



Asset Leadership Network

MEMORANDUM TO THE US TAG TO ISO/TC251

DATE: July 13, 2020

FROM: The Asset Leadership Network

SUBJECT: Identifying the Adoption of ISO 55000 Around the World

Executive Summary

The Asset Leadership Network (ALN) is dedicated to expanding the adoption of ISO 55001 within the United States and beyond. We believe that helping U.S. organizations become more aware of the extent to which the standard has been adopted around the world is an important tool for doing this. There are two ways to identify the extent to which the standard has been adopted: (1) identifying the organizations that have been certified to ISO 55001; and (2) identifying the organizations that have begun the process of adopting the standard, or that have adopted the standard, but aren't seeking certification. This memorandum looks at both situations and identifies actions to address them.

Identifying Organizations Certified to ISO 55001

The ALN strongly believes it is critical that information about organizations around the world, whose Asset Management Systems (AMS) are certified to conform with ISO 55001, be useful and credible. We believe that this could be a major factor in expanding the adoption of this standard in the U.S. and internationally. Such information might also support the work of TC 251/WG7 on the adoption of asset management by governments around the world.

The ALN has produced a Position Paper on "Improving the Availability and Quality of ISO 55001 Certification Information." This paper is attached for your convenience and is also available on the ALN website (assetleadership.net). The paper goes into considerable detail on issues with the current state of affairs; particularly with the process used by organizations to post their adoption of ISO 55001 to the "Known Certified Organizations" (KCO) list on the TC 251 website. A finding that many readers might find surprising is that only 58% of the organizations on that list provided adequate evidence of third-party certification. The paper also obtained information on third-party certified organizations from national accreditation bodies and third-party certification bodies. This information identified more such organizations than are on the KCO list, but also revealed issues with how the information is made available. The paper recommends

that the US TAG reach out to ISO/TC 251 and to the International Accreditation Forum (IAF) and determine their willingness to help improve the current situation.

Identifying Organizations Adopting the Standard, but Not Seeking Certification

The Position Paper reveals that ISO/TC 251 intentionally allows organizations that claim adoption of ISO 55001 to post their information on the KCO list, whether or not they are actually certified. The Position Paper doesn't challenge this practice, but recommends that TC 251 change the way that information is presented on the KCO list to distinguish between third-party certifications and other claims of adoption. Depending on how TC 251 decides to implement our recommendations, the ALN may establish a place on its website for organizations that have adopted, or are in the process of adopting, ISO 55001 to post information on their status. We have learned from our annual conferences and engagements with our partner organizations that adoption of the standard is more widespread in the US than generally known. Our intent is to create a credible source of this information to augment the information on certified organizations and provide a more complete picture of the adoption of ISO 55001 around the world.

Attachment below



Asset Leadership Network

Improving the Availability and Quality of ISO 55001 Certification Information An Asset Leadership Network Position Paper

Executive Summary

The Asset Leadership Network (ALN) has completed an extensive market review about organizations certified to ISO 55001 using information available on the Internet, interviewing key members of the ISO/Technical Committee (TC) 251, hereafter referred to as TC 251, and discussions with international asset management experts. Our review disclosed numerous inconsistencies that suggested ways to improve international listings of organizations gaining benefits from involvement with ISO 55001.

- Of the 282 organizations listed on the Known Certified Organizations (KCO) list on the TC 251 website:
 - 58% provided adequate evidence of 3rd party certification by an accredited certification body;
 - 27% claimed certification but did not provide adequate evidence; we nevertheless considered this sufficient evidence of some level of involvement with ISO 55001;
 - 15% provided links to “Not Found” or similar webpages; this can be the result of minimal website maintenance and oversight; it is also known to apply to organizations that were previously certified but are no longer.
- The TC 251 KCO list doesn’t distinguish between 3rd party certifications and other levels of involvement with the standard; this can be misleading for those readers who assume that only 3rd party certifications would be listed.
- Lists of 3rd party certified organizations from other sources reveal a systemic, sometimes significant, undercounting of organizations on the KCO list.
- Problems were also identified with the information available from other sources, mainly from national accreditation bodies that accredit 3rd party certification bodies as well as from many of the 3rd party bodies.

All these issues are international in scope and require international solutions. TC 251 should take steps to provide greater discipline over the process for organizations to post information on the KCO list. It should also modify the list slightly to distinguish between 3rd party certifications and other levels of involvement. Only the International Accreditation Forum (IAF) can address the issues with the national accreditation bodies and with accredited 3rd party certification bodies.

This paper commits the ALN to working through the US Technical Advisory Group (TAG) to TC 251 to contact both bodies to pursue those alternative approaches.

Introduction

At the time of publication, the only comprehensive set of information on organizations that have been certified compliant with ISO 55001 is on the TC 251 website. A list of “Known Certified Organizations” is available under the “Resources” tab on the main TC 251 webpage. The introductory language to this list encourages, but doesn’t require, certified organizations to contact TC 251 to be included on the list. This introductory language also notes that “ISO does not maintain a central registry of all ISO 55001 certified organizations, nor can it guarantee the correctness of the information below.”

We looked at the TC 251 listings for Japan, Australia, the Netherlands, and the United Kingdom (U.K.), the four countries with the highest number of organizations on the KCO list. We also included the TC 251 listings for the United States (U.S.) and New Zealand. This information was collected on April 8, 2020. Together, these six countries had 181 organizations on the KCO list, or 64% of all the organizations listed.

Problems with the TC 251 Website

Our discussion begins with an analysis of the problems with the information on the TC 251 website.

1. The TC 251 KCO list is misleading to many readers and includes more than just accredited certifications. Most people looking at the TC 251 website would naturally assume that the organizations listed on a “Known Certified Organizations” list would have been issued certificates by independent, third party certification bodies accredited by national accreditation bodies against ISO 17021-5. This is an incorrect assumption. A person with deep knowledge of TC 251 and its KCO list pointed out that TC 251 must adhere to an ISO “neutrality principle.” The ISO policy committee that issues “conformity assessment” policies is the ISO Committee on Conformity Assessment (ISO/CASCO). This committee has defined this principle as follows: “The ‘neutrality principle’ means that the content of a standard shall not state a preference for a form or one type of assessment over another. In other words, the standard must be written so that it can be applied by any one of the following:
 - a. A manufacturer or supplier (first party)
 - b. A user or purchaser (second party)
 - c. An independent body (third party)”

ISO/CASCO states that conformity assessments can be carried out by a first, second, or third party. A statement of conformity issued by a first or second party is known as a declaration of conformity; whereas only a statement of conformity issued by a third party is known as a certificate of conformity. ISO/IEC 17050 provides information on the content of a first-party declaration of conformity, also known as a supplier’s declaration of conformity. ISO and the International Electrotechnical Commission (IEC) do not have any specific standards or guides about a second-party declaration of conformity. Under the

ISO/CASCO conformity assessment scheme, third-party management systems certification bodies need to be accredited by national accreditation bodies based on their conformance to ISO 17021-1 and, in the case of conformity to ISO 55001 to ISO 17021-5. The bottom line here is that only organizations that demonstrate that they have received a certificate of conformity can claim to be certified.

The last section of the most recent TC 251 newsletter (January 2020) is on the “Known ISO 55001 Certified Organizations”. The section contains the following statement: “We are interested in hearing from any organization that has certified to ISO 55001 or is complying with the standard.” This is a clear invitation for non-certified organizations to post their information on the KCO list. The ALN applauds TC 251’s desire to gather information about ISO 55001 adoption from the broadest set of organizations who want to make that claim. However, it’s important that 3rd party certified organizations on the KCO list are distinguished from those that are only claiming conformance or some other level of involvement with the standard. Otherwise, readers assuming that the list of Known Certified Organizations would be limited to 3rd party certified organizations would be misled. It would also be more accurate to re-label the list as “Known Organizations” and to add language to the introductory text clarifying what the list represents.

2. The instructions for posting links on the TC 251 website don’t distinguish between third-party certifications and other types of involvement with the standard, but it is possible to find adequate evidence of third-party certifications. The following instructions for providing information to the TC 251 KCO website are provided to organizations wishing to be listed when they click on the “contact us” in the introductory language. “Please submit a short description of your organization’s business, country, date of certification and a link to a publicly available web page or document supporting the certification of your organization.” [NOTE: This language strongly, but incorrectly, suggests a strong preference that only organizations with 3rd party issued certificates should post their information on the KCO list.]

Attachment 1 “Identifying Adequate Evidence for Third Party Certified Organizations on the TC 251 KCO Website” provides the results of an analysis of all the links on the TC 251 KCO list for the organizations listed. Each link was examined to determine whether it provided adequate evidence of third-party certification. Of the 282 organizations examined,

- 165 (58%) provided links to adequate evidence of third-party certification,
- 75 (27%) claimed certification, but did not provide adequate evidence; we nevertheless considered this sufficient evidence of some level of involvement with ISO 55001, and
- 42 (15%) linked to websites that said “Not Found” or were otherwise non-functional. Some of the “Not Found” webpages were clearly for organizations that were certified when listed but are no longer certified.

Other “Not Found” or non-functional websites could just be mistakes on the part of the webpage owners.

3. The TC 251 KCO list is incomplete, sometimes significantly so. For all the countries except the U.K., we were able to find independent organizations that tracked and reported information on their certified organizations. The following table shows the difference between the numbers of certified organizations reported to TC 251 and available from other sources. The details behind these numbers are provided in Attachment 2 “Discrepancies between TC 251 Listings and Information from Other Sources (as of April 2020).” These details include numerous findings about obvious problems with current approaches.

Country	Certified Organizations Listed on		TC 251 Under Count (B-A)	Pct. Diff. ((B-A)/A)
	TC 251 (A)	Other Sources (B)		
Japan	53	59	6	11%
Australia	48	54	6	13%
Netherlands	42	61	19	45%
U.K.	29	29	0	0%
USA	7	9	2	29%
New Zealand	2	4	2	100%
Sub-total	181	216	35	19%

*NOTE: We currently don't have another source for U.K.-based certified organizations.

Although the numeric differences in the preceding table may not appear significant, the percentage differences sometimes are. A 19% undercount from just this sample is worthy of attention.

4. There is no requirement to use a common language for the information to which links are provided. This can make it difficult to validate the organization name on the TC 251 website against the organization name in the linked information. It can also make it difficult to compare TC 251 listings with other sources. This was a big problem in validating the certified organizations in Japan and the Netherlands and would likely be true for many countries that weren't studied.
5. There is little discipline over the process used to add organizations to the TC 251 list, or to assure that only organizations with active certificates are listed. A person very familiar with the creation of the KCO list stated that TC 251 volunteers in various countries created the initial list in early 2018. These volunteers mostly used Google searches to identify organizations that were certified or claiming to be. He stated that the initial list included “about 100 organizations.” During the process of writing a 2018 white paper on the history of asset management, two ALN Senior Fellows learned about the list and used it

to compile statistics on the number of certified organizations around the world. As of April 2018, the KCO listed 169 organizations in 31 countries. As of April 2020, the KCO listed 282 organizations in 45 countries. The person familiar with the origin of the KCO stated that 75% of the new listings are posted by the organizations themselves. The other 25% come from TC 251 volunteers who learn about new certifications from direct contacts or information posted on the Internet. Once an organization has been included on the KCO list, there is no regular process managed by TC 251 for updating its information. Although we have found examples of a few organizations being dropped from the list over time, we have also found examples of organizations whose certificates have expired or were not in effect when posted to the website. For example,

- The Sept. 7, 2019 list for the U.S. included MARTA, whose certificate from WS Atkins didn't become effective until Dec. 3, 2019.
- The April 8, 2020 list for the U.K. included Welsh Water – Dwr Cymru, whose certificate from SGS expired February 10, 2020.

Problems with Information Available from Other Sources

After we had exhausted the information we could glean from the TC 251 KCO website and its links, we went looking for other sources of information on organizations certified against ISO 55001. An Internet search for “ISO 55001 Certified Organizations” generated a link to the TC 251 website, miscellaneous press releases about specific organizations being certified, and articles promoting certification by specific companies. Other than the TC 251 KCO list, the search didn't turn up any comprehensive lists of certified organizations.

We then looked more closely at the websites of the organizations that accredited certification bodies as well as the websites of the accredited certification bodies themselves. This proved more fruitful, but also revealed deficiencies.

1. Information available on the national accreditation bodies is incomplete and sometimes misleading. We found information on national accreditation bodies in two places, the IAF website and the websites for each national accreditation body.
 - The IAF is an association of national accreditation bodies, the organizations that accredit the organizations that actually certify compliance (conformance) with ISO 55001 and other standards. Management systems certification bodies are accredited based on their compliance with ISO/IEC 17021-1, which contains principles and requirements for the competence, consistency and impartiality of bodies providing audit and certification of all types of management systems. Conformance with ISO 17021-5 is required for accreditation of bodies that certify compliance with the asset management systems standard, ISO 55001. The IAF website lists 94 countries as members. Of the five countries whose ISO 55001-certified organizations we examined closely, three only had one national accreditation body, each of which was accredited to certify compliance with management systems and other

standards. The other two had more than one national accreditation body. Japan listed three, two of which were accredited to certify compliance with management systems and other standards, and the U.S. listed five, only two of which were accredited to do so. **Although the IAF webpages for each country always listed specific management systems standards within the scope of the body's accreditation authority, none of the webpages for the five countries we reviewed listed ISO 55001.** Yet they clearly had accredited certification bodies to do so. This has created an impression among some TC 251 members that the IAF cares more about management systems standards for quality, environmental, and other subjects than it does for asset management.

- The websites for each national accreditation body are discussed below.
 - Australia sets the standard here. The JAS-ANZ website lists the six certification bodies it has accredited for ISO 55001. The webpages for each certification body provide contact information, the schemes and standards for which the body is accredited, the technical sectors for which the body is accredited, the standards against which the body was accredited (e.g., management systems standards are accredited based on conformity with ISO/IEC 17021-1:2015), and the countries in which the bodies are accredited to certify conformance. The only weakness in the Australian approach is the lack of information about which certification activities are accredited in each country. We also understand that not all certified organizations in Australia permit their information to be posted on the JAS-ANZ website. **This would further understate the actual number of certified organizations reported.**
 - The Japan Accreditation Board (JAB) also does a good job in posting information about its three accredited certification bodies. For each, its website describes in English the applicable accreditation criteria (in this case, ISO/IEC 17021-1:2015), the name and standard against which the body was accredited, and the premises covered by the accreditation. Japan has another national accreditation body to accredit organizations to certify management systems compliance, but it limits its activities to organizations that only certify compliance with information security management systems.
 - The Dutch Accreditation Council lists 61 organizations accredited to certify compliance with management systems standards, but its website didn't have an additional filter to limit the list to organizations accredited to certify compliance with ISO 55001. For the six accredited certification bodies that certify compliance with ISO 55001, the accreditation body website only showed one as being accredited for ISO 55001. The other five identified other certification schemes for which they were accredited, but not ISO 55001.

- The United Kingdom Accreditation Service (UKAS) identifies 9 organizations on its website that were accredited to certify compliance with ISO 55001. The webpages for each accredited certification body provide contact information for the organization, the applicable accreditation criteria, the date the accreditation was issued, the “Summary of Accredited Scope” (equivalent to the schemes and standards for which the body is accredited), the addresses of the key locations (countries) in which certification activities are accredited, and the standards for which the body is accredited in each location. [This is an excellent approach and should be adopted internationally.]
- The ANSI National Accreditation Board (ANAB) is the first national accreditation body listed for the U.S. by the IAF and identifies only one organization, ABS Quality Evaluations, Inc. (ABS QE), on its website as being accredited to certify compliance with ISO 55001. The webpage for this organization provides the contact information, the scope of the accreditation, and the additional locations to which the accreditation applies. It also provides a link to the Certificate of Accreditation, which provides the date of the accreditation and further details on the scopes of specific accreditations. The second U.S. national accreditation body listed by the IAF is the International Accreditation Service. The only certification body that it has accredited to certify compliance with ISO 55001 is in India.

2. The other sources of information on certified organizations vary by country; and have their own shortcomings.

- The Wikipedia article on the “International Accreditation Forum” provides a link to an “IAF CertSearch” website. Searching this website for organizations certified against “ISO 55001:2014” produced a list of only 11 organizations. We understand that the IAF is working to expand this list but don’t know its timeline for doing so.
- The national accreditation bodies for Australia and Japan list both the accredited certification bodies for ISO 55001 as well as the organizations certified, although their lists of certified organizations are sometimes incomplete.
- The websites for the accredited certification bodies in Japan are in Japanese and it’s not possible to find or read links to lists of organizations they certified.
- The national accreditation bodies for the Netherlands, the U.K., and the U.S. only list the accredited certification bodies for ISO 55001, not information on the certified organizations themselves.
 - In the Netherlands, only two of 6 accredited certification bodies provide lists on their websites of the organizations they have certified. The Netherlands also has a “mirror committee” that keeps track of certified organizations in the country, including

organizations that haven't posted their information to TC 251. Unfortunately, this information is not available from the Internet.

- We were unable to find any independent information on certified organizations in the U.K.
- For the U.S., we obtained information from ABS QE, the only accredited certification body in the U.S. ABS QE certified three of the seven certified U.S. companies. One of the other four certified U.S. companies was certified by Lloyds Register, which was accredited to do so by UKAS. Two were certified by IAM Endorsed Assessors and one is unknown.

Alternative Approaches

The problems discussed above are international in scope and can only be addressed by organizations with an international reach. There are only two: TC 251 and the IAF.

1. TC 251 can influence, if not control, the information on certified organizations posted on its website. For example,
 - a. It could require the organizations listed on its website to identify whether they have received third-party certifications, first or second-party declarations of conformity, or have some other level of involvement with the standard.
 - b. It could require organizations that wish to claim third-party certification to provide compelling evidence to support their claim. The best evidence would be a link to the certificate itself, making sure to display the scope of the Asset Management System and the effective dates of the certificate. For those organizations that prefer to link to their own webpages or to press releases, TC 251 could require that those webpages and press releases contain links to the actual certificates. At a minimum, they should identify the accredited 3rd party certification body that awarded the certificate.
 - c. Organizations that wish to claim certification in their own press releases or organization documents, but have no adequate evidence to support a claim of third-party certification, could be asked to be as specific as they can in supporting their certification claims. They should also be invited to be specific about claims to have adopted the standard, even if they haven't sought or received actual certification.

TC 251 does not have the resources to "police" the KCO list, nor does it believe that this is an appropriate role for it. Therefore, TC 251 can influence the information new postings to the KCO list, but not influence the information already posted there.

2. It's also unlikely that TC 251 would require certified organizations to post themselves to the TC 251 website. This will likely always remain voluntary. Therefore, a more promising approach to maximize the information available

about organizations certified to ISO 55001 around the world would be to work with the IAF. The IAF publishes Mandatory Documents, which are required to be used by accreditation bodies when accrediting certification bodies to “assure that they operate their programs in a consistent and equivalent manner.” These Mandatory Documents are issued, modified, or withdrawn based on resolutions passed by the IAF membership. The IAF should issue a Mandatory Document that required its member national accreditation bodies add the following (or equivalent) language to their accreditation requirements: “Each accredited certification body must maintain on its website the following information on the organizations it has currently certified as being in compliance with ISO 55001. At a minimum, the information should include the name of the organization, the country in which the certified activity is located, the business sector in which the certified activity operates, the effective date and end date of the certificate, the scope of the AMS being certified, and a point of contact for the organization.” This approach would have several advantages over the TC 251 voluntary approach.

- a. It would provide a readily available, Internet-based source of credible information on all organizations that have been certified compliant with ISO 55001.
- b. This information would be more uniform, complete, and up to date than the information on the KCO list.
- c. It would eliminate the need for TC 251 to maintain and publish the KCO list.

Some might see certain disadvantages in this approach; e.g.,

- It might not be possible to get a sufficient number of IAF members to agree to issue the necessary Mandatory Document to implement this requirement.
- Some TC 251 members like having the flexibility to include certifications by IAM Endorsed Assessors on the KCO list. There is a belief by some in the AM community that some of the criteria to become an IAM Endorsed Assessor are more rigorous (and some not) in requiring AM competence than the ISO 17021-5 requirements used to accredit certification bodies under the IAF approach. There are also organizations that prefer to be certified by IAM Endorsed Assessors. There might be ways that the IAF and ISO could come to an approach on this that would satisfy both parties. The ALN takes no position on this matter and has included IAM certificates as evidence of third-party certification in this paper. Of the six IAM certificates found on the KCO list, two were in the U.S. The IAM Endorsed Assessor program endorses organizations to perform “gap analysis assessments” as well as certify conformance with standards. There is a concern by some within the international asset management community that allowing the same organization that performs a gap analysis assessment to certify conformance creates a conflict of interest. The U.S. addressed a similar situation where independent companies that audited financial statements were prohibited by law from auditing the statements of companies for which they had provided consulting services.

We are unaware of whether this was the case with the two U.S. IAM certificates and see no reason to pursue this.

Recommendation

The Asset Leadership Network (ALN) will approach the U.S. Technical Advisory Group (US TAG) to TC 251 to lead parallel efforts to approach both TC 251 and the IAF to explore the alternative approaches presented above. If the US TAG is unwilling to pursue these efforts, the ALN will pursue contact with the IAF on its own. The first step along this path would be to reach out to ANAB directly. Discussions with the US TAG and other groups might also identify concerns and suggestions outside of those presented in this paper and improve the recommendations going forward.

Identifying Adequate Evidence for Third-Party Certified Organizations
on the TC 251 KCO Website

The most compelling evidence of third-party certification is a link to the actual certificate. Other evidence of third-party certification could include mirror certificates and press releases from national accreditation bodies, lists of certified organizations and press releases from accredited certification bodies, and press releases and other documents from the listed organizations that mention the certifying bodies. Most of the links to documents or webpages that did not mention the certifying body claimed that the organization was certified but didn't provide adequate evidence. We did not attempt to determine whether any of these documents or webpages met the requirements for a first-party declaration of conformity. However, we do consider such documents or webpages as evidence of some level of involvement with the standard. Links to "Not Found" or non-functional webpages could be considered evidence that a previous certification is no longer in effect, or just a mistake on the part of the webpage owner.

As mentioned in the body of the position paper, we first took a close look at the links for the following six countries that represented 64% of all the organizations on the TC 251 KCO list. We subsequently reviewed the links for the remaining organizations to produce a comprehensive analysis of this subject.

Japan

The links to the 53 Japanese organizations on the TC 251 KCO list provided the following results regarding the adequacy of the evidence for third-party certification:

- Only 15 of the links (28%) provided adequate evidence of third-party certification:
 - 11 of the links were to the national accreditation body (JAB) web pages in English. Each of these web pages summarized the key characteristics of the certificate that was in effect.
 - 4 of the links were to press releases (3 in English, 1 in Japanese) that provided information about the certifying bodies.
- 32 of the links claimed certification but did not provide adequate evidence of third-party certification. We consider this sufficient evidence of involvement with the standard.
 - 24 of the links were to JAAM web pages in Japanese.
 - 8 of the links were to press releases (1 in English, 7 in Japanese) that provided no information about the certifying bodies.
- 6 of the links were to "Not Found" or a similar message. These links may be associated with organizations that were previously certified but are no longer.

Australia

The links to the 48 Australian organizations on the TC 251 KCO list provided the following results regarding the adequacy of the evidence for third-party certification:

- 42 of the links (88%) provided adequate evidence of third-party certification.
 - 32 of the links were to a national accreditation body (JAS-ANZ) webpage for the organization, which displays all the key features of the actual certificate.
 - 7 of the links were to actual certificates (4 for BSI, 2 for Lloyds, and 1 for Bureau Veritas). [NOTE: Lloyds was accredited by UKAS to accredit certification bodies for Australia, but not by JAS-ANZ and is therefore not included on the JAS-ANZ webpage.]
 - 2 of the links were to organization press releases that identified the certifying body and/or showed the certificate.
 - 1 of the links was to a press release from the certifying body.
- 2 links were to organization press releases that claimed certification but did not mention the certifying body. We consider this sufficient evidence of involvement with the standard. [NOTE: One of these organizations was listed by JAS-ANZ as being certified.]
- 4 links were to the overall JAS-ANZ webpage, but showed “Not Found,” which suggests that they may no longer be certified.

Netherlands

The links to the 42 Dutch organizations on the TC 251 KCO list provided the following results regarding the adequacy of the evidence for third party certification:

- 29 of the links (69%) provided adequate evidence of third-party certification.
 - 16 of the links were to actual certificates (15 for KIWA and 1 for DEKRA)
 - 5 of the links were to the same list of DIFAM certificates.
 - 1 of the links was to a press release from the national accreditation body. It’s interesting to note that this press release also identified 5 other certified organizations, only one of which had a link that provided evidence of certification. The link for three was to “Not Found” and one was to an organization press release that didn’t mention the certifying body.
 - 6 of the links (4 in English, 2 in Dutch) were to organization press releases that identified the certifying body and/or showed the certificate.
 - 1 of the links was to a press release issued by the certifying body.
- 5 of the links (2 in English, 3 in Dutch) were to organization press releases that claimed certification but did not mention the certifying body. We consider this sufficient evidence of involvement with the standard.
- 8 of the links were to “Not Found,” or a similar message, which suggests that they may no longer be certified.

United Kingdom

The links to the 29 U.K. organizations on the TC 251 KCO list provided the following results regarding the adequacy of the evidence for third-party certification:

- Only 10 of the links (34%) provided adequate evidence of third-party certification.
 - 4 of the links were to actual certificates (2 for BSI and 2 for SGS)
 - 2 of the links were to press releases from the certifying bodies
 - 3 of the links were to organization press releases that identified the certifying body and/or showed the certificate.
 - 1 of the links was to an organization document that mentioned the certifying body.
- 11 of the links claimed certification but did not provide adequate evidence of third-party certification. We consider this sufficient evidence of involvement with the standard.
 - 6 of the links were to organization press releases that claimed certification, but did not that did not mention the certifying body (one appeared to be from a consulting organization that claimed to have given a certification)
 - 5 of the links were to organization documents that claimed certification but did not identify the certifying body.
- 8 of the links were to “Not Found,” or a similar message, which suggests that they may no longer be certified.

United States

The links to the 7 U.S. organizations on the TC 251 KCO list provided the following results regarding the adequacy of the evidence for third-party certification:

- 6 of the links (86%) provided adequate evidence of third-party certification.
 - 1 of the links was to actual certificates (ABS Group);
 - 1 of the links was to a press release from the certifying body;
 - 2 of the links were to organization press releases that mentioned the certifying bodies; and
 - 2 of the links were to certificates from IAM Endorsed Assessors.
- 1 of the links was to an organization press release that claimed certification but did not identify the certifying body. We consider this sufficient evidence of involvement with the standard.

New Zealand

The links to the two New Zealand organizations on the TC 251 KCO list provided adequate evidence of third-party certification. One link was to an actual certificate and the other was to an organization press release that mentioned the certifying body.

Remaining Countries

The links for the 101 listed organizations in the remaining countries produced the following results:

- 61 of the links (60%) provided adequate evidence of third-party certification.
 - 30 of the links were to actual certificates (29 from accredited certification bodies and one from a national accreditation body)
 - 6 of the links were to press releases from the certifying bodies
 - 21 of the links were to organization press releases that identified the certifying body and/or showed the certificate.
 - 4 of the links were to certificates from IAM Endorsed Assessors.
- 24 of the links claimed certification but did not provide adequate evidence of third-party certification. We consider this sufficient evidence of involvement with the standard.
 - 23 of the links were to organization press releases that claimed certification, but did not that did not mention the certifying body
 - 1 appeared to be from a consulting organization that claimed to have given a certification.
- 16 of the links were to “Not Found,” or a similar message, which suggests that they may no longer be certified, unless they result from sloppy website upkeep.

Table 1 on the following page summarizes the information from the six listed countries as well as from the remaining countries to produce worldwide totals cited in the Executive Summary and under problem 2 on page 3 of the position paper.

Table 1

Analysis of TC 215 Known Certified Organizations List
Adequacy of Certification Evidence for All Countries
(as of June 23, 2020)

<u>Adequate Evidence of Certification</u>	<u>Totals for Listed Countries</u>		<u>Totals for Remaining Countries</u>		<u>Grand Totals</u>	
NAB Cert	43		1		44	
CAB Cert	29		29		58	
CAB Cert list	5		0		5	
NAB PR	1		0		1	
CAB PR	4		5		9	
CAB PR (F)	1		1		2	
Org PR*	15		17		32	
Org PR* (F)	3		4		7	
Org doc*	1		0		1	
IAM Cert	2		4		6	
Sub-total	104	58%	61	60%	165	58%
<u>Inadequate Evidence of Certification</u>						
Org PR	12		22		34	
Org PR (F)	10		1		11	
Consultant PR			1		1	
NAMA link (F)	24		0		24	
Org doc	5		0		5	
Sub-total	51	28%	24	24%	75	27%
Not Found	24		13		37	
Not Found (F)	2		3		5	
Sub-total	26	14%	16	16%	42	15%
Total	181	100%	101	100%	282	100%

Discrepancies between TC 251 Listings and Information
from Other Sources (as of April 2020)

The following countries are listed in descending order based on the number of organizations in each country listed on the TC 251 KCO website.

Japan

As of April 8, 2020, the TC 251 website listed 53 certified organizations for Japan. This was a net increase of 10 over the number reported on Sept. 7, 2019. The Japan Accreditation Board (JAB) is the organization in Japan that accredits the organizations authorized to certify the compliance of organizations against various standards. The JAB has accredited 3 organizations to certify compliance to ISO 55001. All three are only accredited to certify compliance within Japan.

The JAB also maintains a list of organizations currently certified to ISO 55001. As of April 2020, this list identified 62 organizations, only 27 of which were identified by their English names. The Japan Association of Asset Management (JAAM) is an umbrella organization that promotes asset management in Japan. The most recent JAAM list effective as of Oct. 27, 2019 listed 51 organizations certified to ISO 55001, only 33 of which were identified by their English names. Unfortunately, we were unable to match the Japanese entries to the TC 251 list.

Although we were able to align most of the organizations on all three lists, there were numerous discrepancies.

- 36 of the organizations on the JAB or JAAM lists matched organizations listed on TC 251.
 - 13 organizations were on both the JAB and JAAM lists
 - 12 organizations were only on the JAAM list
 - 11 organizations were only the JAB list.
- There were 17 organizations on TC 251, which were not listed by either JAB or JAAM, at least not in English. It may be possible that some of these are accredited by other national accreditation bodies, e.g., Lloyds Register is accredited by UKAS to certify ISO 55001 compliance in Japan or may be IAM Endorsed Assessors. There's no way to know until this information is posted in English.
- There were 6 additional organizations listed by JAB or JAAM, or both, in English that were not listed on TC 251. Assuming that these are valid certified organizations, the true count of certified Japanese organizations could be 59.

Because of the language discrepancies, there were also some organizations that might have been listed twice on TC 251 twice, e.g., on the JAAM list, Ashinoko Skyline Corporation seems to be shown as a subsidiary of NIPPO Co. Ltd. We will recommend that TC 251 pay greater attention to the need to clarify language issues.

Australia

As of April 8, 2020, the TC 251 website listed 48 certified organizations for Australia. This was a net increase of 10 over the number reported on Sept. 7, 2019. The Joint Accreditation System of Australia and New Zealand (JAS-ANZ) accredits the organizations in Australia and New Zealand that can certify compliance with ISO 55001 (and other standards). It has accredited 6 such certification bodies. Each of the 6 accredited certification bodies is accredited to certify AMS compliance in multiple countries, from as few as 8 countries to as many as 125. In between those two outliers, the number of countries ranged between 30 and 64. Unfortunately, it wasn't possible to determine in which countries the certification bodies were accredited for ISO 55001.

JAS-ANZ also maintains a list of organizations certified for ISO 55001. As of April 2020, this list included 42 organizations certified in Australia, which appears to be six fewer than the 48 organizations on the TC 251 website. However, the facts are a little more complex. Thirty-six of the organizations on the JAS-ANZ list match up with organizations on the TC 251 website. This means two things: (1) the JAS-ANZ list lacks 12 of the organizations listed on TC 251; and (2) but also lists 6 organizations that aren't listed on TC 251. If these 6 organizations have valid certificates, the true count of certified organizations in Australia is 54. We've also been told that not all ISO 55001-certified organizations in Australia have agreed to have their information posted by JAS-ANZ. This implies that the true count is even higher, although there's no current way to know by how much.

We downloaded the JAS-ANZ listed of certified organizations a second time, but accidentally didn't limit the countries to Australia. This had the interesting result of listing five organizations certified by JAS-ANZ accredited certification bodies but located in other countries. Three of these organizations are in New Zealand and the other two are in the United Arab Emirates and Papua New Guinea, respectively. Two of the three New Zealand based organizations were not listed on the TC 251 website, bringing the number of certified organizations in that country up to four. This is twice the number listed on the TC 251 website.

We downloaded the JAS-ANZ list a third time on June 17, 2020 and found that two of the organizations on the April list were no longer on the current JAS-ANZ list. Their links from the TC 251 KCO list went to the JAS-ANZ website but showed up as "Not Found."

All in all, the TC 251 links to Australian ISO 55001-certified organizations were consistently the most useful of the countries' links we examined.

Netherlands

As of April 8, 2020, the TC 251 website listed 42 certified organizations for the Netherlands. [NOTE: The actual list only showed 40 organizations, but two of them were reported as having two business lines, both Electrical & Gas, so we counted them

twice and listed them separately on the control list. This was a net increase of 3 over the number reported on Sept. 7, 2019. The Dutch Accreditation Council accredits the organizations in the Netherlands that can certify compliance with ISO 55001 (and other standards). The Council's website lists 61 "management system certifying bodies" that it has accredited. DIFAM is the only accredited certification organization with ISO 55001 in the scope posted on the Council's website. This list includes the 6 organizations that have certified all but one of the organizations in the Netherlands listed on the TC 251 website as compliant with ISO 55001. The certifying body for one of the organizations listed on the TC 251 website, Sodexo, was not identified. The certifying organizations with the greatest numbers of certificates issued are KIWA (17), DIFAM (9), and Lloyds (8). The other three certifying bodies, BSI, DEKRA, and DNV GL together have 7. BSI, DNV GL, and Lloyds are accredited to certify ISO 55001 compliance in the Netherlands by UKAS. DEKRA and KIWA don't appear to be accredited to certify compliance with ISO 55001 based on the information available on the Council's website. The website is apparently incorrect.

The Netherlands also has a "mirror committee" that keeps track of the certified organizations in the country, including organizations that haven't posted their certification information to the TC 251 website. In addition to the 42 certified organizations posted to the TC 251 website as of Apr. 8, 2020, the "mirror committee" listed 15 additional certified organizations as of Oct. 27, 2019. It was able to provide more detailed information on 10 of these, but only the names for five. In addition, as of April 2020, the DIFAM website listed three organizations not listed on TC 251 and KIWA listed one for a grand total of 19. If all 19 of the additional organizations listed by the "mirror committee" and the two certifying bodies are actually certified, and not duplicates of others listed on TC 251, the total number of certified organizations in the Netherlands would actually be 61.

United Kingdom

The TC 251 website listed 29 certified organizations in the U.K. as of April 8, 2020. This resulted from an increase of two certified organizations since Sept. 7, 2019, but a net increase of one, since one organization on the Sept. 7 list (Sodexo) was dropped from the April 8 list. The United Kingdom Accreditation Service (UKAS) accredits the organizations in the U.K. that can certify compliance with ISO 55001 (and other standards). As of May 3, 2020, there were nine accredited AMS certification organizations in the U.K. Of these, five were accredited to certify AMS compliance in only one country, generally the U.K. Of the other four accredited certification bodies, two were accredited to certify AMS compliance in the U.K. and one other country; one (BSI Assurance UK Limited) was accredited for five countries; and one (Lloyds Register) was accredited for 40 countries, including Australia, Japan, the Netherlands, the U.K., and the U.S.

Although UKAS maintains a list accredited organizations on its website, unlike JAS-ANZ in Australia, it does not maintain a list of certified organizations.

United States

The TC 251 website listed 7 U.S. certified organizations as of April 8, 2020. This was an increase of two certified organizations since Sept. 7, 2019. The ANSI-ASQ National Accreditation Board (ANAB) website states that it was the first management systems accreditation body in the U.S. The website also states that ANAB is “a non-governmental organization that provides accreditation services and training to public- and private-sector organizations, serving the global marketplace.” Also, that “ANAB is the largest accreditation body in North America and provides services in more than 75 countries.” These services include the accreditation of many different inspection and certification bodies across a wide variety of standards. When one searches the ANAB website for accredited third-party certification bodies (“Accredited CBs”) for ISO 55001 in the U.S., the only one listed is ABS Quality Evaluations, Inc., aka ABS QE. ABS QE is accredited to certify ISO 55001 compliance in 12 countries in addition to the U.S.

We know that three of the organizations listed on TC 251 were certified by ABS QE. However, we also know that Lloyds Register, EA Technology Ltd., and WS Atkins International Limited, respectively, each certified one. No information was available on the certifying organization for Sodexo, the seventh U.S. organization listed. The UKAS has accredited Lloyds Register to certify against ISO 55001 in the U.S. and 39 other countries. Both EA Technology and WS Atkins are IAM Endorsed Assessors.

ABS QE also reported certifying two additional organizations that weren’t reported to the TC 251 website, Phillips Healthcare and Raytheon. Therefore, as of April 8, 2020, the U.S. potentially had 9 known certified organizations.

With only 7 organizations listed, the information on links isn’t too useful. Four of the links were to press releases and the other three were to the certificates issued by ABS QE, EA Technology, and WS Atkins, respectively.

July 13, 2020