



Stichting Dolphinmotion
Dijkstraat 21
6551 ZG Weert

info@dolphinmotion.nl

16 October 2013

Loro Parque Fundación
Avda. Loro Parque, s/n
38400 Puerto de la Cruz
Tenerife (Canary Islands)
adjunto@loroparque-fundacion.org
Tel: +34 922 37 40 81 - +34 922 37 38 41
Fax: + 34 922 37 31 10
www.loroparque-fundacion.org

Dear Mr Kiessling & Dr Alumunia,

Reference: Reply Inspection Request Morgan the Orca

In answer to your letter 30 september 2013, I am very disappointed to learn Loro Parque again refused our request for inspection of Morgan and state you do not see Dolphinmotion as a legitimate organization.

It is also unfortunate that you had misinterpreted the intention of having a Notary Public present during such an inspection. Rather than being a threat, it was intended to ensure that claims could not be made that were unsubstantiated. This was also to ensure that valid data was collected. You use the example of the weight of Morgan, so I will expand on that point here and say that suggesting a Notary Public be present was not to imply that you have presented false weights of Morgan, but we must inform you that we do have photographs and video which clearly show trainers standing on the weighing scale *with* Morgan, which would lead to a misinterpretation of the weights that *may* have been recorded. Again, having an impartial Notary Public figure present would protect both parties during an inspection.

It is offensive to both the organisation DolphinMotion and to Dr Visser that you would claim that she has "manipulated information" when all of her data has been verified by photographs, video etc. If you have any particular point you feel has been misrepresented, then please make that clear to us and we would be more than willing to provide evidence to show you that she has not 'manipulated information'. Unfortunately, again, it came as no surprise that you should make such claims, as you have done this in the past. But, as Dr Visser anticipated such claims, this therefore this led us to offer to include a Notary Public to accompany the inspection. Again, the presence of a Notary Public would prevent such false accusations.

Likewise, you have made the erroneous claim that Dr Visser refused an invitation by Loro Parque to have access to the holding area of the orcas. Dr Visser was invited by Dr Almunia and Ms Delponti to observe whilst a short video of Morgan was filmed. This was done from the area next to the trainers office. Accompanied by Dr Almunia, Dr Visser entered the area (for a maximum of 10 minutes). During this time Dr Visser was informed that she could not take note, photographs with a long lens, nor any video. Despite your claims, this is the ONLY invitation that Loro Parque has ever extended to Dr Visser. If you have evidence of either any other invitations or any refusals to such invitations in emails or letters, please do send them along to us as we would welcome clarification. If you have been wrongly informed by your staff as to the situation we hope that the details here will shed light on the event for you.

You claim *“Loro Parque has [been] always willing to cooperate with any animal welfare organization, and we are proud to be transparent about our animal management standards. Nevertheless, we do not see the legitimacy of your organization and which is the added value of your experts observing Morgan.”* The second part of your sentence is in direct conflict with the first and we must ask why you have taken such a strong and vehement stand?

We would like to point out that DolphinMotion is recognised by the Dutch Courts as a legitimate, legal party to the ongoing Court case about Morgan, which includes her transport to Loro Parque and her welfare at your entertainment park. Therefore, your claim that you do not see the legitimacy of DolphinMotion is counterintuitive and as such this can only lead us to one conclusion; that the evidence we have been supplied is indicative that there are still ongoing issues with Morgan and you do not want these issues to be exposed.

Likewise your claim that you do not see the value of our experts – this would, given our evidence, be a claim made by an organisation which had something to hide. If you have nothing to hide, there shouldn't be an issue with an inspection. It really couldn't be any more simpler than that. We would be happy to have an independent veterinarian present during the inspection also, which would add yet another level of transparency.

I look forward to your prompt response.

Sincerely,



Hester Bartels
DolphinMotion