

ISO-IEC-42001-Lead-Auditor Prüfungsaufgaben & ISO-IEC-42001-Lead-Auditor Fragenpool



2026 Die neuesten ITZert ISO-IEC-42001-Lead-Auditor PDF-Versionen Prüfungsfragen und ISO-IEC-42001-Lead-Auditor Fragen und Antworten sind kostenlos verfügbar: <https://drive.google.com/open?id=1ExbSr0yaHhesi5q1CTpGjnTRKVLqGP8>

Die PECB ISO-IEC-42001-Lead-Auditor Fragenkataloge von ITZert werden von den IT-Experten konzipiert. Sein Design ist eng mit dem heutigen schnell verändernden IT-Markt verbunden. Die Ausbildung von ITZert wird Ihnen helfen, mit der erneuerten Technik Ihre Fähigkeit zur Problemlösung zu fördern und Ihre Zufriedenheit am Arbeitsplatz zu verbessern. Die Deckung der PECB ISO-IEC-42001-Lead-Auditor Zertifizierung von ITZert ist um 100% als geplant gestiegen. Solange Sie unsere Prüfungsfragen und Antworten verwenden, garantieren wir Ihnen, dass Sie zum ersten Mal die PECB ISO-IEC-42001-Lead-Auditor Prüfung mühelos bestehen können.

PECB ISO-IEC-42001-Lead-Auditor Prüfungsplan:

Thema	Einzelheiten
Thema 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none">AI management system requirements: This section of the exam measures the skills of a Lead Auditor and focuses on understanding the key requirements outlined in ISOIEC 42001. It explains how organizations should structure their AI-related activities and processes to meet compliance standards effectively.
Thema 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Fundamental audit concepts and principles: This section of the exam measures the skills of a Lead Auditor and outlines essential audit concepts such as evidence collection, impartiality, objectivity, and ethical conduct. It introduces the core principles that form the foundation of a reliable and consistent auditing process.
Thema 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Fundamental principles and concepts of an AI management system: This section of the exam measures the skills of an AI Compliance Officer and covers the basic principles of artificial intelligence, including ethical use, trustworthiness, and transparency. It introduces the purpose and importance of having an AI management system in place for responsible AI governance.

ISO-IEC-42001-Lead-Auditor Fragenpool & ISO-IEC-42001-Lead-Auditor Buch

Die Schulungsunterlagen zur PECB ISO-IEC-42001-Lead-Auditor Zertifizierungsprüfung von ITZert sind meistens in der Form von PDF und Software. Die IT-Fachleute und Experten nutzen Ihre Erfahrungen aus, um Ihnen die besten Produkte auf dem Markt bereitzustellen und Ihr Ziel zu erreichen.

PECB ISO/IEC 42001:2023 Artificial Intelligence Management System Lead Auditor Exam ISO-IEC-42001-Lead-Auditor Prüfungsfragen mit Lösungen (Q53-Q58):

53. Frage

Scenario 2: OptiFlow is a logistics company located in New Delhi, India. The company has enhanced its operational efficiency and customer service by integrating AI across various domains, including route optimization, inventory management, and customer support. Recognizing the importance of AI in its operations, OptiFlow decided to implement an Artificial Intelligence Management System (AIMS) based on ISO/IEC 42001 to oversee and optimize the use of AI technologies.

To address Clauses 4.1 and 4.2 of the standard, OptiFlow identified and analyzed internal and external issues and needs and expectations of interested parties. During this phase, it identified specific risks and opportunities related to AI deployment, considering the system's domain, application context, intended use, and internal and external environments. Central to this initiative was the establishment and maintenance of AI risk criteria, a foundational step that facilitated comprehensive AI risk assessments, effective risk treatment strategies, and precise evaluations of risk impacts. This implementation aimed to meet AIMS's objectives, minimize adverse effects, and promote continuous improvement. OptiFlow also planned and integrated strategies to address risks and opportunities into AIMS's processes and assessed their effectiveness.

OptiFlow set measurable AI objectives aligned with its AI policy across all organizational levels, ensuring they met applicable requirements and matched the company's vision. The company placed strong emphasis on the monitoring and communication of these objectives, ensuring they were updated annually or as needed to reflect changes in technology, market demands, or internal processes. It also documented the objectives, making them accessible across the company.

To guarantee a structured and consistent AI risk assessment process, OptiFlow emphasized alignment with its AI policy and objectives. The process included ensuring consistency and comparability, identifying, analyzing, and evaluating AI risks. OptiFlow prioritizes its AIMS by allocating the necessary resources for its comprehensive development and continuous enhancement. The company carefully defines the competencies needed for personnel affecting AI performance, ensuring a high level of expertise and innovation.

OptiFlow also manages effective internal and external communications about its AIMS, aligning with ISO/IEC 42001 requirements by maintaining and controlling all required documented information. This documentation is meticulously identified, described, and updated to ensure its relevance and accessibility.

Through these strategic efforts, OptiFlow upholds a commitment to excellence and leadership in AI management practices.

To comply with Clause 9 of ISO/IEC 42001, the company determined what needs to be monitored and measured in the AIMS. It planned, established, implemented, and maintained an audit program, reviewed the AIMS at planned intervals, documented review results, and initiated a continuous feedback mechanism from all interested parties to identify areas of improvement and innovation within the AIMS.

Which of the following requirements of Clause 6.1.2 AI risk assessment did OptiFlow NOT consider?

- A. AI risk treatment
- B. Documentation
- C. Cost minimization

Antwort: C

Begründung:

Clause 6.1.2 of ISO/IEC 42001:2023 addresses AI risk assessment and includes requirements such as:

- * Establishing and applying AI risk assessment criteria
- * Identifying and analyzing risks and opportunities
- * Evaluating AI risks
- * Planning for AI risk treatment
- * Documenting the process and outcomes to ensure traceability and repeatability In the scenario, OptiFlow:
- * Established and maintained AI risk criteria.
- * Performed identification, analysis, and evaluation of risks.

* Integrated AI risk treatment into its AIMS.

* Maintained documentation of objectives and internal communications as per the standard.

However, there is no reference in the scenario to cost minimization, either as a guiding factor or an outcome of the AI risk assessment process. While cost control may be a strategic or operational consideration for a business, it is not a core requirement under Clause 6.1.2 and is clearly not discussed in OptiFlow's implementation activities in the scenario.

Therefore, "Cost minimization" is the element NOT considered, making it the correct answer.

Reference:

* ISO/IEC 42001:2023, Clause 6.1.2 - AI risk assessment

* ISO/IEC 42001:2023, Annex A - Guidance on AI risk identification and evaluation

* PECB ISO/IEC 42001 Lead Auditor Guide, Section 6.1.2 - Interpretation of AI risk-based requirements

#####

54. Frage

Scenario 8 (continued):

Scenario 8:

Scenario 8: InnovateSoft, headquartered in Berlin, Germany, is a software development company known for its innovative solutions and commitment to excellence. It specializes in custom software solutions, development, design, testing, maintenance, and consulting, covering both mobile apps and web development.

Recently, the company underwent an audit to evaluate the effectiveness and compliance of its artificial intelligence management system AIMS against ISO/IEC 42001.

The audit team engaged with the auditee to discuss their findings and observations during the audit's final phases. After evaluating the evidence, the audit team presented their audit findings to InnovateSoft, highlighting the identified nonconformities.

Upon receiving the audit findings, InnovateSoft accepted the conclusions but expressed concerns about some findings inaccurately reflecting the efficiency of their software development processes. In response, the company provided new evidence and additional information to alter the audit conclusions for a couple of minor nonconformities identified. After thorough consideration, the audit team leader clarified that the new evidence did not significantly alter the core conclusions drawn for the nonconformities.

Therefore, the certification body issued a certification recommendation conditional upon the filing of corrective action plans without a prior visit.

InnovateSoft accepted the decision of the certification body. The top management of the company also sought suggestions from the audit team on resolving the identified nonconformities. The audit team leader offered solutions to address the issues, fostering a collaborative effort between the auditors and InnovateSoft. During the closing meeting, the audit team covered key topics to enhance transparency. They clarified to InnovateSoft that the audit evidence was based on a sample, acknowledging the inherent uncertainty. The method and time frame of reporting and grading findings were discussed to provide a structured overview of nonconformities. The certification body's process for handling nonconformities, including potential consequences, guided InnovateSoft on corrective actions. The time frame for presenting a plan for correction was communicated, emphasizing urgency. Insights into the certification body's post-audit activities were provided, ensuring ongoing support.

Lastly, the audit team briefed InnovateSoft on complaint and appeal handling.

InnovateSoft submitted the action plans for each nonconformity separately, describing only the detected issues and the corrective actions planned to address the detected nonconformities. However, the submission slightly exceeded the specified period of 45 days set by the certification body, arriving three days later.

InnovateSoft explained this by attributing the delay to unexpected challenges encountered during the compilation of the action plans.

InnovateSoft submitted corrective action plans for nonconformities three days past the certification body's deadline of 45 days.

Question:

Based on Scenario 8, is InnovateSoft eligible for certification?

- A. Yes, it is up to the auditee to decide when to submit the action plans
- B. No, the action plans were not submitted within the specified period
- **C. Yes, the submission of the action plans can be delayed for up to 10 days**

Antwort: C

Begründung:

While ISO/IEC 17021-1 does not prescribe a strict number of days, certification bodies typically allow minor grace periods, e.g., 5-10 days, based on internal policy.

* ISO/IEC 17021-1:2015 Clause 9.4.9 requires that nonconformities must be addressed within a timeframe agreed by the certification body.

* If the delay is minor (e.g., 3 days), and the CB accepts it with justification, the certification process can still proceed.

* The Lead Auditor Manual notes: "Minor extensions may be granted for corrective actions when justified and documented."

Reference: ISO/IEC 17021-1:2015 Clause 9.4.9; ISO/IEC 42001 Lead Auditor Guide - Section 8 ("Certification Decision Timelines").

55. Frage

Scenario 4 (continued):

BioNovaPharm, a German biopharmaceutical company, has implemented an artificial intelligence management system AIMS based on ISO/IEC 42001 to optimize various aspects of drug discovery, including analyzing extensive biological data, identifying potential drug candidates, and streamlining clinical trial processes. After having the AIMS in place for over a year, the company contracted a certification body and is now undergoing an AIMS audit to obtain certification against ISO/IEC 42001.

Adopting a risk-based approach, the audit team focused on risk throughout their activities. The level of detail outlined in the audit plan corresponded to the scope and complexity of the audit. The team employed a ranking system for detailed audit procedures, prioritizing those with the highest risk.

Once the stage 1 audit began, the audit team started reviewing the auditee's documented information. To assess whether BioNovaPharm complies with the legal and regulatory requirements related to incident communication, the audit team examined evidence provided by the company's external legal office. The evidence confirmed that BioNovaPharm applies the requirements of the EU AI Act, which mandates that providers of high-risk AI systems report serious incidents to relevant authorities.

Following the completion of the stage 1 audit, John, an audit team member, documented the stage 1 audit outputs, including the observations of the audit team that could result in nonconformities during the on-site audit. However, the audit team leader, Emma, who was overseeing the audit activities, observed that John failed to document significant observations related to the lack of transparency in the AI decision-making processes of BioNovaPharm. Considering that Emma observed John's lack of competence in undertaking some audit activities, a disciplinary note was recorded for John.

Question:

Which of the following AI applications for auditing did the audit team employ?

- A. Automated planning
- B. Augmented audit interviews
- C. Augmented analysis
- D. Automated data validation

Antwort: D

Begründung:

The audit team used Automated Data Validation by using AI to gather and validate external digital data (e.g., drug development information).

* ISO/IEC 42001 Clause 9.2.2 allows the use of automated methods to collect and validate information, provided that the reliability and integrity of such systems are ensured.

* The Lead Auditor Course Guide explains: "Automated data validation tools help auditors improve evidence collection efficiency by cross-referencing multiple datasets with minimal manual intervention." Reference: ISO/IEC 42001:2023 Clause 9.2.2; Lead Auditor Guide Module 5 ("Use of Automated Tools in Audits").

56. Frage

What type of audit evidence did Augustine gather when he collected management review records? Refer to scenario 3.

Scenario 3: Heala specializes in developing AI-driven solutions for the healthcare sector. With a keen focus on leveraging AI to revolutionize patient care, diagnostics, and treatment planning, the company has implemented an artificial intelligence management system AIMS based on ISO/IEC 42001. After a year of having the AIMS in place, the company decided to apply for a certification audit.

It contracted a local certification body, who established the audit team and assigned the audit team leader.

Augustine, the designated audit team leader, has a wide range of skills relevant to various auditing domains. His proficiency encompasses audit principles, processes, and methods, as well as standards for management systems and additional references. Furthermore, he is knowledgeable about the Heala's context and relevant statutory and regulatory requirements.

Augustine first gathered management review records, interested party feedback logs, and revision histories for Heala's AIMS. This crucial step laid the groundwork for a deeper investigation, which included conducting comprehensive interviews with key personnel to understand how feedback from interested parties directly influenced updates to the AIMS and its strategic direction. Augustine's thorough evaluation process aimed to verify Heala's commitment to integrating the needs and expectations of interested parties, a critical requirement of ISO/IEC 42001.

Augustine also integrated a sophisticated AI tool to analyze large datasets for patterns and anomalies, and thus have a more informed and data driven audit process.

This AI solution, known for its ability to sift through vast amounts of data with unparalleled speed and accuracy, enabled Augustine to identify irregularities and trends that would have been nearly impossible to detect through manual methods. The tool was also helpful in preparing hypotheses based on data.

During the audit, Augustine failed to fully consider Heala's critical processes, expectations, the complexity of audit tasks, and necessary resources beforehand. This oversight compromised the audit integrity and reliability, reflecting a significant deviation from the diligence and informed judgment expected of auditors.

- A. Observational
- B. Mathematical
- **C. Documentary**
- D. Confirmative

Antwort: C

Begründung:

Audit evidence can be classified into different types, including documentary, oral, observational, and physical. According to ISO 19011:2018 (Guidelines for Auditing Management Systems), which is referenced in ISO/IEC 42001:2023 for audit practice, "Documented information (such as policies, procedures, reports, records)" is considered documentary evidence.

In the scenario, Augustine collected:

Management review records

Feedback logs

Revision histories

All of these are written or electronic records and fall under documentary evidence.

Reference:

ISO 19011:2018, Clause 3.8 - Audit Evidence

ISO/IEC 42001:2023, Clause 9.2 - Internal audit evidence requirements

PECB ISO/IEC 42001 Lead Auditor Study Guide, Chapter: Types of audit evidence

57. Frage

Did the audit team leader appropriately schedule the follow-up after the initial audit? Refer to scenario 9.

Scenario 9: ImoAI, headquartered in California, USA, provides AI solutions for various industries such as finance, healthcare, retail, and manufacturing. Its clients include major financial institutions seeking AI powered fraud detection systems, healthcare providers leveraging AI for diagnostics and patient care, retailers optimizing supply chain management with AI forecasting, and manufacturers enhancing production efficiency through AI-driven automation.

ImoAI has recently undergone a certification audit to ensure that its artificial intelligence management system AIMS is in compliance with ISO/IEC 42001. During the audit, a major nonconformity related to data security protocols was identified, requiring urgent resolution.

ImoAI swiftly initiated corrective actions to address the

major nonconformity. The audit follow-up, in agreement with the auditee, was scheduled six weeks after the initial audit. As part of exploring alternatives to audit follow-up, the audit team leader chose to verify the effectiveness of the actions taken by the auditee by scheduling a specific visit to ImoAI's premises.

The follow-up audit involved a thorough evaluation of the effectiveness of these actions. The audit team leader thoroughly examined the corrections, corrective actions, and root cause analysis conducted by ImoAI to assess whether they adequately addressed the nonconformity identified during the initial audit.

In conjunction with the external audit follow-up, ImoAI engaged its internal auditing team to oversee the progress of corrective actions. The AIMS manager of ImoAI updated Ms. Rebecca Hayes, the internal auditor, on the status of corrections and corrective actions prompted by the nonconformity identified during the external audit. Subsequently, Ms. Hayes thoroughly reviewed these measures, analyzing the corrections, root causes, and effectiveness of the implemented actions.

Upon satisfactory validation of the action plans, ImoAI was recommended for certification.

- A. No, the audit follow-up should have been scheduled immediately after the initial audit
- **B. Yes, the audit follow-up was scheduled six weeks after the initial audit**
- C. No, the audit follow-up should have been scheduled 15 weeks after the initial audit

Antwort: B

Begründung:

There is no fixed number of weeks mandated between an initial audit and a follow-up audit. However, ISO

/IEC 17021-1:2015 Clause 9.4.8 allows the certification body and auditee to mutually agree on a timeline that enables sufficient implementation of corrective actions and their verification. In this scenario, a six-week timeframe is reasonable and appropriate for addressing and reviewing a major nonconformity, especially when validated by both parties.

Reference:

ISO/IEC 17021-1:2015 Clause 9.4.8 - Nonconformity management and scheduling of follow-up audits ISO/IEC 42001:2023

• • • • •

ISO-IEC-42001-Lead-Auditor Fragenpool: https://www.itcert.com/ISO-IEC-42001-Lead-Auditor_valid-braindumps.html

- 2026 Die neuesten ITZert ISO-IEC-42001-Lead-Auditor PDF-Versionen Prüfungsfragen und ISO-IEC-42001-Lead-Auditor

Fragen und Antworten sind kostenlos verfügbar: <https://drive.google.com/open?id=1ExbSr0yaHhesi5q1CTpGjnTRKVLqGP8>