

1. Leak from WATERDAM

From: Senior Policy Advisor (redacted)

To: Director of Urban Futures

Subject: Re: Vision Implementation Constraints

As requested, here is the internal clarification for what we can realistically deliver under Vision 2040.

Despite the public messaging, we will not be able to address the mobility-access gaps in Noorddam and Veenwijk until at least 2032. The budget reallocations to the canal belt upgrades have locked in our investment path for the next four cycles. Communications should continue to emphasise “phased roll-out,” but internally we should assume the outer districts will retain current service levels.

Regarding housing: displacement continues to be raised by community groups, but current redevelopment contracts include no negotiable affordability clauses. Legal has advised against opening this discussion. Recommend shifting attention to “place identity” storytelling and encouraging residents to make use of the new cultural amenities, even if uptake remains low.

Participation platforms remain popular with younger residents, which we will highlight. Engagement gaps in migrant communities should be described as “barriers we are actively learning from,” not as structural shortcomings.

Please advise if you want a revised communications package.

2. Leak from KLOMPENDAM

From: Participation Office Coordinator

To: Deputy City Manager

Subject: Practical Limits of the Pluriverse Platform

We are reaching capacity with the current co-creation formats. Staff have reported that the story circles run past midnight, and facilitators are struggling to synthesise 200+ “coexisting realities” into a single planning input. The Bring Your Own Ontology sessions have exceeded budget, particularly once groups requested multilingual metaphysical mediation.

We still lack a process for situations where two community worldviews directly contradict each other. Legal is unsure whether the proposed “mutual validity clause” has any grounding in Dutch administrative law.

Also, participation fatigue is becoming visible. Some groups are now refusing to attend further sessions unless we commit to direct implementation of their specific visions. Given that we cannot accommodate all simultaneous cosmologies spatially, we may need to scale back expectations without undermining the public narrative.

Please advise on whether we should pause new pluriversal pilots until staff are trained in conflict de-escalation.

3. Leak from MOSSELBROEK

From: Interdepartmental Strategy Liaison

To: Manager, Vision 2040 Programme

Subject: Clarification Needed Before Public Roll-Out

While the Vision text states that Mosselbroek will “promote a balanced housing supply,” we still have no internal alignment on what “balanced” means. Planning interprets it as more mid-range units; Welfare believes it should prioritise low-income households; and Finance insists on market-rate developments for revenue stability.

Mobility teams are also asking whether “connected city” implies reallocating road space to cyclists. This became sensitive after the business association complained that reduced car access could “disrupt entrepreneurial vitality.” Suggest keeping language general.

Participation protocols remain unclear. The statement that “responsibility lies with both residents and institutions” has already been flagged by legal, who worry it may be read as shifting blame to residents for low turnout.

We need internal guidance on how much specificity departments are allowed to provide when residents ask for details we do not yet have.

4. Leak from REGELSPOORT

From: Chief Administrative Analyst

To: Municipal Secretary

Subject: Procedural Overlaps – Request for Immediate Streamlining

We now have five overlapping frameworks for cross-department coordination, none of which reference each other. Staff are unsure which applies in which context. For example, the Spatial Allocation Matrix requires inputs that depend on approval of the Outcomes Assessment Protocol, which is itself waiting for results from the Pilot for Testing the Pilot.

The PCP (Participation Compliance Process) checklist has reached 47 steps, many of which require signatures from offices that no longer exist due to restructuring. Several departments have begun quietly skipping steps to meet deadlines, which technically invalidates the process but has become unavoidable if we want anything to move forward.

Communications is requesting a simplified narrative to maintain public confidence. They propose emphasising “phased implementation,” “adaptive coordination,” and “ongoing refinement,” while avoiding any mention of procedural bottlenecks.

5. Leak from ORDEWIJK

From: Internal Governance Advisor

To: Chief Executive, Central Coordination Office

Subject: Monitoring Risks in the Unified Decision System

Early testing shows that the Integrated Decision System centralises authority more tightly than anticipated. While efficiencies are indeed improving, several departments have raised concerns that they no longer have meaningful discretion. Staff morale is declining, though they remain cautious about expressing this openly due to the new performance review indicators tied to “strategic alignment.”

The Ordewijk Input Portal continues to receive resident suggestions, but synthesis teams report that 90% of submissions are being classified as “non-actionable” due to misalignment with the city’s predetermined objectives. The public version of the dashboard should continue displaying high engagement without detailing approval rates.

Cultural Affairs has asked whether the Ordewijk Identity Programme might be perceived as prescriptive. Communications recommends emphasising “unity” and “shared values,” but avoiding specifics that might draw attention to the underlying behavioural expectations.

Please advise on how explicitly we should address these concerns in internal reporting, given the leadership’s priority of maintaining a cohesive narrative.