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 06 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 06 February 2026

LLM Position Analysis - Taxation

Generated: Fri Feb 6 10:50:18 2026

Stakeholder Positions

LLM Processing Status: 66 responses analysed across all domains (4.0% complete, 1588 remaining). **This domain**: 66 responses. Results are partial and will update as processing continues.

Analysis of positions extracted through LLM analysis of consultation responses. Extracted 197 positions across 7 categories.

Position Overview

Position Category	Support	Oppose	Neutral/Mixed	Total
Public Funding	68	4	0	72
Tax Incentive	27	17	4	48
Procurement Preference	24	1	1	26
Digital Services Tax	23	3	0	26
Vat Exemption	12	4	3	19
State Aid	5	0	0	5
Short Termism	0	1	0	1

Detailed Position Analysis

Public Funding

Total responses 72 positions extracted across 2 distinct responses
Support position 68 responses (94.4%), 44.1% express strong advocacy
Primary stakeholders (support) EU Citizens (21), Companies (20), NGOs (14)
Core arguments (support) Regulatory frameworks, R&D funding, and infrastructure investment are necessary but insufficient if not accompanied by a deliberate policy for skills training and certification.; A talent policy that connects education vendor-neutral certification employability, with measurable metrics and scalable implementation, is critical to overcome obstacles.
Opposition position 4 responses (5.6%), 25.0% express strong opposition
Core arguments (oppose) Die EU-Kommission verweigert seit über 20 Jahren eine Rechtsgrundlage für gemeinnützige Stiftungen in Europa.; Current system of funding based on research projects is problematic, as it leads to a focus on short-term gains and neglects the maintenance of existing software.
Specific proposals mentioned 1-2 billion via Digital Europe Programme (1 mentions); Assign a budget to support existing fundamental projects, such as Blender. (1 mentions); Define the budget/scope of public funding of open source projects retroactively, based on applications submitted by the projects themselves. (1 mentions)
Evidence cited Evidence from French public-sector initiatives (2); The EU open-source sector boasts significant strengths. . . (1); Googles AGPL policy (1); XZ backdoor was a targeted attack towards a fundamental low-level component in near ubiquitous use by a likely state-sponsored actor (1); In our own experience we could not form a charitable entity that is legally binding beholden to serving the public interest in the field of civic-tech (1)

Tax Incentive

Total responses 48 positions extracted across 4 distinct responses
Support position 27 responses (56.2%), 0.0% express strong advocacy
Primary stakeholders (support) EU Citizens (10), Companies (8), NGOs (3)
Core arguments (support) Open source delivers clear added value to both public and private sectors through legal and technical reuse, reduced vendor lock-in, and stronger digital sovereignty.; Alternative funding corridors should be created to incentivize the development of open-source software, independent from specific research projects.
Opposition position 17 responses (35.4%), 17.6% express strong opposition
Core arguments (oppose) Stiftungen werden aus rein wirtschaftlichen Gründen außerhalb Europas gegründet, um Steuern zu sparen.; Formally recognizing Open Source contributions as tax-free voluntary service is necessary.
Specific proposals mentioned formally recognize Open Source contributions as tax-free voluntary service (1 mentions); Migration Grant covering a percentage of the annual ICT budget for administrations adopting EU-approved licences. (1 mentions); OSS Innovation Grant for projects adopted by at least N Member States. (1 mentions)
Evidence cited aus rein 'wirtschaftlichen' Gründen (1); Thus establishing other forms of contributions outside of code like engagement in the project or collaboration agreements suffer from severe friction due to different legal systems and recent geopolitical developments (1); EESCs report on services of general interest (TEN/851-EESC-2025) (1); Roadmap §3.3 (1); The main barrier remains public procurement frameworks. (1)

Procurement Preference

Total responses 26 positions extracted across 3 distinct responses
Support position 24 responses (92.3%), 25.0% express strong advocacy
Primary stakeholders (support) EU Citizens (8), Companies (7), NGOs (5)
Core arguments (support) Tenders should be crafted to favor open-source software developers, and proof of contributions should be required.; Public institutions should be required to use open formats and prefer open-source solutions in procurement.
Opposition position 1 responses (3.8%), 0.0% express strong opposition
Core arguments (oppose) Procurement trends favor commercial suites perceived as cheaper to maintain, forcing institutions into onesizefitsall solutions.
Specific proposals mentioned Adopt open-source solutions in public administrations. (1 mentions); Demand proof of contributions. Demand concepts on how reuse will be enabled. (1 mentions); EU must ensure public procurements favor open-source solutions (1 mentions)
Evidence cited ARS Feedback (1); Public examples include France's Nextcloud deployments and Estonia's X-Road... (1); Sovereign Tech Fund (1); The measures proposed in this response (1)

Digital Services Tax

Total responses 26 positions extracted across 2 distinct responses
Support position 23 responses (88.5%), 13.0% express strong advocacy
Primary stakeholders (support) EU Citizens (10), NGOs (5), Companies (4)
Core arguments (support) The current technology is locked and controlled by a few third parties, making it essential to break software into manageable parts.; For-profit companies exploit users and stifle competition, making a tax on proprietary vendors necessary.
Opposition position 3 responses (11.5%), 0.0% express strong opposition
Core arguments (oppose) Permissive licenses allow publicly-funded innovations to be absorbed by proprietary vendors effectively undermining the economic sustainability of the

open-source ecosystem.; Additional regulation of open source is not the most effective path forward.

Evidence cited EESCs report on services of general interest (TEN/851-EESC-2025) (2); Meta suppressing internal research (1); Roadmap §7 (1); White Paper §3-4 (1); Microsoft vs IBM example (1)

Vat Exemption

Total responses 19 positions extracted across 3 distinct responses

Support position 12 responses (63.2%), 0.0% express strong advocacy

Primary stakeholders (support) EU Citizens (6), Companies (3), NGOs (2)

Core arguments (support) EU should create a way to exempt VAT for open source maintainers and contributors.; The EU digital wallet should mandate country implementation to not use device attestation from Google or Apple, which could be related to VAT exemption.

Opposition position 4 responses (21.1%), 25.0% 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.

State Aid

Total responses 5 positions extracted across 1 distinct responses

Support position 5 responses (100.0%), 0.0% express strong advocacy

Primary stakeholders (support) EU Citizens (2), Companies (1), NGOs (1)

Core arguments (support) All states benefiting from open-source should contribute to funding, implying public subsidies for OSS projects.; Public subsidies for OSS projects could be used to support their development and maintenance.