grants (2 mentions); 1. Targeted funding for social infrastructure, including community governance, trust and safety tooling, content moderation support, and ethical AI integration. (1 mentions); Assign a budget to support existing fundamental projects, such as Blender. (1 mentions)

Evidence cited German Sovereign Tech Fund (2); https://opentitan.org/ (2); Economic Policy Research (2); Evidence from French public-sector initiatives (2); FAIR data principles (1)

Tax Incentive

Total responses 224 positions extracted across 4 distinct responses

Support position 133 responses (59.4%), 3.0% express strong advocacy

Primary stakeholders (support) EU Citizens (54), Companies (44), NGOs (10)

Core arguments (support) Open-source infrastructure eliminates hidden licensing fees, reducing TCO and allowing for reinvestment in innovation.; Open-source infrastructure reduces total cost of ownership, eliminating licence fees and lowering CAPEX and OPEX.

Opposition position 70 responses (31.2%), 10.0% express strong opposition

Core arguments (oppose) It's effectively very difficult to make money or even build a business around open-source development, especially for a solo-developer.; The Bundeskammer warns against a progressing economization of digital dependencies through abonnement-based license models.

Specific proposals mentioned tax credits or subsidies (2 mentions); adequate grant schemes or tax exemptions (1 mentions); Incentives for companies to deploy resources to work on and improve the specific open source stack they use (1 mentions)

Evidence cited points 6-8 (1); Roadmap §3.3 (1); citizen donations (1); 2. Drivers of the subscription economy (1); sporadic project grants (1)

Digital Services Tax

Total responses 183 positions extracted across 4 distinct responses

Support position 135 responses (73.8%), 18.5% express strong advocacy

Primary stakeholders (support) EU Citizens (74), Companies (26), NGOs (15)

Core arguments (support) The current dominance of proprietary vendors in digital infrastructure is a threat to democracy, and an open digital ecosystem based on well-documented standards and open-source software is necessary.; The European Open Digital Ecosystem Strategy aims to strengthen digital sovereignty, interoperability, security, and transparency across Europe's digital landscape.

Opposition position 44 responses (24.0%), 20.5% express strong opposition

Core arguments (oppose) The Kammer criticizes the increasing shift of central functions to proprietary cloud infrastructures, which would lead to a loss of control over availability, confidentiality and functionality.; Ouvertarism treats openness not as ideology, but as a disciplined method to restore sovereignty, resilience, and innovation capacity through shared foundations.

Specific proposals mentioned Impose EU requirements for migration (1 mentions); Impose taxes on foreign cloud services (1 mentions); Mandates requiring that public and critical service websites remain fully accessible without a mandatory mobile app. (1 mentions)

Evidence cited https://media.ccc.de/v/39c3-a-post-american-enshittification-resistant-internet (2); EESCs report on services of general interest (TEN/851-EESC-2025) (2); https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Facebook%E2%80%93Cambridge_Analytica_data_scandal (1); Kerckhoff'sche Prinzip (1); The Cyber Resilience Act (1)

Procurement Preference

Total responses 149 positions extracted across 4 distinct responses

Support position 141 responses (94.6%), 30.5% express strong advocacy

Primary stakeholders (support) EU Citizens (72), Companies (37), NGOs (15)

Core arguments (support) A regulatory framework that supports open source software and on-premises solutions would strengthen digital sovereignty, reduce vendor lock-in, and foster innovation.; Open-source solutions reduce vendor lock-in, improve long-term sustainability, and facilitate compliance with data protection and security requirements.

Opposition position 6 responses (4.0%), 33.3% express strong opposition

Core arguments (oppose) The Kammer rejects closed-BIM strategies and proprietary ecosystems that restrict interoperability and hinder collaboration in complex, division-of-labor-based value chains.; The current procurement model is outdated and prevents iteration, blocks learning, and transforms uncertainty into contractual risk.

Specific proposals mentioned
3. Procurement reform to ensure public institutions are incentivised (or mandated) to adopt open-source alternatives wherever feasible, including those operated by small or non-profit entities. (1 mentions); Adopt open-by-default tender templates (1 mentions); Adopt open-source solutions in public administrations. (1 mentions)

Evidence cited ARS Feedback (1); Tallinn Declaration (6 October 2017) (1); The measures proposed in this response (1); https://media.ccc.de/v/39c3-a-post-american-enshittification-resistant-internet (1); Ensuring the independence of public administration is most important and would also serve as an example to other institutions that open source solutions are viable alternatives. (1)

Vat Exemption

Total responses 75 positions extracted across 3 distinct responses
Support position 57 responses (76.0%), 3.5% express strong advocacy
Primary stakeholders (support) EU Citizens (26), Companies (18), NGOs (6)
Core arguments (support) The respondent supports VAT exemption for open-source solutions to maintain sovereignty and control over data.; Open Source software is a public good which is donated to the public by its developers.
Opposition position 11 responses (14.7%), 9.1% express strong opposition
Core arguments (oppose) VAT exemptions can lead to unnecessary intermediation and exploitation of OSS communities.; Excessive regulation makes European projects less attractive compared to global alternatives operating under more flexible frameworks.
Evidence cited Q5 Sectors with highest impact (1); opensourcewerken.nl (1); Joomla! (1); Kerckhoff'sche Prinzip (1); A: Reduced financial and operational risk: risk is spread amongst multiple parties, which benefits all involved parties simultaneously. (1)

State Aid

Total responses 41 positions extracted across 2 distinct responses
Support position 35 responses (85.4%), 2.9% express strong advocacy
Primary stakeholders (support) EU Citizens (20), Companies (7), NGOs (5)
Core arguments (support) Direct funding for maintainers and innovators in projects like KDE is critical.; The future strategy should prioritize the development of a validated,

industrial-grade intermediate layer that integrates existing open-source standards into a European software stack.

Opposition position 6 responses (14.6%), 16.7% express strong opposition

Core arguments (oppose) The absence of pathways for citizen-generated digital public goods contradicts EU commitments to participatory democracy and digital sovereignty.; Uncertainty about donations lasting or further funds makes it difficult to plan for the future.

Specific proposals mentioned Fund the 'maintainers' and 'innovators' in projects like KDE directly. (1 mentions); Universal basic income for open source maintainers. (1 mentions)

Evidence cited Key factors: TCO reduction, transparency, and collaborative ecosystems. (1); 3. NIS2: operational evidence instead of paper compliance (1); EU commitments to participatory democracy and digital sovereignty (1); This enables a real exit option, strengthens transparency and auditability (1); EU-FOSSA initiative (1)