

Citizen contributions to investigating territorial capacity for sustainable mobility in southern Luxembourg

Institutional learning from the discussions following the scenes

Expert-Citizen Forum, Sanem, 18 June 2026
Äerdschëff asbl | Municipality of Sanem

Purpose of the document

This document brings together contributions made after the three scenes at the second Expert-Citizen Forum held in Sanem on 18 June 2026. This was the third forum in a process launched in January 2025 and the second held in Sanem. The analysis cross-checks a partial automatic transcript with the meeting secretary's notes, which cover all three sequences and clarify several attributions. It examines what the contributions reveal about territorial capacity for sustainable mobility, distinguishing the knowledge contributed by citizens and users, experts and practitioners, and the logics of public decision-making. Performed content and facilitators' reformulations are excluded from the main analysis. The appendix brings together representative formulations.

Summary statement

The forum's main contribution is not the choice of a vehicle. It is the identification of five capacities to investigate: understanding needs, experimenting, maintaining, cooperating and deciding.



Component output	Purpose
Citizen and expert contributions	Identify the needs, criteria, trade-offs, stances and evidence required for the territorial inquiry.
Analysis of forum theatre	Assess the format's ability to open up controversies, generate new contributions and produce reliable material for institutional use.

Part of a multi-stage inquiry process

The forum on 18 June 2026 was neither an isolated event nor the starting point of the inquiry. It was the third Expert-Citizen Forum in the process launched in January 2025 and the second held in Sanem.

Period	Stage	Role in the process
January 2025	Online “Roulez léger” Expert-Citizen Forum	Open the discussion on sustainable individual mobility, barriers to use, infrastructure, sharing, and resource-efficient, repairable alternatives.
17 December 2025	First Expert-Citizen Forum in Sanem	Explore a possible intermunicipal centre for intermediate light vehicles (VLI) and its potential functions: testing, repair, training, social leasing and citizen research.
18 June 2026	Second Expert-Citizen Forum in Sanem	Identify territorial capacities, decision criteria, required evidence and contributions from citizens and experts.
July–December 2026	Working meetings with citizens and experts	Investigate the questions raised since January 2025: use cases, maintenance, social access, governance, responsibilities and intermunicipal or cross-border cooperation.
December 2026	Third Expert-Citizen Forum planned in Sanem, fourth in the overall process	Present interim findings, debate working scenarios and guide the next stages of the territorial inquiry.

Overall logic

The “Roulez léger” forum opened up the field of sustainable mobility. The Sanem forums then grounded it in the territory: first by exploring a possible VLI Centre function, then by identifying the capacities and evidence needed for decisions. The intervening working meetings should investigate these questions before another public presentation in December 2026.

Executive summary

The contributions do not divide neatly into support for or opposition to intermediate light vehicles. They form a space for judgement in which several criteria are considered together: public value, feasibility, social justice, lifecycle cost, climate effectiveness, local learning and European cooperation.

Capacity to investigate	What the contributions offer	What is still missing	Proportionate next step
Understand needs	Start with problems, journeys, user groups and constraints before choosing a vehicle.	Prioritised needs, a baseline situation and actual demand.	Select two to four use cases and document the needs.
Experiment	The municipality can provide a setting for trials, lead by example or offer a targeted service.	Mandate, responsibilities, duration, target groups and success criteria.	Organise limited, comparable and reversible pilots.
Maintain	Parts, diagnostics, repair, training, after-sales support and waste prevention determine trust and useful life.	Full costs, critical stock, responsible contacts, repairability and support response times.	Put a maintenance and circularity plan in place from the first trial.
Cooperate	External expertise is valued provided it includes transfer, documentation, local room for manoeuvre and an explicit public-private relationship.	Committed partners, contractual rights, economic opportunities and functions that can be shared.	Test learning-oriented procurement, cooperation by function and circular business models.
Decide	Decisions must connect the public mandate, climate impact, material sufficiency, territorial value and financial viability.	Continuation thresholds, governance, business model and circularity ambitions.	Build a decision matrix before expanding.

The five capacities as a learning sequence

1. Understand needs	2. Experiment	3. Maintain	4. Cooperate	5. Decide
---------------------	---------------	-------------	--------------	-----------

Progress is iterative: trial results may lead to revised needs, partnerships or decision criteria.

Cross-cutting capacity. Translating between civic, political, economic, technical and financial realities underpins the entire sequence. It turns an intuition into understandable needs, criteria, responsibilities, budgets and consequences without erasing disagreements.

Main finding

The forum shifts the question from “Which vehicle should we choose?” to “Which capacities does the territory want to build, for which uses, and on what evidence?”

Institutional significance

This document is a structured interim contribution to the inquiry informing a roadmap. It is not a political decision, a financial commitment or an adopted roadmap. Three forums have taken place so far, two in Sanem. The process continues with work involving citizens, experts, practitioners, municipalities and partners, followed by a fourth forum overall, the third in Sanem, planned for December 2026.

1. Scope, method and status of findings

1.1 What is included and excluded

Status	Content
Included	Questions, objections, examples, proposals and arguments expressed by the audience after the scenes.
Included	Stances and decision criteria made visible through the contributions.
Excluded	Actors' dialogue, arguments prepared in character sheets and elements intended to provoke debate.
Excluded	Facilitators' reformulations, except where essential to understanding a contribution.
Excluded	Promotional claims about a vehicle or brand unless participants turn them into a question.

1.2 Categories used in the analysis

Status	Definition
Observed contribution	An idea, objection, example or criterion explicitly expressed after a scene.
Stance	A way of entering the debate: budgetary caution, advocacy for inclusion, attention to the lifecycle, and so on.
Individual proposal	An idea put forward by one person that merits investigation but cannot be treated as a collective priority.
Convergence	An idea repeated in several contributions or supported by different arguments.
Unresolved tension	A trade-off for which several legitimate positions remain.
Territorial signal	A cautious interpretation of what the exchanges suggest about the territory's capacities or expectations.

1.3 Caution about stakeholder categories

The transcript and the meeting secretary's notes identify several experts and practitioners, but not every contribution with the same certainty. The document therefore distinguishes contributions by the kind of knowledge used rather than

systematically attributing them to individuals. The sources do not fully agree on who made the ironic pro-car intervention. This document treats it as a devil's-advocate contribution, not as a personal or institutional position. Any public attribution must be checked against the complete recording.

1.4 What the document can conclude

The material identifies decision criteria, proposals, tensions and evidence needs. It is neither a vote, a political mandate nor a representative survey of southern Luxembourg's population. Nor does it allow assessment of exchanges missing from the transcript.

2. What the forum reveals about the territory

The points below are signals to verify, not established properties of the territory. They nevertheless show how those present spontaneously framed sustainable mobility.

Observed signal	Strategic interpretation	Limitation to keep visible
Needs before objects	The project's legitimacy depends on a clearly identified public problem and target group.	Needs have not been prioritised collectively.
Experimentation before investment	The territory appears more willing to test and learn than to commit immediately to a substantial structure.	The scale, duration and responsibility for trials remain to be defined.
Maintenance as the first local threshold	Repairing, training, stocking parts and documenting appear more credible in the short term than full manufacturing.	Actual skills and costs have not yet been mapped.
Partnership rather than self-sufficiency	Outside expertise is accepted when it also creates learning and local room for action.	The actual content of skills transfer must be contractually defined.

Observed signal	Strategic interpretation	Limitation to keep visible
Service beyond demonstration alone	The contributions seek useful services for municipalities and people with limited access to mobility.	No use case has been given collective priority.
The Greater Region reflex	Cross-border cooperation is considered as a way to reach critical mass or share certain functions.	Its relevance must be demonstrated for each function.
Translation between worlds	Civic, political, economic, technical and financial realities must be made comparable to support explicit choices.	A shared language removes neither conflicts of interest nor the need to decide.
Circularity beyond recycling	Contributions connect sufficiency, waste prevention, reparability, obsolescence, finite resources, economic opportunities and public support.	No level of ambition, business model or public-private division of responsibilities has yet been agreed.

2.1 From technical object to territorial capacity

The clearest shift concerns the focus of reflection. The exchanges go beyond acquiring a vehicle to question the territory's capacity to understand uses, ensure availability, train, adapt, cooperate and make choices. The vehicle becomes a basis for investigating dependencies and responsibilities.

"They do not all speak the same language. Expectations need to be aligned first."

2.2 A territory seeking evidence

Cautious contributions do not reject innovation. They ask for ambition to be connected to real situations, a budget, responsibilities and a decision horizon. This gives Mobility Lab a role in learning and reducing uncertainty rather than endorsing promotional claims.

2.3 Graduated autonomy

Territorial autonomy is not equated with full manufacturing. It can begin with access to parts, maintenance, training, documentation, module adaptation and the ability to negotiate with a supplier. This graduated view offers a more credible path than a simple choice between importing and complete production.

2.4 The appropriate scale remains open

The municipality appears to be the level for concrete trials. Intermunicipal cooperation could support shared functions. The Greater Region is mentioned for specialist skills, circularity, training or industrial critical mass. The forum does not choose between these levels. It suggests assigning each function to the scale at which it becomes useful and sustainable.

2.5 A cross-cutting capacity: translating between worlds

The secretary's notes show that Patrick Van Egmond (LuxMobility) opens the first discussion by distinguishing three realities brought into contact: political, civic and economic. Anthony Auert (Luxinnovation) then reframes the problem as a gap in language and expectations between stakeholders. This translation is not a separate sixth stage. It is a condition for each of the five capacities: making a need intelligible, turning an objection into a criterion, explaining the public consequences of a technical constraint, and specifying who finances, who acts and who bears the risk.

2.6 Circularity as a lifecycle approach

The third sequence substantially broadens the circular economy concept. Contributions do not reduce it to recycling: they address sufficiency, waste prevention, repair, planned obsolescence, use of local resources, private businesses, economic outlets and support from public authorities. This material calls for assessing a solution across its entire lifecycle: actual need, design, material quantities, use, maintenance, repair, reuse, end of life and the viability of the business model.

3. Specific contributions from citizens, experts and public decision-making

The categories below describe types of contribution. They do not claim to attribute every statement to a confirmed identity. Their purpose is to show that territorial decision-making draws on different, complementary kinds of knowledge.

3.1 Contributions from citizens, users and civil-society organisations

Contribution	Knowledge produced	Implication for the inquiry
Everyday usefulness	The value of a VLI depends on whether it enables shopping, access to public services or a local journey.	Describe concrete situations before choosing configurations.
Accessibility and inclusion	Older people, disabled people and those without a car may have different needs from commuters.	Test distinct user groups and services instead of generalising a single solution.
Legitimacy of municipal action	Providing vehicles is not seen as an obvious municipal duty.	Link each action to a public mission, a target group and an assigned responsibility.
Social acceptability	Objections about comfort, rain, parking and car habits must be taken seriously.	Test beyond already convinced audiences and document barriers.
Proposal for solidarity-based mobility	A supported light-mobility service can connect mobility, proximity and pathways into employment.	Treat this as an individual hypothesis requiring legal and operational piloting.
Material sufficiency and prevention	Contributions stress buying less, keeping, giving away and repairing things, and preventing waste before discussing recycling.	Include reduced need, durability, affordability and everyday practices when assessing scenarios.

3.2 Contributions from experts and practitioners

Contribution	Knowledge produced	Implication for the inquiry
Diagnosis before solutions – Patrick Van Egmond, LuxMobility	Experience in mobility suggests understanding the origins of flows, infrastructure and behaviour before introducing a vehicle.	Establish a baseline and hypotheses about which journeys could be replaced.
Lifecycle cost – Fadi Fikani, CFL	The purchase price covers neither parts, downtime, training time nor after-sales service.	Compare scenarios using full costs and availability rates.
Repairability	A model in which a minor fault requires replacement of an entire assembly creates dependency and waste.	Negotiate access to parts, diagnostics, documentation and the right to repair.
Transfer partnership – Massimo Russo, Voltup	Expertise already mature abroad can become a resource for local learning.	Specify and cost training, support, documentation and adaptation rights in the contract.
Climate effectiveness – Jean Lasar, Survcoin	Local content should not be pursued independently of actual decarbonisation gains.	Compare impacts, useful life and journeys actually replaced.
Local customisation – Anthony Auert, Luxinnovation	A standardised base can be supplemented with modules adapted to territorial needs.	Test a division of labour compatible with safety and warranty requirements.
Territorial value – Matthieu Degrave, Myways	Wages, social contributions, purchases and local activity change how the cost to the public is assessed.	Add a local-value analysis to lifecycle costing.
Greater Region cooperation – Frédéric Liégeois, Infogreen	Certain functions could reach critical mass at cross-border scale.	Identify functions that can be shared, distances and administrative barriers.

Contribution	Knowledge produced	Implication for the inquiry
Economic conditions for circularity – Frédéric Liégeois, Infogreen	A circular loop becomes sustainable when it also meets economic requirements: access to materials, buyback, outlets, secure supplies and anticipation of risks.	Test the business model, material flows, customers, incentives and public support needed for viability.
Recovery infrastructure – Matthieu Degrave, Myways	Businesses are progressing in recovery and recycling, but facilities for adding value to recovered materials, reparability and sustainable solutions remain insufficient.	Map the workshops, platforms, material flows and repair capacities available in the territory.

3.3 Contributions relevant to public decision-making

Contribution	Decision question	Corresponding requirement
Budgetary caution	How should ambition, available resources and accepted risk be balanced?	Phasing, full budget, a responsible lead and the option to stop.
Municipal mandate	What public mission justifies intervention?	Target group, expected service, legal competence and relationship to existing provision.
Accountability to taxpayers	Will the investment still make sense in five or ten years?	Useful life, residual value, maintenance, obsolescence and an exit scenario.
Choice of scale	Should the municipality act alone, share functions or cooperate across borders?	Compare governance, coordination costs, service proximity and political legitimacy.
Multi-criteria decisions	How can climate, social justice, local value, cost and resilience be balanced?	A transparent matrix and progression criteria agreed before expansion.
Public-private relationships	How should private initiative, public investment, risk-taking and the creation of economic opportunities be distributed?	Explicit governance, risk-sharing, transparency rules and a defined role for each stakeholder.

Contribution	Decision question	Corresponding requirement
Public framework for circularity	How can obsolescence be limited, repair supported and circular solutions made affordable?	Regulation, public procurement, repairability standards, incentives and support for recovery infrastructure.

Complementary contributions

Citizens and users reveal needs, barriers and conditions for acceptability. Experts and practitioners clarify technical, economic and organisational consequences. Public stakeholders must turn these contributions into mandates, responsibilities, criteria and reversible decisions.

4. The five territorial capacities revealed by the contributions

The contributions can be read as expressing five interdependent capacities. Each corresponds to practical skills to develop and evidence to produce before any major commitment.

4.1 Understand needs

Observed contributions	What they reveal	Evidence still needed
Start with the local problem, distinguish user groups, investigate journeys, check that the product meets an actual need, explore solidarity-based mobility and address social objections.	The territory needs capacities for diagnosis, inquiry and sufficiency, not just a supply of vehicles.	Journey data, interviews, a map of existing services, avoidance potential, before-and-after conditions and political selection of use cases.

4.2 Experiment

Observed contributions	What they reveal	Evidence still needed
The municipality as a trial setting, internal use, public demonstration, cautious innovation and refusal to deploy without demonstrated demand.	Trials must be limited, comparable, supported and connected to a future decision.	Mandate, responsible lead, duration, use rules, success criteria, current baseline and stopping procedure.

4.3 Maintain

Observed contributions	What they reveal	Evidence still needed
Lifecycle cost, parts, downtime, local diagnostics, repair, training, after-sales service, waste prevention and customisation.	Maintenance and repairability are the first test of credibility and may become the first local circular capacity.	Maintenance plan, critical stock, skills, downtime, hourly costs, supplier support, warranty, repairability and withdrawal procedure.

4.4 Cooperate

Observed contributions	What they reveal	Evidence still needed
Transfer partnerships, existing expertise abroad, a reliable base, local adaptations, public-private relationships, circular value chains and the Greater Region option.	The sovereignty sought is open: it concerns capacities, rights, partnerships and economic opportunities, rather than self-sufficiency.	Committed partners, functions that can be shared, contractual clauses, business model, governance, service distances and regulatory compatibility.

4.5 Decide

Observed contributions	What they reveal	Evidence still needed
Budget, municipal mandate, public money, climate effects, material sufficiency, territorial value, circularity, responsibility and a five-to-ten-year horizon.	Decisions must be transparent, reversible and based on multiple criteria, with continuation thresholds and explicit circularity ambitions.	Full costs, impact, social access, availability, waste avoided, useful life, governance, partner commitments and criteria for continuing, refocusing or stopping.

Interdependence

One cannot experiment without understanding needs, maintain without cooperating with suppliers, or decide without trial data. Mobility Lab can be understood as the arrangement connecting these five capacities.

4.6 Two cross-cutting themes

Translate between worlds. User knowledge, technical constraints, economics, political responsibilities and financial conditions must become mutually understandable.

Think circular across the entire lifecycle. Circularity starts with need and sufficiency, then extends to design, materials, use, maintenance, repair, reuse, end of life and the economic conditions that sustain these practices.

5. Stances and decision criteria introduced into the debate

Stances are not personal labels. One person may draw on several. They identify the criteria that a future decision will have to reconcile.

Stance	Question raised	Criterion introduced
Translator between worlds	How can the project be understood across politics, technology, finance and use?	Shared language and explicit expectations.
Guardian of the public mandate	Why should the municipality act?	Mission, proportionality, responsibility.
Devil's advocate	Does the project withstand ordinary objections?	Acceptability and strength of the arguments.
Problem-oriented practitioner	Which local problem are we trying to solve?	Diagnosis and baseline situation.
Advocate for inclusion	Which groups remain without a solution?	Social access and everyday usefulness.
Economic pragmatist	Where does expertise already exist, and at what cost?	Maturity, speed, technical risk.
Lifecycle steward	Who maintains, repairs and pays for downtime?	Availability, repairability, full costs.
Advocate for climate effectiveness	Which scenario genuinely reduces impacts?	Substitution, materials, useful life, emissions.

Stance	Question raised	Criterion introduced
Territorial integrator	What should be standardised, and what adapted locally?	Modularity, warranty, adaptation.
Cross-border strategist	At what scale do functions become viable?	Critical mass, sharing, governance.
Advocate for material sufficiency	How can we avoid producing, buying and discarding what is unnecessary?	Actual need, prevention, durability, repairability.
Circular-economy entrepreneur	Under what conditions does a repair, reuse or recycling loop become economically viable?	Outlets, material flows, incentives, business model.
Public-private architect	How should initiative, risk, funding, regulation and operation be allocated?	Governance, transparency, responsibility, public support.

Political interpretation

The debate does not reveal one camp for VLI and another against them. It produces a structure of criteria: usefulness, social justice, cost, climate, learning, autonomy, cooperation and public responsibility.

6. Proposed inquiry matrix

This matrix turns contributions into testable hypotheses. The leads mentioned are possibilities to confirm. The forum itself assigns no roles.

Capacity	Hypothesis to test	Data or experience	Potential lead, to be confirmed
Understand	Two to four use cases offer sufficient usefulness to justify a trial.	Interviews, journey data, service mapping and usefulness criteria.	Äerdschëff with municipalities and relevant stakeholders.
Experiment	Some municipal journeys can be made without reducing service quality.	A pilot recording baseline conditions, weather, load, time, incidents and acceptance.	A participating municipal service and Mobility Lab coordination.

Capacity	Hypothesis to test	Data or experience	Potential lead, to be confirmed
Understand / experiment	A light service can meet an unmet need for solidarity-based mobility.	Mapping existing provision, a limited pilot, support, cost, safety and continuity.	A willing municipality, association or social operator.
Maintain	A local contact, minimum parts stock and documentation reduce downtime.	Maintenance log, availability, critical parts, costs and response times.	A local technical partner working with the supplier.
Maintain / cooperate	Local modules improve use without undermining safety or warranty.	Limited prototypes, validation, usefulness, cost, reparability and user feedback.	Designer, workshop and supplier to be identified.
Cooperate	A learning-oriented contract creates measurable skills and rights in the territory.	Training hours, documentation, parts access, support and modification rights.	A public or civil-society purchaser working with a supplier.
Cooperate	Certain functions are more effective at intermunicipal or cross-border scale.	Comparison of costs, distances, timescales, shared needs and governance.	PRO-SUD, participating municipalities and ZFT partners.
Decide	A sustainable governance arrangement and business model can be defined using trial results.	Ownership, insurance, maintenance, coordination, full costs, social access and commitment.	Political and operational steering committee.
Maintain / decide	Resource-efficient, durable and repairable design reduces waste, downtime and total cost.	Useful life, successful repairs, parts availability, waste avoided, reuse, costs and material impacts.	Supplier, technical partner, workshop and purchaser to be identified.

Capacity	Hypothesis to test	Data or experience	Potential lead, to be confirmed
Cooperate / decide	A public-private model can support circularity if roles, risks and economic outlets are explicit.	Investment, revenue, public support, private commitments, governance, exit clauses and territorial value.	Municipalities, PRO-SUD, willing operators and businesses.

6.1 Progression criteria

Capacity	Criterion for continuing or refocusing
Understand	Use cases are defined, target groups identified and the baseline documented.
Experiment	Use is regular, responsibilities are controlled and concrete usefulness or substitution is evident.
Maintain	Availability, repairability, response times, useful life and maintenance costs fit the expected service.
Cooperate	Partners take on specific functions, dependencies are contractually defined and economic opportunities are plausible.
Decide	The mandate, costs, impact, circularity ambitions, governance and stopping criteria are explicit.

7. What the forum did not decide

The credibility of the next steps depends as much on visible uncertainties as on good proposals. The following points remain open.

Open question	Why it remains open	Evidence or decision needed
Which public problem should be addressed first?	Several needs are mentioned without collective prioritisation.	Diagnosis and political selection of use cases.
Which groups should be served?	Staff, residents, businesses, associations and vulnerable groups face different constraints.	Usage profiles, access criteria and support.
Which journeys will actually be replaced?	Interest in a VLI does not prove that it replaces a car or van.	Usage logs and before-and-after comparisons.
Which business model?	The purchase price does not cover operation, insurance, coordination and maintenance.	Full costs, rental or leasing scenarios and funding sources.
Which governance arrangement?	Ownership, responsibility and decision-making have not been assigned.	Mandate, agreements and a written allocation of roles.
What level of local capacity?	Maintenance, adaptation, assembly and production have different requirements.	Mapping skills, volumes, costs and risks.
At what scale should functions be shared?	The Greater Region is a hypothesis, not a conclusion.	Partners, distances, administrative barriers and measurable gains.
What safety and warranty framework?	Adaptations can change responsibilities.	Supplier assessment, insurance, technical validation and a modification procedure.
What political representativeness?	The forum produces criteria, not a mandate from the population.	Political deliberation, additional surveys or targeted validation.
What ambitions for sufficiency and circularity?	The debate covers prevention, repair, recycling, obsolescence and finite resources, without agreed objectives or indicators.	Criteria for need, useful life, repairability, recycled material, waste avoided and access costs.

Open question	Why it remains open	Evidence or decision needed
Which public-private model?	Private businesses are considered necessary, but their role, risks and public support remain under discussion.	Governance scenarios, business model, public procurement, risk allocation and safeguards for the public interest.

A proportionate decision

The available material may justify a limited exploratory phase. It is insufficient for an immediate decision on a substantial fleet, a permanent structure or an industrial strategy.

8. Conclusion and proposed next steps

The forum's main finding is not a preference for a vehicle, brand or sector. It is the identification of territorial capacities needed to make light mobility credible: understanding needs, experimenting, maintaining, cooperating and deciding. The secretary's notes also confirm two cross-cutting themes: translating between civic, political, economic and technical worlds, and considering circularity throughout the lifecycle.

Citizens and users mainly enriched understanding of needs, social usefulness, acceptability, material sufficiency and the municipal mandate. Experts and practitioners clarified consequences for maintenance, lifecycle costs, contracts, climate effectiveness, industrial integration, circular business models and the scale of cooperation. Public decision-making perspectives highlighted the need to proceed in phases, justify action, regulate, allocate responsibilities and make investment reversible.

Mobility Lab can be designed as the learning arrangement connecting these contributions. Its value would lie not in the number of vehicles deployed, but in producing the evidence needed to continue, refocus or stop. A VLI Centre function would become relevant only afterwards, to share capacities whose usefulness has been demonstrated, including maintenance, repair, resource recovery and useful public-private cooperation.

8.1 Continuing the process until December 2026

From July to December 2026, working meetings involving citizens, experts, practitioners, municipalities and partners should investigate questions opened by "Roulez léger" and refined at the two Sanem forums. A fourth Expert-Citizen Forum overall, the third in Sanem, is planned for December 2026 to present findings from this phase, discuss interim scenarios and guide the next stage of inquiry.

Proportionate stage	Expected result
1. Define the scope	Choose a few use cases, target groups, partners and success criteria.
2. Test	Document use, substitution, incidents, acceptability and costs.
3. Maintain	Train local contacts, organise parts and measure availability.
4. Compare	Assess scenarios for contracts, adaptation, shared functions and governance.
5. Decide	Continue, refocus or stop using criteria announced in advance.

Brief formulation

First decide what the territory wants to be able to do, for which uses, with which responsibilities and on what evidence.

Appendix 1. Representative quotations from the exchanges

The short formulations below have been lightly normalised for readability from the automatic transcript and the meeting secretary's notes. They illustrate emerging decision criteria, but are not a certified verbatim record or an exhaustive attribution to institutions.

Reading caution

Use the quotations as qualitative traces of the debate. Any public reuse attributed to a person or institution must be checked against the complete recording.

Representative quotation	Contribution illustrated
"Three realities meet: political, civic and economic. They need translation between them."	Translation between worlds and decision criteria.
"What is the local problem we are trying to solve?"	Territorial diagnosis before choosing a vehicle.
"Public authorities can show existing solutions so citizens can try them."	Public experimentation and learning through use.
"Provide a municipal service for citizens facing mobility difficulties."	Social usefulness and a local service.
"A good idea is a partnership."	Cooperation and skills transfer.
"Does the vehicle's cost hold up over its full lifecycle?"	Lifecycle costs and investment decisions.
"There is one very important point: after-sales service."	Maintenance, trust and service continuity.
"What makes a vehicle expensive is customisation."	The balance between a standardised base and local adaptation.
"We need to consider effectiveness in terms of decarbonisation."	Climate impact as a decision criterion.
"The Greater Region could provide a large enough base to develop an industrial project."	Critical mass and cross-border cooperation.
"The starting point is not recycling. It is not creating waste."	Sufficiency, prevention and the hierarchy of circular strategies.

“Let us think circular throughout the product’s entire life.”	Lifecycle, maintenance, repair and end of life.
“In the real economy, public authorities also need to create opportunities and support initiatives.”	Economic conditions, regulation and the public role.
“Let us build locally if it makes sense and is necessary; then let us make it as circular as possible.”	Circularity conditional on need and territorial relevance.

These quotations show that contributions mainly added decision criteria: public need, experimentation, maintenance, translation between worlds, cooperation, full costs, climate impact, sufficiency, circularity, business model and territorial scale.