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 07 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
Stakeholder types	10

Metric	Value
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%
security	300	300	49.7%

Co-occurring Term	Occurrences	Documents	Document %
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 07 February 2026

LLM Position Analysis - Sovereignty

No position data available yet.

LLM extraction not yet run for this domain.

Run: `make llm-extract DOMAIN=sovereignty`