EU Open Digital Ecosystems Consultation Analysis

Domain: sovereignty - Complete Analysis

Documented Insights Analysis System

February 2026

Contents

EU Open Digital Ecosystems Consultation

Digital Sovereignty

Analysis date 08 February 2026
Domain scope Technological independence, strategic autonomy, European digital capacity
Commission context European digital sovereignty strategy, critical infrastructure, dependency reduction

Executive Summary

This domain received substantial engagement across the consultation, with 604 responses (36.4% of corpus) addressing related themes. Respondents from 41 countries and 10 stakeholder types contributed, indicating broad interest across the EU.

Market Sentiment Overview

Coverage and Engagement

Metric	Value
Matching responses	604
Coverage of corpus	36.4%
Countries represented	41

Metric	Value
Stakeholder types	10
Organisations	232
Responses with attachments	137

Stakeholder Positions

The consultation response was dominated by EU Citizens (57.0%), followed by Companys (20.7%). This distribution suggests strong grassroots interest rather than primarily industry-driven advocacy.

Stakeholder Type	Responses	Countries	Percentage
EU Citizen	344	26	57.0%
Company	125	20	20.7%
NGO	50	15	8.3%
Non EU Citizen	23	13	3.8%
Academic Research Instittution	22	11	3.6%
Other	19	11	3.1%
Business Association	10	6	1.7%
Public Authority	8	5	1.3%
Trade Union	2	2	0.3%
Environmental Organisation	1	1	0.2%

Geographic Distribution

Geographic engagement shows concentration in Germany (21.0%), with notable participation from Netherlands and Italy. The distribution across 41 countries indicates EU-wide relevance rather than localised concern.

Country	Responses	Percentage
Germany	127	21.0%
Netherlands	70	11.6%
Italy	63	10.4%
France	56	9.3%
Belgium	41	6.8%
Austria	33	5.5%
Spain	28	4.6%
Poland	24	4.0%
Sweden	20	3.3%
Portugal	18	3.0%
United Kingdom	16	2.6%
United States	15	2.5%
Finland	11	1.8%
DNK	9	1.5%
Romania	9	1.5%

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.

dependence (strength: 2.4) Moderately concentrated in this domain

Positive framing – Used with: support, strengthen, benefits

Critical framing – Discussed alongside: lack, barriers, limited

independence (strength: 2.2) Moderately concentrated in this domain

Positive framing – Used with: support, supporting, enable

Critical framing – Discussed alongside: barriers, lack, challenges

autonomy (strength: 2.2) Moderately concentrated in this domain

Positive framing – Used with: support, strengthen, supporting

Critical framing – Discussed alongside: barriers, lack, challenges

dependency (strength: 2.0) Moderately concentrated in this domain

Positive framing – Used with: support, supporting, strengthen

Critical framing – Discussed alongside: barriers, lack, limited

sovereignty (strength: 1.6) Moderately concentrated in this domain

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	44.7%
Problem-focused language	39.4%
Solution-focused language	48.0%

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	533	533	88.2%
source	466	466	77.2%
sovereignty	459	459	76.0%
digital	446	446	73.8%
software	443	443	73.3%
european	397	397	65.7%
public	381	381	63.1%
support	335	335	55.5%
infrastructure	314	314	52.0%

Co-occurring Term	Occurrences	Documents	Document %
security	300	300	49.7%
open-source	280	280	46.4%
projects	278	278	46.0%
solutions	274	274	45.4%
data	269	269	44.5%
critical	264	264	43.7%
funding	254	254	42.1%
europe	251	251	41.6%
development	247	247	40.9%
companies	243	243	40.2%
ecosystem	238	238	39.4%

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
Autonomy	526	87.1%
Dependency	423	70.0%
Capacity	224	37.1%
Strategic	115	19.0%
Development	4	0.7%

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 33 terms (8 keywords, 25 keyphrases)
Analysis date 08 February 2026

LLM Position Analysis - Sovereignty

Generated: Sun Feb 8 20:18:54 2026

Stakeholder Positions

LLM Processing Status: 1133 responses analysed across all domains (68.3% complete, 477 remaining). **This domain**: 188 responses. Results are partial and will update as processing continues.

Analysis of positions extracted through LLM analysis of consultation responses. Extracted 486 positions across 26 categories.

Position Overview

Position Category	Support	Oppose	Neutral/Mixed	Total
Public Funding	167	12	3	182
Procurement Preference	123	10	0	133
Digital Services Tax	78	20	0	98
State Aid	29	6	1	36
Tax Incentive	3	7	0	10
Digital Sovereignty	4	0	0	4
Digital Sovereignty Failure	0	3	0	3
Vat Exemption	2	0	0	2
Us Centricity	0	1	0	1
Interoperability Requirements	1	0	0	1
Civil Cybersecurity	1	0	0	1
Sovereignty Preservation	1	0	0	1
Surveillance Capitalism	0	1	0	1
Foreign Control	0	1	0	1
Bureaucratic Simplification	1	0	0	1
Infrastructure Maintenance	1	0	0	1
Barriers To Adoption	0	1	0	1
Closed Drivers	0	1	0	1
Sovereignty Loss	0	1	0	1
Anti Circumvention Laws	0	1	0	1
Alternative Sovereign Infrastructure	1	0	0	1
Regulatory Action	1	0	0	1
Community Engagement	1	0	0	1
Data Harvesting	0	1	0	1
Intellectual Property Reform	1	0	0	1
Ai Path	0	1	0	1

Detailed Position Analysis

Public Funding

Total responses 182 positions extracted across 4 distinct responses
Support position 167 responses (91.8%), 55.1% express strong advocacy
Primary stakeholders (support) EU Citizens (113), Companies (25), NGOs (11)
Core arguments (support) Open source is a strategic pillar for the future of the European digital ecosystem, and its role should be further strengthened in EU policies, funding, and

implementations.; Open source development is a way to prevent technicians and engineers from being just users or operators of complex products made in other non-UE countries.

Opposition position 12 responses (6.6%), 50.0% express strong opposition

Core arguments (oppose) The EU's strategy must address the lack of internal know-how in companies, and providing 'new tools' without a massive support structure will not be enough.; EU institutions are funding American corporations instead of EU ones, undermining digital sovereignty.

Specific proposals mentioned 100M for a document suite, 150M for a cloud provider stack, 100M for an open source operating system, 50M for an identity provider and authenticator, 100M for an open source federated forge (1 mentions); A basic version of Linux that can be installed on servers, PCs, smartphones, and IoT devices. (1 mentions); aid from the EU to put Free and Open-Source software on the frontline of the IT world (1 mentions)

Evidence cited multiple EU-funded initiatives (1); embedded expertise, knowledge transfer, and durable operational support models (1); [4] (1); European Sovereign Tech Fund (1); https://pluralistic.net/2026/01/29/post-american-canada/#ottawa (1)

Procurement Preference

Total responses 133 positions extracted across 2 distinct responses

Support position 123 responses (92.5%), 23.6% express strong advocacy

Primary stakeholders (support) EU Citizens (88), Companies (17), NGOs (6)

Core arguments (support) The EU's policy represents a declaration of technological independence, where transparency is the fundamental principle and collaboration supersedes closed competition.; Open Source solutions allow institutions to maintain independence and control over digital tools, reducing reliance on external providers.

Opposition position 10 responses (7.5%), 50.0% express strong opposition

Core arguments (oppose) The new AWS European Sovereign Cloud will allow proprietary vendors to win public contracts, undermining EU independence.; EU institutions are relying on proprietary solutions, perpetuating lock-in and undermining digital sovereignty.

Specific proposals mentioned adopt use-open-source policy (1 mentions); ban Meta, Google and Microsoft (1 mentions); EU hiring full-time open source engineers (1 mentions)

Evidence cited Azure (1); Why Now Matters (1); open standards (1); All EU civil servants are daily logging in to Windows, sharing their data on SharePoint (1); citation not provided (1)

Digital Services Tax

Total responses 98 positions extracted across 2 distinct responses

Support position 78 responses (79.6%), 26.9% express strong advocacy

Primary stakeholders (support) EU Citizens (54), Companies (9), NGOs (6)

Core arguments (support) Enforcing interoperability requirements would put an end to Meta's role as gatekeeper, allowing users to migrate away from WhatsApp and permitting an ecosystem of alternative messaging software to flourish.; The current internet architecture allows corporate gatekeepers to dominate the internet, but IPv6 adoption would enable peer-to-peer services and reduce their control.

Opposition position 20 responses (20.4%), 10.0% express strong opposition

Core arguments (oppose) Banning X and consolidating behind a platform that adheres to social norms is necessary for global peace.; Massive data storage in non-EU clouds threatens EU sovereignty and institutions' credibility.

Specific proposals mentioned ban Meta, Google and Microsoft (1 mentions); Ban the use of X formerly known as Twitter (1 mentions); Encourage, if not compel, the creation of European services. (1 mentions)

Evidence cited IPv6 massively expands the available address space (1); The EU might be funding EU 'champions' but it does not rely on them (1); 30+ years of using Open Source Software (1); Cloud Act (1); US (1)

State Aid

Total responses 36 positions extracted across 3 distinct responses
Support position 29 responses (80.6%), 20.7% express strong advocacy
Primary stakeholders (support) EU Citizens (17), Companies (5), OTHER (4)
Core arguments (support) The EU must invest heavily in human experts-practitioners who can bridge the gap between complex cloud architectures and daily business needs.; The Sovereign Technology Fund should be expanded to more Software projects and be given more resources.
Opposition position 6 responses (16.7%), 33.3% express strong opposition
Core arguments (oppose) The EU risks repeating the pattern of publicly supported open infrastructures being captured by actors with misaligned incentives.; Public subsidies for OSS projects are misallocated due to lack of actual AI competence.
Specific proposals mentioned All previously funded projects must continue to receive support, not be abandoned just as they become critical infrastructure. (1 mentions); Create an EU platform to host the entire Symbian source code and provide dedicated courses to learn the programming language. (1 mentions); Expand the Sovereign Technology Fund (1 mentions)
Evidence cited https://xmpp.org/announcements/open-letter-meta-dma/technical-briefing/ (1); funding of two large research projects (1); Framework Computer (1); Not only this will produce immediate benefits (the software projects themselves)... (1); Research Infrastructures as long-term operational anchors (1)

Tax Incentive

Total responses 10 positions extracted across 2 distinct responses
Support position 3 responses (30.0%), 0.0% express strong advocacy
Primary stakeholders (support) EU Citizens (1), NON_EU_CITIZEN (1), OTHER (1)
Core arguments (support) Replacing proprietary software with open-source solutions raises the price significantly for any actor to extract intelligence.; Modern technology has matured simultaneously, creating an opportunity for Europe to invest in Sovereign OS and RVAD.
Opposition position 7 responses (70.0%), 0.0% express strong opposition
Core arguments (oppose) Tax breaks for proprietary vendors undermine democratic societies.; Repealing or softening anti-circumvention laws would ease the lives of European developers creating competitive alternative offerings for the domestic market.

Digital Sovereignty

Total responses 4 positions extracted across 1 distinct responses
Support position 4 responses (100.0%), 75.0% express strong advocacy
Primary stakeholders (support) EU Citizens (4)
Core arguments (support) Digital sovereignty is not just about keeping data on EU soil, but also guaranteeing command, control, and communication to the Open Digital Ecosystems.; Repealing article 6 would give a huge boost to EU digital sovereignty and the OSS sector.
Specific proposals mentioned repeal article 6 (1 mentions)

Digital Sovereignty Failure

Total responses 3 positions extracted across 1 distinct responses

Opposition position 3 responses (100.0%), 100.0% express strong opposition

Core arguments (oppose) The EU retained a technological burden and digital sovereign debt due to the adoption of OOXML.; The EU's failure to adopt ODF as a standard has led to a lack of digital sovereignty.

Evidence cited the waste of public money (1); any software except that of the monopolistic incumbent has had to allocate significant resources merely to be compatible (1); only seven contributions mention the Open Document Format (1); the year of the infamous fast-track approval of ISO/IEC 29500 (1)