Who answers for a decision on Bonaire?



Bonaire AI white paper • 27 November 2026 · Revision 2

Bonaire is a public body of the Netherlands. Its local framework should tell residents whether an island office or a national service holds their file, and make tourism and marine decisions understandable to the people who depend on them.

The decision before local leaders

This paper proposes two starting points for Bonaire. Before either begins, the service owner should agree on an existing comparison service, a way to challenge an error and the conditions for ending the trial.

Test a lost application moving between an island counter and an RCN unit.

Proposed lead. Participating service supervisors

What to measure. Count cases reaching the correct office with their original receipt date.

Review a sample of navigation and mooring suggestions with the marine park.

Proposed lead. Visitor information service lead

What to measure. Count unsupported claims that a buoy is available or authorised for use.

Local evidence in context

Indicator	Value	Observation	Source
Population	26,552	1 Jan 2025	Statistics Netherlands

The year and geographic coverage belong to each observation. These figures describe the jurisdiction as a whole. Collect service-level figures before setting a cost target, staff requirement or digital access threshold.

Economic and social needs

Count how visitors arrived

Statistics Netherlands reports that 171,100 tourists visited Bonaire by air in 2023. That series measures one form of arrival. A business buying food for a market day would need additional information about cruise calls, local demand and whether arrivals spread over several days. A proposed demand forecast should state which customers it covers and let traders compare its prediction with their own unsold stock.

Policy response. Publish separate inputs for overnight and day demand and allow vendors to record exceptions.

Statistics Netherlands, The Caribbean Netherlands in numbers, air tourism

Help a carer finish the application

Rijksdienst Caribisch Nederland describes child benefit for qualifying parents or carers in the Caribbean Netherlands and provides an application form. An AI helper could explain which field a carer missed. It should preserve the person’s route to the RCN unit responsible for the benefit. A missing attachment should prompt clear instructions about the next step and leave an identifiable person available to review a disputed request.

Policy response. Test incomplete applications and record whether carers can resolve them without starting over.

Rijksdienst Caribisch Nederland, Child benefit

Public institutions and environmental needs

Distinguish the island authority from the national office

The Dutch government explains that Bonaire has an island authority and is also governed by Dutch central government. Its executive council handles day-to-day island governance. An assistant covering more than one service must establish which authority owns the decision before it tells a resident where to complain. The proposed policy requires a named receiving office and a record whenever a request moves between the two levels.

Policy response. Test handovers across island and national offices using the same case reference.

Government of the Netherlands, Governance of Bonaire, St Eustatius and Saba

A map cannot allocate a mooring

STINAPA publishes mooring rules and an application process involving registration details for certain mooring uses. A boating assistant that spots a buoy on an image cannot infer who may use it, whether permission is current or whether conditions have changed. For a pilot, the harbour and park contacts should check what the tool may display. A visitor should see the date and source of the guidance before relying on it.

Policy response. Suppress claims of availability or permission when the official record does not establish them.

STINAPA Bonaire, Mooring rules

How the policy would change a decision

Enter a sample payment under a variant of the tenant’s surname, then run the ranking. Check how staff discover the mismatch and whether a corrected ledger changes the order of offers. Avoid using actual applicants for the trial.

- Record the source of each ranking factor and why the housing provider needs it.
- Set a deletion date for test files and check that the provider and supplier remove their copies.

The allocations manager should keep the queue order before and after correction, with a timestamp for the next offer. If the team cannot restore the applicant’s place in time, suspend automated ranking and allocate from the checked list.

Source: CAIA jurisdiction guide for Bonaire. The worked example illustrates the proposal.

Ask people where the camera cannot see

Invite Papiamentu-speaking residents, water users and park staff to mark areas they know and places the camera cannot see. Give people a shore-based reporting route; contributing should not require a boat or an expensive camera.

The local pilot connects to Tourism, retail and small businesses. Review R03 · R05 in the regional risk register.

Implementation and public review

Stage	Evidence or decision	Proposed responsibility
Before the trial	Define a completed case and sample the current process. Include people who use the phone, desk or an offline route.	Participating service supervisors
During shadow testing	Count cases reaching the correct office with their original receipt date. Compare the same cases through both routes and record every override.	Participating service supervisors
At the local decision	Count unsupported claims that a buoy is available or authorised for use. Record whether the result justifies a live trial and identify the person who can stop it.	Visitor information service lead
After six months	Publish results by channel, the correction time, unresolved complaints and the decision to continue, revise or stop.	Local service owner

What partners can share

Other Dutch Caribbean islands could use the same seagrass test. Bonaire, Aruba and Curaçao have different legal arrangements. Ask each partner which office can release its own survey records.

Record the local approval, correction route and stop authority before exchanging results. Other jurisdictions can reuse the method and run their own tests. Regional recommendation 5.

Where to draw the boundary

An office adopting this proposal would still need to check its own powers, contracts and data permissions. Organisations named as possible reviewers or leads have not been appointed by this publication. Publish any accepted role and its date with the local trial record.

A 90-day plan for the first service

Test a lost application moving between an island counter and an RCN unit.

Proposed pilot lead. Participating service supervisors

A handoff between counters resets a filing date

Failure to test. An application reaches the wrong office or loses its original timestamp when the case moves.

Evidence to retain. Keep the dated receipt, transfer log and receiving officer’s confirmation of the original time.

Pause condition. The case may miss a deadline because either office cannot recover its original receipt.

When	Proposed action and evidence
Days 1–30	Participating service supervisors agrees the eligible cases, existing service measures, staffed alternative and authorised decision owner. Record reviewers and a cost estimate in local currency for staff time, testing, access and recovery. Identify the funding source and who would approve it.
Days 31–60	Run the original and proposed routes on the same sample. Count cases reaching the correct office with their original receipt date. Report counted errors and eligible cases by channel and language where lawful, plus the time from error report to correction.
Days 61–90	Witness the fallback, correction and restart before asking the accountable officer for a decision. Pause on the condition above. Record affected cases, unresolved issues, costs and the date for the next check.
Six months after live launch	Publish a lawful comparison with the baseline, including corrections, open complaints and the decision to continue, change or end the use.

Sponsorship, funding and the proposed lead’s acceptance require a recorded local decision. Share test methods with Caribbean partners using the local data permissions.

Sector guide · Government of the Netherlands, Governance of Bonaire, St Eustatius and Saba · Local evidence and sources · Regional high-impact use rules · Local risk scenario

Sources and method

The committee used published local evidence to select the four priorities and compared them with the Caribbean AI Framework’s requirements for access, data, skills, oversight and adoption. Recommendations and stories are editorial proposals. This edition reports no results from a completed local pilot.

1. Statistics Netherlands, The Caribbean Netherlands in numbers, air tourism
2. Rijksdienst Caribisch Nederland, Child benefit
3. Government of the Netherlands, Governance of Bonaire, St Eustatius and Saba
4. STINAPA Bonaire, Mooring rules
5. Statistics Netherlands — Population
6. Bonaire jurisdiction guide, Caribbean AI Association
7. Bonaire pilot note, Caribbean AI Association
8. Caribbean AI Framework, consultation edition, 27 November 2026

Suggested citation: Caribbean AI Association, AI Framework Committee (2026). Who answers for a decision on Bonaire?. Country white paper, consultation edition, 27 November 2026. Publication page.