

Von: **Info Make Stewardship Count** info@make-stewardship-count.org 

Betreff: Response from MSC - a response to our letter from January

Datum: 29. April 2018 um 23:48

An: kate.oconnell@balaena.org, Shannon Arnold sarnold@ecologyaction.ca, Cat Dorey catdorey@gmail.com



Dear Colleagues and Friends,

And here comes the surprise from the MSC....

More than 3 months after having received our letter they have now finally taken the time to send us an answer!

And while I have to say it is quite a long letter, the way it is written doesn't show any real appreciation of our requests, the offered help in improving the MSC, nor our coalition of meanwhile 76 scientists and NGOs around the globe - with 66 of us actually having signed the letter already back then. But please, read it (attached to this mail) yourselves and let us know what you think about it.

Without going into more detail at this stage, there are **some key issues to note** straight away:

- Our letter from January 2018 was addressed to Rupert Howes and Werner Kiene. So I think we should also receive an answer from them or at least somebody more senior than Nicolas Guichoux, who is the commercial director of the MSC, shouldn't we? And actually he had not even sent it himself, but it was sent by James Simpson (head of public relations) instead.
- Our letter was sent to the MSC on behalf of all signatory parties, a coalition of 66 scientists and NGOs from around the globe; therefore it is not appropriate to refer in their response solely to Sharkproject or the "*Shark Project letter*" (...+ they are consistently spelling it the wrong way throughout the letter). While Sharkproject is one of the signatories and we are strongly committed to this joint campaign as are many others of you, the requested improvements are definitely not just the

"Shark Project recommendations"! This is disrespectful of our international coalition of scientists and experts, who signed the letter!

- They haven't taken the time or made the effort to actually read and understand the requested improvements but chosen to simply reply by listing their already ongoing activities like the Assurance Review. To this they actually did invite me (as they write) to come to London - however only with a bit more than 1 week's notice, so that I had literally no chance to attend this, nor had Kate, Shannon or Cat on such short notice. Saying this I would have thought that this meeting had been planned by MSC for several months already, as it was to include the new STAC members and was therefore scheduled directly after the first meeting of the new STAC for April 20th...;
- In most other cases they simply refer to the upcoming regular review of the standard, which is planned for implementation by 2020 and at least another 3 years of transition period. They completely ignore that we had requested a much swifter action than that scheduled time frame, and in the letter they are not even offering a direct meeting to discuss our requests.
- And as said above, they didn't really take the time or didn't want to actually read and understand our requests, which we had formulated after extensive discussions with many scientists and experts within and outside of our coalition of signatories. To me **their responses rather sound like "standard replies" referring back to their own agenda and in most instances they deliberately disregard our requested improvements.**

Please, do let us have your thoughts and comments to this response so that Cat, Kate, Shannon and I can work on drafting a more detailed response letter or have these ready to use when / if we meet with them to discuss this response.

The more we can collect your inputs already now, the better and more structured we can then formulate our reply.

I have just started to add some comments myself pointing out that the provided answers either do not properly address our referenced request or is deliberately ignoring it. So when they claim that "In version 2.0 of the MSC Fisheries Standard, before a fishery can be certified it must be able to demonstrate that sharks landed have the fins naturally attached. This is regarded as best practice" they forget to mention it is neither executed this way during the assessments by the CABs nor is it at all applied to fisheries when sharks are not the target species but only a significant bycatch like in the PNA, Canadian swordfish longlining or Echebastar.

But I think we should review together all of their "answers" in such a way before coming to a conclusion for a response to them and whether to address such a response to them first or publishing it directly.

And last but not least: Please, note that I just received this letter now, after having met with Stefanie Kirse and James Simpson during the MSC Future Forum at the Seafood Expo in Brussel, where they stopped me after their event almost "encircling" me and thereafter send me an email that they would like to attend our meeting.....

But I have to give them credit that James actually offered in his mail when forwarding Nicola's letter:

"When we spoke, you said that you would prefer a direct meeting to a letter. Could you supply a selection of dates when a meeting would be convenient please? I recommend these are in June onwards as the more notice we have, the better the availability of our senior staff."

Please, let us have your thoughts about this reply and what you would consider to be the best way forward.

And meanwhile we will just send them a quick note to emphasise that this hasn't been a Shark Project letter or "Shark Project recommendations" but a letter from an international community of scientists and NGOs expressing our serious concerns and that a meeting with their senior staff (e.g. including the new standard director?) will have to be scheduled with a delegation of our coalition.

Thanks

Kind regards

Iris

visit our website for current updates and more information

<http://www.make-stewardship-count.org>



Letter to Shark
Project...-18.pdf