Request from Team Pulse-Twin

English translation of the received Dutch email

From: Team Pulse-Twin | To: Michel Peen

Received: 5 October 2026 at 14:54 (Amsterdam time)

Subject: Request (Dutch original: Verzoek)

Anonymised reading translation. The Dutch originals remain authoritative. Personal names other than Michel Peen and case references are marked as redacted. Email addresses and technical delivery details are omitted. This PDF is a text representation, not an original email export.

Dear Mr Peen,

With this email, we would like to ask you to kindly stop sending emails directly to the mayor about Pulse-Twin. Your questions and/or comments are being, and will continue to be, handled within the organisation, rather than directly by the mayor. As of today, we will therefore no longer bring emails addressed to him about this matter specifically to the mayor's attention, so that you are aware.

Your Woo request with case number [case number redacted] is ongoing, as you know. Contact concerning this Woo request is handled through the Woo desk.

Finally, we have offered several times to meet with you to discuss your questions, because we consider openness and engagement important. Unfortunately, you do not wish to do so; you have indicated that you only wish to communicate in writing. That is why we are informing you of this in writing.

Kind regards,

Team Pulse-Twin

Source: the received Dutch email, checked against the supplied screenshots and the complete message in Gmail.

Reply by Michel Peen

English translation of the reply sent in Dutch

From: Michel Peen | To: Team Pulse-Twin

Sent: 5 October 2026 at 15:12 (Amsterdam time)

Subject: Re: Request (Dutch original: Re: Verzoek)

Dear Team Pulse-Twin,

Your email of 5 October 2026 concerns the route for my correspondence, but contains no substantive answers to the seven questions about governance that I raised on 29 July 2026 and brought to your attention again on 1 October 2026. I find this unsatisfactory.

These questions concern the possible consequences of Pulse-Twin for residents: their privacy, the use of surveillance and interventions, and oversight of data processing. Residents deserve clear and verifiable answers about these matters.

The mayor is responsible for maintaining public order. Furthermore, in his letter to the municipal council of 16 March 2026, the mayor [name redacted] himself states that he launched the Pulse-Twin project with partners. Having municipal staff handle correspondence does not remove his responsibility as an office-holder for matters within his portfolio.

I reject the suggestion conveyed by the words 'Unfortunately, you do not wish to do so'. I am willing to engage in dialogue and cooperate, but only in writing. Written communication is also a form of dialogue and makes questions and answers verifiable. My choice to communicate in this way is no reason to withhold substantive answers.

I therefore ask you to provide specific written answers to the following questions:

- Why has a substantive response on governance from or on behalf of the mayor to my seven questions not been provided?
- Has the mayor read my report and questions, and was your statement that emails will no longer be brought specifically to his attention made on his behalf?
- Who holds responsibility for the response at the governance level, and which member of staff is my designated contact? Please provide their name or role and email address.
- When will the seven questions be answered separately and in a verifiable manner? I maintain my reminder of 1 October 2026.

My questions about governance are separate from the Woo request with case number [case number redacted] and the formal complaint with reference [complaint reference redacted]. Referring me to the Woo desk does not replace the requested answers on governance.

Please send your response only in writing by email.

Kind regards,

Michel Peen

Sources on the mayor’s role: letter to the municipal council, 16 March 2026, page 2; Municipalities Act, Article 172(1).

Public translation: the mayor’s personal name, Woo case number and complaint reference are visibly redacted. Michel Peen is the only personal name shown.