|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Identification of Complaint | Date, recorded in EA system | Subject of Complaint | Summary of process to date | Next action(s) planned | Status (if closed, date of closure) |
| **TESYDO vs CAI** | 26/01/2015 | Concerns one CB for extension of validity of accreditation when CAI decided to not grant accreditation for the full scope subject to the application.  Concerns one IB whose application was entirely rejected by CAI. | Concerning CB: Complainant went to the Ministry in charge which upheld CAI decision. Complainant went to Court which reverted Ministry and CAI decisions. Result: CAI shall reconsider the process for the CAB. On 4/09/2017 CAI reported that assessment of CAB is ongoing. Decision expected.  Concerning IB:  The Complaint went to the Ministry in charge which upheld CAI ruling. Then Complainant went to court. No progress to date. | Concerning CB: decision on accreditation  CAI granted accreditation which came into effect on 30/10/2017 and legally into force on 15/11/2017. It closes the process.  Concerning IB: ruling by the Court | 16/11/2017  **Update 09/11/18**  **Not closed** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Verifavia vs DAkkS** | | 15/06/2017  (Initial contact made with N.C. Dalstrup on 5/06) | Concerns practices of Classification companies accredited for MRV.  Complainant claims there is unfair competition for accredited independent verifiers.  Issue is IT and Consultancy services given as a package with verification service by those companies | On 17/08/2017 DAkkS has been requested to provide a report on how the complaint was dealt with at DAkkS level.  The report has not been received yet.  On 23/08/2017 DAkkS accepted by anticipation to share it with the other NAB involved in the case (UKAS and ESYD).  Note 1: the case was first raised by Complainant in the EU ETS network and came to the Secr thru Niels-Christian Dalstrup.  Note 2: the Complainant raised also an issue against ESYD but could not demonstrate that a complaint had effectively been lodged with ESYD although contacts had obviously been taken. By email to ESYD on 16/10 2017, EA asked for an update on this.  Note3: UKAS is also mentioned but there is no evidence 1st that a complaint is raised with EA against UKAS and there is a case at UKAS level  DAkkS report received on 28/08/2018. It demonstrates that DAkkS took the appropriate action, including through onsite assessment and investigation which concluded that the CB Monitoring Plan Generator does not constitute “technical assistance” in the meaning of the Regulation. The outcome of DAkkS investigation is that there is no conflict of interest regarding impartiality and in particular consultancy. | DAkkS informed EA that they would report on conclusion of the complaint to the Complainant.  EA will send the complaint summary report by end of August 2018 | **Closed 29/08/2018** |
| **Scheidt MT against SAS**  **2018-01** | Received by ground mail on 08/08/2018  AR by EA on 13//08 | | SAS is reported to not have been able to appoint an assessor in due course, thus undermining accreditation of the laboratory and therefore continuity of business and reputation.  Complainant is complaining about SAS complaint process.  Additional technical issues regarding assessment practices in a specific calibration field will be transferred to the EA LC. Not part of the complaint process. | On 21/08/2018, Secr wrote to complainant to confirm that the Complaint has been registered, asking for additional translation of some documents.  Secr Informed SAS and asked a report on the complaint at SAS level.  SAS report was received only 21/09/2018. It showed that the Complaint had been proper handled at SAS level. | On 26/10/2018, the summary report and a copy of SAS report were forwarded to the complainant with the indication that the case was considered as closed at EA level. | **Closed 26/10/2018** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SETER vs ACCREDIA**  **2018-02** | Received thru ILAC on 12/09/2018  AR EA on 17/09/2018 | Concerns a supposed lack of impartiality on part of ACCREDIA because of its links with the Italian NMI and the way ACCREDIA managed a complaint lodged with ACCREDIA. | On 17/09/2018 EA writes to Complainant to inform that the Complaint has been registered under EA procedure. It is confirmed that Calzolari will be the Complainant contact point for this case.  On 1/10/2018, EA asks ACCREDIA a report.  On 23 /10/2018, the report is received.  Meanwhile, additional material had been sent to EA. Secr reiterated that the information did not provide new evidence; nor did it substantiate an additional complaint to be opened.  The report has been examined and found to be satisfactory. It also demonstrates that ACCREDIA has been in regular contacts with Complainant and strives to give answers to all issues raised.  This is reported back to ACCREDIA on 26/10/2018. ACCREDIA gives EA authorization to give Complainant their report to EA with EA’s conclusion that the complainant is closed at EA level. | Summary report and final responses being drafted | **To be closed by end November 2018** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Československý Lloyd vs CAI**  **2018-03** | Received by email on 12/09/2018  AR by EA on 17/09/2018 | Complainant questions CAI process for assigning assessors. CAI is said to have failed to maintain confidentiality of information gained through assessments | On 3/10/2018, Secr writes to Complainant informing him that EA is requesting a report from CAI.  On 3/10/2018, CAI is requested to provide a report on the complaint dealt with at CAI level.  On 2 /11/2018, CAI report is received in EA Secretariat. | CAI report is under review. | **Ongoing** |

**Expression of dissatisfaction**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NAB concerned** | **AR by EA** | **Issue** | **Reply** | **Next** |  |
| CAI (from TESYDO)  **2018-01** | Received 23/01 2018 and AR on 7/02 2018 | CAI practices on accreditation | In agreement with CAI:  not a complaint according to EA procedure, that we do not accept/support in any way the defamatory statements made against CAI in the letter; that we formerly and firmly reject the statement made about EA (ILAC and IAF) that is said to be interest based.  Additionally, we will note that the successful result of CAI peer evaluation is making most of the issues raised completely obsolete. | Reply to Complainant sent on 28/08/18 cc CAI. | CLOSED |
| Jeff Smith about PCA  **2018-02** | Received on 06/03/2018  AR on 8/03/2018 | Concerns NBs and market surveillance rules | On 8/03/18 EA reverted Complainant to PCA the accrediting body, in the absence of a response by the Italian authorities. | No reply from J.Smith | CLOSED |
| Thru IAF Mr PARIS about UKAS  **IAF ILAC 2018-01** | Received in cc on 24/03/18 and AR by IAF on 24/03/2018 | Issuance of non-accredited certificates | On 24/03/18 IAF Secretariat started an investigation by asking UKAS a report.  It’s only if IAF is not satisfied with UKAS reply that EA will have to initiate its own investigation. |  | Ongoing at IAF level? |
| ERGOCERT about DPA  **2018-03** | Received in cc on 27/03/2018  AR on 10/04 | Notified bodies supposedly prevented from operating in Albania. The body is a branch of an ESYD accredited CAB | EA acknowledged receipt of the letter received in copy. Informed Complainant that we are waiting for outcome of process at Ministry level |  | Ongoing? |
| Frieden about SAS  **2018-04** | Received by registered mail on 4 July  AR by EA on 4 July | The complainant is complaining about the non quality of the services supplied by his garage for his car. | We had to ask for the English version of the documentation before recording the case. The documentation was received on 10 and 11 July. It proved that, when contacted about the accredited CB having certified the garage, SAS had properly responded: ISO 9000 certification is not for product certification. ISO 9001 certification is a certification of a quality (in this case) management system meant to ensure that the appropriate system is in place for continuous improvement.  Also SAS invited the Complainant to turn to the court to claim compensation against law. | On 22/10/2018 answer sent to the complainant in the form of a summary report, stating that there is nothing substantiating a complaint against SAS at EA level. Having examined the documentation provided, it is confirmed that SAS properly investigated the case and revert to the complainant in due course with a fully acceptable conclusion.  A link to ISO website and the ISO communiqué on ISO 9001 certification will be provided. | **CLOSED 22/10/2018** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Calzolari about ACCREDIA  **2018-05** | Received 26 July.  AR by EA 26 July | About conflict of interest.  Challenges ACCREDIA impartiality in the selection of a technical assessor. | Not clear whether the complainant has addressed a complaint to ACCREDIA first.  On 23/08/2018 Secr writes to Complainant with a view to check first that the process at ACCREDIA level has been activated and pointing out that the case is not a complaint at EA level until this has happened.  ACCREDIA is kept informed and reported to be in close contact with Complainant.  There are several exchanges between ACCREDIA and complainant. On 3 /09/2018, ACCREDIA replies to Complainant. Complainant rejects ACCREDIA report on 7 /09/2018.  A complaint at EA level is opened on 1 /10/2018. ACCREDIA is asked to provide a report on the process at ACCREDIA level. The report is received on 12 October 2018.  In the meantime, Complainant continues to provide additional material (concerning her removal from ACCREDIA Assessor list) and is said that that is outside of the ongoing process and will not be considered until the process is completed.  The report is examined and found to be satisfactory. It also demonstrates that ACCREDIA has been in regular contacts with Complainant and strives to give answers to all issues raised.  This is reported back to ACCREDIA on 26 /10/2018. ACCREDIA gives EA authorization to give Complainant their report to EA with EA’s conclusion that the complainant is closed at EA level. | Summary report and final responses being drafted | **To be closed by end November 2018** |
| Clayton about UKAS  **2018-06** | Letter sent to ES on 16/08/2018  AR by EA on 21/08/2018 | Claims that UKAS has not investigated the complaint made with UKAS against CERTSURE about default equipment and services supplied by an electrician under (alleged) person certification. | Not a complaint at EA level.  It is confirmed that UKAS has recorded the complaint and started the investigation. Because of the summer period, a reply is foreseen by 21/09/18.  On 21/08/2018, Secr wrote to complainant indicating that EA would not open a complaint investigation before it is confirmed and demonstrated that the case has first been put to the NAB complained about.  UKAS has been kept informed. No action required from UKAS at this stage based on the information received from Complainant.  Case mentioned in EX Sept 2018 meeting.  Freedom of information request dismissed on 09/10/18. | Secr responded that based on UKAS report on complaint made at UKAS level, EA considers the case as closed, UKAS having managed the complaint in a proper way. | **Closed 4/09/2018** |
| FREDO SRLS about SAS  **2018-07** | First email received on 16 March. Invited to look into EA Complaint procedure on 19 April. Not clear it is a complaint against SAS and what is the subject of the complaint. | Concerns contractual commercial relations between Complainant and a certification body. | SAS was contacted and replied that the issue raised is not an accreditation-related issue.  On 23/08/18 Secr wrote to Complainant to confirm that SAS reply is correct with regards to accreditation requirements and that the issue relates to contractual and commercial relations which are outside accreditation remit.  The request to EA does not substantiate a complaint against SAS at EA level. |  | CLOSED 23/08/2018 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **WOODSAFE TIMBER PROTECTION about FINAS**  **2018-08** | First email receive 10/09/2018.  AR by Secr on 12/09/2018 indicating that EA will seek clarification with FINAS | Concerns reported lack of harmonisation of CE certificates for CPR  Accredited CAB FINOTROL identified to issue non reliable certificates | EA asks FINAS a report on the reported situation on 1/10/2018. WoodSafe is kept informed.  FINAS report is received on 17/10/2018.  On 26/10/2018 EA replies to FINAS that the report is found to be satisfactory. FINAS agrees to make their report to EA available to WOOD SAFE. Meanwhile the latter writes another email with additional documents and claiming that FINAS did not reply about their complaints to FINAS.  There is no clear indication in FINAS report to EA that effectively FINAS provided their conclusion to the complainant. Only the ministry in charge, who received the original complaint was given the outcome of FINAS investigation.  On 9/11/2018, Secr asks FINAS clarification about that and encourages FINAS to effectively close the complaints with WOOD SAFE. | Secr will write to FINAS for final clarification before closure with WoodSafe | **To be closed by End November** |
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