

# EU Open Digital Ecosystems Consultation Analysis

Domain: sovereignty - Complete Analysis

Documented Insights Analysis System

February 2026

## Contents

|  |          |
|--|----------|
| <b>EU Open Digital Ecosystems Consultation</b> | <b>1</b> |
| Digital Sovereignty . . . . .                  | 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        |
| <b>LLM Position Analysis - Sovereignty</b>     | <b>5</b> |

## EU Open Digital Ecosystems Consultation

### Digital Sovereignty

**Analysis date** 06 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 Companies (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 Institution | 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** 06 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`