

Pass Guaranteed ISO-IEC-42001-Lead-Auditor - Unparalleled ISO/IEC 42001:2023 Artificial Intelligence Management System Lead Auditor Exam Reliable Exam Simulator



BONUS!!! Download part of TestPDF ISO-IEC-42001-Lead-Auditor dumps for free: <https://drive.google.com/open?id=17dT4P8qInNgCCyHDskw2qgDoKKxp4Q6E>

We are amenable to offer help by introducing our ISO-IEC-42001-Lead-Auditor real exam materials and they can help you pass the ISO/IEC 42001:2023 Artificial Intelligence Management System Lead Auditor Exam practice exam efficiently. All knowledge is based on the real exam by the help of experts. By compiling the most important points of questions into our ISO-IEC-42001-Lead-Auditor guide prep our experts also amplify some difficult and important points. Being devoted to this area for over ten years, our experts keep the excellency of our ISO/IEC 42001:2023 Artificial Intelligence Management System Lead Auditor Exam exam question like always. They are distinguished experts in this area who can beef up your personal capacity. By cutting through the clutter of tremendous knowledge, they picked up the essence into our ISO-IEC-42001-Lead-Auditor Guide prep.

PECB ISO-IEC-42001-Lead-Auditor Exam Syllabus Topics:

Topic	Details
Topic 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.
Topic 2	<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.

Topic 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Closing an ISO • IEC 42001 audit: This section of the exam measures the skills of an AI Compliance Officer and explains how to complete the audit process. It includes reporting findings, managing nonconformities, and conducting follow-ups to ensure continuous improvement and compliance.
Topic 4	<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.

>> ISO-IEC-42001-Lead-Auditor Reliable Exam Simulator <<

PECB Realistic ISO-IEC-42001-Lead-Auditor Reliable Exam Simulator

As for PECB ISO-IEC-42001-Lead-Auditor exam, it is the most difficult to pass. But, as long as you believe in TestPDF, everything is ok. TestPDF PECB ISO-IEC-42001-Lead-Auditor exam simulations contain the most accurate questions and answers. If you don't believe our PECB ISO-IEC-42001-Lead-Auditor certification training, you can go to our TestPDF. You can find pdf real questions and answers and download it. And the purchase rate is unbelievably high every day. By choosing it, pass rate is 100%. Hurry up! Don't hesitate to add our PECB ISO-IEC-42001-Lead-Auditor Dumps Torrent to your shopping cart.

PECB ISO/IEC 42001:2023 Artificial Intelligence Management System Lead Auditor Exam Sample Questions (Q168-Q173):

NEW QUESTION # 168

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. Cost minimization**
- C. Documentation

Answer: B

Explanation:

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

#####

NEW QUESTION # 169

What does the 'Human-Centered Design' core element prioritize in AI development?

- A. Minimizing user interaction
- B. Increasing automation
- C. Maximizing profit
- **D. Designing AI systems that prioritize human needs and values**

Answer: D

Explanation:

Human-Centered Design focuses on designing AI systems that respect and enhance human well-being, align with user needs and values, and promote inclusive and accessible technologies.

According to ISO/IEC 42001:2023 - Clauses 4.2 and 6.1.2, and highlighted throughout the PECB Lead Auditor Guide - Domain 1, AI systems should be usable, inclusive, and ethically aligned, especially when intended for diverse or vulnerable user groups.

This principle ensures that humans remain in control and benefit from the capabilities of AI.

Reference: ISO/IEC 42001:2023 - Clause 4.2 (Needs of interested parties), Clause 6.1.2 (Ethical impact and risk analysis) PECB Lead Auditor Guide - Domain 1: "Human-Centered Design and Trustworthy AI"

NEW QUESTION # 170

A tech company has decided to apply ISO/IEC 42001 specifically to integrate the AIMS with existing management systems, such as the Information Security Management System and the Business Continuity Management System. Which part of ISO/IEC 42001 should the company use as guidance on aligning the AIMS with these systems to ensure cohesive objectives, streamlined processes, and unified documentation?

- A. Annex C
- **B. Annex B**
- C. Annex D

Answer: B

Explanation:

Annex B of ISO/IEC 42001:2023 provides detailed guidance on the integration of AIMS with other management systems. It supports harmonization with existing systems, such as:

ISO/IEC 27001 (Information Security Management System)

ISO 22301 (Business Continuity Management System)

ISO 9001 (Quality Management System)

Annex B promotes the use of a high-level structure (HLS), aligned terminology, and a risk-based approach to enable integrated planning, unified documentation, and cohesive objectives across systems.

Option B (Annex C) relates to additional implementation guidance for AI-specific controls.

Option C (Annex D) does not exist in ISO/IEC 42001.

Reference:

ISO/IEC 42001:2023, Annex B - Integration with other management system standards ISO/IEC Directives Part 1 - Harmonized Structure (Annex L) PECB Lead Auditor Study Guide, Chapter 3 - Integration of AIMS with existing management systems

NEW QUESTION # 171

Scenario 5 (continued):

Scenario 5: Aizoia, located in Washington, DC, has revolutionized data analytics, software development, and consulting by using advanced AI algorithms. Central to its success is an AI platform adept at deciphering complex datasets for enhanced insights. To ensure that its AI systems operate effectively and responsibly, Aizoia has established an artificial intelligence management system AIMS based on ISO/IEC 42001 and is now undergoing a certification audit to verify the AIMS's effectiveness and compliance with ISO/IEC 42001.

Robert, one of the certification body's full-time employees with extensive experience in auditing, was appointed as the audit team leader despite not receiving an official offer for the role. Understanding the critical importance of assembling an audit team with diverse skills and knowledge, the certification body selected competent individuals to form the audit team. The certification body appointed a team of seven members to conduct the audit after considering the specific conditions of the audit mission and the required competencies.

Initially, the certification body, in cooperation with Aizoia, defined the extent and boundaries of the audit, specifying the sites (whether physical or virtual), organizational units, and the activities for review. Once the scope, processes, methods, and team composition had been defined, the certification body provided the audit team leader with extensive information, including the audit objectives and documented details on the scope, processes, methods, and team compositions.

Additionally, the certification body shared contact details of the auditee, including locations, time frames, and the duration of the audit activities to be conducted. The team leader also received information needed for evaluating and addressing identified risks and opportunities for the achievement of the audit objectives.

Before starting the audit, Robert wrote an engagement letter, introducing himself to Aizoia and outlining plans for scheduling initial contact. The initial contact aimed to confirm the communication channels, establish the audit team's authority to conduct the audit, and summarize the audit's key aspects, such as objectives, scope, criteria, methods, and team composition. During this first meeting, Robert emphasized the need for access to essential information that would help to conduct the audit.

Moreover, audit logistics, such as scheduling, access, health and safety arrangements, observer attendance, and the need for guides or interpreters, were thoroughly planned. The meeting also addressed areas of interest or concern, preemptively resolving potential issues and finalizing any matters related to the audit team composition.

As the audit progressed, Robert recognized the complexity of Aizoia's operations, leading him to conclude that a review of its AI-related data governance practices was essential for compliance with ISO/IEC 42001. He discussed this need with Aizoia's management, proposing an expanded audit scope. After careful consideration, they agreed to conduct a thorough review of the AI data governance practices, but there was no mutual decision to officially change the audit scope. Consequently, Robert decided to proceed with the audit based on the original scope, adhering to the initial audit plan, and documented the conversation and decision accordingly.

Based on the scenario above, answer the following question:

Question:

According to Scenario 5, was Robert's decision to proceed with the audit without changing its scope appropriate?

- A. Yes, because no agreement was reached to change the scope, and he documented the decision accordingly
- B. No, Robert must have withdrawn from the audit and informed the interested parties
- C. No, Robert should have opted to conduct a follow-up audit

Answer: A

Explanation:

Robert acted correctly by proceeding without changing the scope, because no official agreement was made to modify it, and he documented the conversation properly.

* ISO/IEC 17021-1:2015 Clause 9.2.3.1 specifies that "Audit scope can only be changed if formally agreed by both the auditee and the certification body."

* The Lead Auditor Guide says: "If the auditee and auditor cannot agree to modify the audit scope, the original scope must remain valid, and deviations should be documented." Reference: ISO/IEC 17021-1:2015 Clause 9.2.3.1; ISO/IEC 42001:2023 Clause 9.2.

NEW QUESTION # 172

Scenario 4:

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:

What type of evidence did the audit team obtain to assess BioNovaPharm's compliance with legal and regulatory incident reporting requirements?

- A. Observational
- B. Technical
- C. Analytical
- D. Confirmative

Answer: D

Explanation:

The audit team obtained Confirmative evidence.

* ISO/IEC 42001:2023 Clause 9.2.2 specifies that during audits, objective evidence such as certifications, legal opinions, or official documentation that confirms compliance must be collected.

* Confirmative evidence specifically refers to validated information from independent sources (in this case, external legal advice).

* The Lead Auditor Training Manual also defines Confirmative Evidence as: "Evidence that provides verification of conformance through reliable independent sources." Reference: ISO/IEC 42001:2023 Clause 9.2.2; Lead Auditor Study Guide Chapter 7 ("Evidence Gathering Techniques").

NEW QUESTION # 173

.....

You only need 20-30 hours to practice our software and then you can attend the exam. You needn't spend too much time to learn our ISO-IEC-42001-Lead-Auditor study questions and you only need spare several hours to learn our ISO/IEC 42001:2023 Artificial Intelligence Management System Lead Auditor Exam guide torrent each day. Our ISO-IEC-42001-Lead-Auditor study questions are efficient and can guarantee that you can pass the exam easily. For many people, they don't have enough time to learn the ISO-IEC-42001-Lead-Auditor Exam Torrent. The in-service staff is both busy in their jobs and their family lives and for the students they may have to learn or do other things. But if you buy our ISO-IEC-42001-Lead-Auditor exam torrent you can save your time and energy and spare time to do other things. Please trust us.

Exam ISO-IEC-42001-Lead-Auditor Score: <https://www.testpdf.com/ISO-IEC-42001-Lead-Auditor-exam-braindumps.html>

- ISO-IEC-42001-Lead-Auditor Valid Test Blueprint ☐ Reliable ISO-IEC-42001-Lead-Auditor Exam Cram ☐ New ISO-IEC-42001-Lead-Auditor Test Notes ☐ Easily obtain free download of 【 ISO-IEC-42001-Lead-Auditor 】 by searching on 「 www.examcollectionpass.com 」 ☐ ISO-IEC-42001-Lead-Auditor Reliable Test Prep
- Quiz 2026 The Best PECB ISO-IEC-42001-Lead-Auditor: ISO/IEC 42001:2023 Artificial Intelligence Management System Lead Auditor Exam Reliable Exam Simulator ☐ The page for free download of ➡ ISO-IEC-42001-Lead-Auditor ☐ on www.pdfvce.com ☒ will open immediately ☐ Test ISO-IEC-42001-Lead-Auditor Collection
- ISO-IEC-42001-Lead-Auditor Reliable Test Prep ☐ Valid Study ISO-IEC-42001-Lead-Auditor Questions ☐ ISO-IEC-42001-Lead-Auditor Valid Test Blueprint ☐ Easily obtain 「 ISO-IEC-42001-Lead-Auditor 」 for free download through ☐ www.troytec.dumps.com ☐ ISO-IEC-42001-Lead-Auditor Valid Test Blueprint

- P.S. Free 2026 PECB ISO-IEC-42001-Lead-Auditor dumps are available on Google Drive shared by TestPDF: <https://drive.google.com/open?id=17dT4P8qInNgCCyHDskw2qgDoKKxp4Q6E>

P.S. Free 2026 PECB ISO-IEC-42001-Lead-Auditor dumps are available on Google Drive shared by TestPDF: <https://drive.google.com/open?id=17dT4P8qInNgCCyHDskw2qgDoKKxp4Q6E>