Original questions and the received response

Michel Peen | 16 October 2026 | Author's comparison of two source documents; Dutch originals authoritative

Sources: Michel Peen's email with seven governance questions of 29 July 2026 and the municipal letter of 16 October 2026, reference 960865. The questions below are faithful translations of the original questions. Each assessment is Michel Peen's commentary. The municipality does provide information; this is not equivalent to a complete answer to the original questions.

1. Does the municipal executive recognise the factual developments, questions and risks described in the report?

The letter describes PULSE-TWIN's principles, but does not separately assess the factual developments, questions and risks in the submitted report.

2. Which AI applications, algorithms, risk models or forms of automated pattern recognition within PULSE-TWIN are operational, have been tested, or are planned?

The letter mentions the start-up/design phase and the absence of working algorithms and prompt sets. It does not provide a specific list covering operational, tested and planned applications, with their status.

3. Can the outputs of these systems directly or indirectly result in additional monitoring, enforcement or interventions in particular neighbourhoods or in relation to particular groups?

The letter says insights support officials, neighbourhood organisations and administrators and that a human weighs up decisions. It does not specifically answer whether or how those outputs can lead to additional monitoring, enforcement or interventions.

4. What safeguards prevent historical records or more intensive monitoring from reinforcing themselves and thereby generating further records and interventions?

The letter mentions the absence of personal data and advice on bias. It does not separately address the specific feedback loop between historical records, deployment and new records.

5. Which DPIAs, fundamental-rights assessments, independent audits and Data Protection Officer recommendations have been completed, and how is follow-up secured at the level of the municipal executive?

The letter mentions privacy assessments, DPIAs, FG/CISO review and ELSA advice. It does not specify the titles, dates, status and findings of completed assessments or independent audits, or how follow-up is secured by the municipal executive.

6. How are residents given understandable information about data collection, data linkages, automated analysis and their rights of access, correction, objection and complaint?

The letter refers to a website and future involvement through Buurtteams and JENS. It does not separately explain the requested information on data processing and the specific options for access, correction, objection and complaint.

7. How and when will the municipal council be fully informed about PULSE-TWIN’s operation, risks, costs, results and any expansion?

The municipal letter’s seventh question concerns participation by residents and civil-society organisations. It does not replace the original question about information to the municipal council. Who will inform the council, when and on the specified subjects remains unanswered.

Responsibility for the response

The letter was sent on behalf of the mayor and municipal executive. It does not confirm whether the mayor has seen the report, whether these answers are also given on his behalf, or whether the contact instruction of 5 October was given on his behalf. This is a separate accountability point; the substance of the received response is taken into account.