

# EU Open Digital Ecosystems Consultation Analysis

Domain: vendor-lock - Complete Analysis

Documented Insights Analysis System

February 2026

## Contents

<b>EU Open Digital Ecosystems Consultation</b>	<b>1</b>
Vendor Lock-in . . . . .	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 - Vendor-lock</b>	<b>5</b>

## 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 Institution	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`