

two additional comments to the mail below.

1. where the first sentence ends with the date '17 December 2017', it must of course be '17 December 2018'.

2. just consulted the website <http://statiagovernment.com/> again. since yesterday or today (I didn't look yesterday) it is back in the air. and yes, *almost four months after its publication* the English translation of the progress report of 14 November 2018 is now also attached (see [http://www.statiagovernment.com/documents/Verzonden%20brief%20TK%20Progress%20report%20Sint%20Eustatius-ENG%20\\_DEF.pdf](http://www.statiagovernment.com/documents/Verzonden%20brief%20TK%20Progress%20report%20Sint%20Eustatius-ENG%20_DEF.pdf)).

With kind regards,

jan meijer.

On 04-03-19 at 22:07 Jan Meijer and Mia van Deelen wrote:

Dear chairman and members of the Committee on Kingdom Relations of the House of Representatives,

I noted with interest the letter from the State Secretary for the Interior and Kingdom Relations to the President of the Lower House of the States General dated 25 February 2019. It concerned a response to questions in my letters/mails of 13 November 2018 and 17 December 2017.

To start with, the mail of November 13, 2018. The 'ultimate question' that I formulated was quoted and then answered with a reference to the enclosed progress reports. In the pdf copy of the letter as I know it, nothing is included at all, but I am aware of two progress reports on St. Eustatius to date: one from 31 May 2018 and one from 14 November 2018 (*the latter dated the day after my letter*).

Then the one of December 17, 2018. On that day I sent two letters/emails:

- one with thirteen comments on the second progress report of 14 November 2018, and...
- one in response to a comment I was allowed to read that day on the website of [koninkrijksrelaties.nl](http://koninkrijksrelaties.nl); in this mail I strongly argue "*for transparency, both during the phase in which plans are drawn up, decisions are made about them and reports are made on them with regard to the progress and (financial) realisation, as well as the extent to which they contribute to a more liveable St. Eustatius*".

There is no response at all to the first mentioned mail and the response to the second mail ignores its essence (i.e. the point concerning transparency) but "only" follows a response to the *postscript* which states that it would adorn the Secretary of State when letters concerning St. Eustatius are made known to the local population in English. Incidentally, the latter appears to be absolutely endorsed by the State Secretary, but the reality is that to this day (4 March 2019) no English translation of the second progress report (of 14 November 2018) has been published on St. Eustatius.

Note: Just to be on the safe side, I'm going to check this last one. However, it turns out that the entire website of the St. Eustatius government has been "taken off the air". A screenshot of this website is attached to this mail. Two days ago (March 2nd) I saw that the following two links (i.e.

[http://statiagovernment.com/documents/Brief%20Knops\\_Voortgang\\_op\\_Sint\\_Eustatius-ENG.pdf](http://statiagovernment.com/documents/Brief%20Knops_Voortgang_op_Sint_Eustatius-ENG.pdf) and [https://www.tweedekamer.nl/kamerstukken/brieven\\_government/detail?id=2018Z10222&did=2018D31597](https://www.tweedekamer.nl/kamerstukken/brieven_government/detail?id=2018Z10222&did=2018D31597)) actually lead to the same letter of May 31st 2018 (first progress report), one in Dutch, the other in English. However, an English translation of the second progress report has never been published locally.

I'll finish with three points.

- First of all, I see a certain discrepancy between what the State Secretary communicates with the House of Representatives on the one hand and what the Government Commissioners shares with the local population on the other. This apart from the point that the English translation of the letter of 14 November 2018 has not yet succeeded (and the entire website appears to have been taken off the air; this fact has not been communicated locally either, for example via Facebook).

- Secondly, I think it is a pity that the mail of 17 December 2018, in which the second progress report is discussed, has remained completely unexplored. For example, I noticed (as item 10 of that mail) that - apparently - a decision on the local elections will be taken around 1 September 2019. The tone and direction of this decision are subject to a dozen conditions. In the 'list of projects' (annexed to the letter of 14 November 2018), I then miss a project, consisting of 12 sub-projects, aimed at fulfilling these conditions.
- Finally, the third point of conclusion: an illustration of how communication can sometimes take place. On 29 November 2018 there will be a 'townhall meeting' about the construction of the prison on St. Eustatius. In this 'meeting' the wish of the population is clearly expressed: *no prison at the location of the police station, but elsewhere on the island*. As an answer to question 16 - referred to 'Beantwoording Kamervragen commissie Koninkrijksrelaties' of 8 February 2019 - I read, among other things, that “it has been *formally* decided that the zoning plan will not be changed to make this possible. The Ministry of Justice and Security is currently investigating whether another location for detention capacity on Statia is feasible”. In local media (internet: Facebook, website: Statiagovernment.com or newspaper: The Daily Herald), I haven't heard about it (or I must have missed reading about it...).

With kind regards,

J.H.T. Meijer MBA,  
Bellevueroad 4, Upper Round Hill, St. Eustatius,  
Caribbean Netherlands.