

Marc Rauchs points out the weaknesses of the coalition agreement:

“I must acknowledge that the aldermen’s statement shows great ambition and lists many important issues: affordable housing, sustainable mobility, climate, youth, integration. But precisely because of this ambition – presented in such a demonstrative way – we have the responsibility to ask critical questions. The document looks more **like a wish list** than a concrete implementation plan. Again and again we read terms such as *examine, expand, promote* – yet there are hardly any concrete figures, clear timelines, or binding cost estimates. A good example is Quarter A *Schwalls*: it is now ‘*considered*’ to *expand the previously planned project* (with ‘a modern residential and care quarter’, ‘meeting the highest quality standards’, including ‘a day care centre, parking facilities, green and park areas’, as well as the restored villa) *by a rehabilitation centre* – but there are no statements on the schedule, financing, or future management. How are citizens supposed to assess this? What role will the municipality take in the planned rehabilitation centre?

Without priorities, deadlines, goals, and budgets, much remains **vague**. For successful implementation, we need a clear 2025–2029 roadmap from the aldermen’s council and the finance commission. I therefore suggest that the aldermen’s council soon present to the municipal council a kind of annex with a concrete implementation plan. This way we could all – including citizens – understand what can realistically be achieved. In this respect, the declaration is undoubtedly very ambitious, but for now it is too much of a ‘wish list’ without a precise execution plan in time. With a clear roadmap, clear priorities, and transparent budgets, the programme would gain credibility and could be reliably steered by the municipal council.

On **finances**, the aldermen’s council merely states: the ‘efficient and versatile financial policy’ will be continued; the municipality has a ‘very healthy financial situation’ and could, ‘in view of the ambitious projects, easily cope with a loan’. The principles of ‘cost coverage’ and ‘polluter pays’ apply, there will be no ‘arbitrary tax increases’. ‘Prudent financial policy remains the top priority.’ But it is precisely here that **transparency is lacking**: there are no figures on revenues and expenditures, no debt ceilings, no forecasts of follow-up costs, no investment plan. If we can ‘easily cope’ with loans – what would then be the actual level of debt required for the announced projects? What is the total investment volume for 2025–2029? How is it to be financed?

Thank you for the many ideas. But without a budget and a timeline, much of this remains up in the air. We want a programmable and measurable aldermen’s declaration.”