EU Open Digital Ecosystems Consultation Analysis

Domain: vendor-lock - Complete Analysis

Documented Insights Analysis System

February 2026

Contents

EU Open Digital Ecosystems Consultation

Vendor Lock-in

Analysis date 06 February 2026
Domain scope Switching costs, technological dependencies, and competitive barriers
Commission context Competition policy, market contestability, interoperability requirements

Executive Summary

This domain received substantial engagement across the consultation, with 667 responses (40.2% of corpus) addressing related themes. Respondents from 40 countries and 10 stakeholder types contributed, indicating broad interest across the EU.

Market Sentiment Overview

Coverage and Engagement

Metric	Value
Matching responses	667
Coverage of corpus	40.2%
Countries represented	40
Stakeholder types	10
Organisations	233

Metric	Value
Responses with attachments	112

Stakeholder Positions

The consultation response was dominated by EU Citizens (61.9%), followed by Companys (20.7%). This distribution suggests strong grassroots interest rather than primarily industry-driven advocacy.

Stakeholder Type	Responses	Countries	Percentage
EU Citizen	413	29	61.9%
Company	138	20	20.7%
NGO	41	14	6.1%
Academic Research Instittution	18	9	2.7%
Non EU Citizen	18	14	2.7%
Other	15	10	2.2%
Business Association	13	8	1.9%
Public Authority	9	6	1.3%
Trade Union	1	1	0.1%
Consumer Organisation	1	1	0.1%

Geographic Distribution

Geographic engagement shows concentration in Germany (22.5%), with notable participation from France and Italy. The distribution across 40 countries indicates EU-wide relevance rather than localised concern.

Country	Responses	Percentage
Germany	150	22.5%
France	79	11.8%
Italy	77	11.5%
Netherlands	69	10.3%
Belgium	38	5.7%
Poland	31	4.6%
Austria	28	4.2%
Spain	26	3.9%
Portugal	20	3.0%
Sweden	19	2.8%
United Kingdom	15	2.2%
DNK	15	2.2%
United States	14	2.1%
Romania	13	1.9%
Finland	11	1.6%

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.

switching (strength: 2.4) Moderately concentrated in this domain

    Positive framing – Used with: support, benefit, advantage

    Critical framing – Discussed alongside: barriers, barrier, lack

portability (strength: 2.0) Moderately concentrated in this domain

    Positive framing – Used with: support, enable, enables

    Critical framing – Discussed alongside: barriers, lack, barrier

lock-in (strength: 1.9) Moderately concentrated in this domain

    Positive framing – Used with: support, supporting, benefits

    Critical framing – Discussed alongside: barriers, lack, limited

migration (strength: 1.8) Moderately concentrated in this domain

    Positive framing – Used with: support, enable, benefits

    Critical framing – Discussed alongside: lack, limited, barriers

interoperability (strength: 1.7) 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	41.4%
Problem-focused language	37.5%
Solution-focused language	45.9%

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	593	593	88.9%
source	526	526	78.9%
software	511	511	76.6%
public	412	412	61.8%
digital	390	390	58.5%
european	358	358	53.7%
support	340	340	51.0%
proprietary	334	334	50.1%
sovereignty	322	322	48.3%
infrastructure	305	305	45.7%

Co-occurring Term	Occurrences	Documents	Document %
security	300	300	45.0%
open-source	300	300	45.0%
solutions	295	295	44.2%
data	289	289	43.3%
lock-in	282	282	42.3%
projects	279	279	41.8%
companies	266	266	39.9%
development	250	250	37.5%
code	248	248	37.2%
vendor	247	247	37.0%

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
Portability	285	42.7%
Proprietary	93	13.9%
Dependency	6	0.9%
Costs	1	0.1%
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

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 (7 keywords, 26 keyphrases)
Analysis date 06 February 2026

LLM Position Analysis - Vendor-lock

No position data available yet.

LLM extraction not yet run for this domain.

Run: `make llm-extract DOMAIN=vendor-lock`