

# EU Open Digital Ecosystems Consultation Analysis

Domain: procurement - Complete Analysis

Documented Insights Analysis System

February 2026

## Contents

<b>EU Open Digital Ecosystems Consultation</b>	<b>1</b>
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
<b>LLM Position Analysis - Procurement</b>	<b>5</b>

## 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`