

31 March 2020

Mr. Christopher Paris
VP Operations
Oxebridge Quality Resources International LLC
Tampa FL – Lima Peru

Re: Complaint in relation to IAS

Dear Mr. Christopher Paris

Please be informed that APAC has completed its complaint response process in relation to the above matter and the findings are provided below.

Oxebridge Complaint #1

IAS stands in violation of ISO 17011:2017 clause 7.1 and the bulk of related clauses, if not the entire spirit of the standard, by arguing that its accredited CBs can violate ISO 17021-1 and IAF MD5 at any time prior to either the signing of a contract or the issuance of a certificate.

APAC's response to Complaint #1

The APAC investigation into this complaint indicates that IAS has taken its own investigations onsite to determine if the conformity assessment bodies (CABs) were providing their clients clear and accurate estimates with regard to their onsite audits.

In communication with the CABs verified during the onsite IAS investigations particularly, AQC Pty Ltd and Inter Cert Pty Ltd confirmed that their quotations or market flyers were certification prices used for generic solicitations and not official CAB-Client contracts. The IAS onsite verification confirmed these CABs have a separate and well-defined contract for each client which lists duration days for the samples that were reviewed. The audit records also demonstrated that the duration days were accurate. IAS has informed the CABs that quotations without duration days should not be sent out as this will confuse the market.

Oxebridge Complaint #2

IAS violated ISO 17011:2017 clause 7.12 by willfully ignoring its obligation to address and enforce ISO 17021-1 clause 4.6 on confidentiality in the complaint filed by Oxebridge.

APAC's response to Complaint #2

The investigation indicates that IAS policy is clear on confidentiality and further its accredited CABs have taken actions since the complaint to indicate a disclaimer on the use of man-days in the quotation template.

Oxebridge Complaint #3

IAS is in violation of ISO 17011:2017 clause 4.3.5 for failing to control the use of its mark by both its accredited CBs as well as unaccredited CBs who illegally use the mark.

APAC's response to Complaint #3

This complaint related to the case of QACS and Al Raeda Business Consulting. IAS suspended this CAB pending an investigation to analyze the relationships between the consultant company and CAB. IAS

New Zealand Society Number: 1877392



completed two onsite investigations in Indore, India and Ajman, UAE. The issue was that an unknown affiliate of the CAB solicited the marketing flyers with the CAB logos, IAS logos and consultancy offers. QACS investigated this and determined it had had no relationship to them and had followed up with legal actions to stop this practice. IAS conducted visits of QACS's clients to substantiate the CABs claims. After all findings were closed satisfactorily IAS reinstated the accreditation of QACS.

The investigation indicates IAS has a formal complaint system which follows-up about misuse of IAS logo.

Oxebridge Complaint #4

IAS is in violation of ISO 17011:2018 clause 9.8 for failing to properly process complaints, for initially providing an inadequate response, and then – after the complaint was escalated to APAC – providing confusing, redundant and wholly insufficient additional responses in an apparent attempt to confuse the process further.

APAC's response to Complaint #4

The investigation indicates the IAS procedure for complaints and appeals was issued in 2016 named "Misuse of IAS Logo, Internal and External Complaints" and is available on the IAS website: https://www.iasonline.org/contact/.

IAS kept communication with complainant, APAC and its accredited CABs timely. IAS took several onsite and off-site investigations and suspend one of its accredited CABs because the CAB's clarification was insufficient during investigation. Therefore, there is no direct evidence that IAS is in violation of ISO 17011:2018 clause 9.8

Oxebridge Complaint #5

APAC has not investigated the complaint against IAS in a timely fashion.

APAC's response to Complaint #5

The whole process of APAC investigation on the complaint against IAS is in accordance with APAC procedure "APAC MS-004 Complaints and Appeals Process". The following list is a chronological order of the handling of the complaint by APAC.

- In September and October 2019, complainant contacted IAS to discuss issues about accredited CABs via email. Some of emails was cc APAC.
- On 11 November 2019, the complainant sent an amended complaint letter with more information to APAC. APAC forwarded it to IAS ask a response to complainant.
- On 13 November 2019, IAS had done some complaint investigations then submitted an updated complaint investigation report to the complainant.
- On 15 December 2019, APAC contacted IAS in order to ensure the issues had been solved by IAS.
 IAS resubmitted the letter of 13 November 2019 to APAC to ask this matter closed. IAS explained
 IAS had taken several steps to ensure that its accredited organizations are in compliance with the
 relevant issues.
- On 17 December 2019, APAC decided to record this as a valid formal complaint because the complainant was still unsatisfied after many rounds of communication with IAS.
- On 11 February 2020, the complainant escalated the complaint against IAS and APAC to IAF.
- On 20 March 2020, the investigation and proposed response was completed.
- On 26 March 2020, the proposed response was endorsed by the APAC Executive Committee.



In conclusion, there is no direct evidence to indicate IAS is in breach of ISO/IEC 17011 and MD 5. APAC will include in its next re-evaluation of IAS a focus on complaint handling, confidentiality and associated records.

APAC thanks you for bringing the above issues to our attention and having completed our investigation we now consider these complaints to be closed.

Yours sincerely

Graeme Drake Secretary