

EU Open Digital Ecosystems Consultation Analysis

Domain: procurement - Complete Analysis

Documented Insights Analysis System

February 2026

Contents

EU Open Digital Ecosystems Consultation	1
Public Procurement	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 - Procurement	5

EU Open Digital Ecosystems Consultation

Public Procurement

Analysis date 06 February 2026
Domain scope Public sector procurement practices, barriers, and reform proposals
Commission context EU procurement directives, transparency requirements, SME access

Executive Summary

This domain received substantial engagement across the consultation, with 429 responses (25.9% of corpus) addressing related themes. Respondents from 37 countries and 9 stakeholder types contributed, indicating broad interest across the EU.

Market Sentiment Overview

Coverage and Engagement

Metric	Value
Matching responses	429
Coverage of corpus	25.9%
Countries represented	37
Stakeholder types	9
Organisations	185

Metric	Value
Responses with attachments	102

Stakeholder Positions

The consultation response was dominated by EU Citizens (52.9%), followed by Companys (25.4%). This distribution suggests strong grassroots interest rather than primarily industry-driven advocacy.

Stakeholder Type	Responses	Countries	Percentage
EU Citizen	227	25	52.9%
Company	109	20	25.4%
NGO	35	12	8.2%
Non EU Citizen	15	10	3.5%
Business Association	14	6	3.3%
Academic Research Institution	13	7	3.0%
Public Authority	8	5	1.9%
Other	7	7	1.6%
Environmental Organisation	1	1	0.2%

Geographic Distribution

Geographic engagement shows concentration in Germany (22.4%), with notable participation from Netherlands and Italy. The distribution across 37 countries indicates EU-wide relevance rather than localised concern.

Country	Responses	Percentage
Germany	96	22.4%
Netherlands	52	12.1%
Italy	44	10.3%
France	40	9.3%
Belgium	31	7.2%
Austria	23	5.4%
Spain	21	4.9%
Poland	18	4.2%
Portugal	13	3.0%
United States	12	2.8%
United Kingdom	11	2.6%
Sweden	8	1.9%
Romania	7	1.6%
Finland	7	1.6%
GRC	6	1.4%

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.

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

Positive framing – Used with: enable, enabled, opportunity

Critical framing – Discussed alongside: difficult

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

Positive framing – Used with: support, benefits, improve

Critical framing – Discussed alongside: fail, barriers, insufficient

supplier (strength: 2.8) Moderately concentrated in this domain

Positive framing – Used with: advantage, enables, support

Critical framing – Discussed alongside: barrier, black, barriers

procurement (strength: 2.2) Moderately concentrated in this domain

Positive framing – Used with: support, supporting, strengthen

Critical framing – Discussed alongside: barriers, lack, limited

tender (strength: 2.1) Moderately concentrated in this domain

Positive framing – Used with: support, advantages, supports

Critical framing – Discussed alongside: barriers, lack, barrier

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	46.6%
Problem-focused language	41.0%
Solution-focused language	52.2%

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	394	394	91.8%
source	353	353	82.3%
software	325	325	75.8%
public	315	315	73.4%
digital	294	294	68.5%
european	282	282	65.7%
vendor	271	271	63.2%
sovereignty	261	261	60.8%

Co-occurring Term	Occurrences	Documents	Document %
support	257	257	59.9%
infrastructure	240	240	55.9%
security	231	231	53.8%
lock-in	231	231	53.8%
open-source	220	220	51.3%
procurement	213	213	49.7%
solutions	212	212	49.4%
projects	204	204	47.6%
data	200	200	46.6%
funding	197	197	45.9%
critical	194	194	45.2%
maintenance	189	189	44.1%

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
Barriers	291	67.8%
Transparency	207	48.3%
Reform	49	11.4%
Process	29	6.8%
Sme Access	26	6.1%

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 31 terms (8 keywords, 23 keyphrases)

Analysis date 06 February 2026

LLM Position Analysis - Procurement

No position data available yet.

LLM extraction not yet run for this domain.

Run: `make llm-extract DOMAIN=procurement`