

Boost up Your Certification Score

GAICC

ISO-IEC-42001-Foundation

GAICC ISO/IEC 42001 Foundation Certification



For More Information – Visit link below:

<https://www.examsboost.com/>

Product Version

- ✓ Up to Date products, reliable and verified.
- ✓ Questions and Answers in PDF Format.

Visit us at: <https://www.examsboost.com/test/iso-iec-42001-foundation>

Latest Version: 6.0

Question: 1

A board director asks: ' Why should we invest in ISO/IEC 42001 certification rather than simply publishing an internal AI ethics statement? ' The Chief AI Officer responds by listing the drivers that motivated publication of the standard. Which option BEST summarises the main drivers behind ISO/IEC 42001 as presented in GAICC Foundation Module 1?

- A. Pressure from professional indemnity insurers, who require ISO/IEC 42001 certification as a precondition for issuing technology errors-and-omissions policies to AI software vendors worldwide.
- B. A directive from the International Telecommunication Union requiring each member state to publish a national AI register before the end of 2026, with a binding regional reporting cycle.
- C. Converging regulatory, commercial, reputational, and operational pressures around AI—including new AI laws, procurement scrutiny, public AI failures, and consequential AI decisions.
- D. A specific request from the World Trade Organization to harmonise tariff treatment for AI-enabled goods and services across the major trading blocs by the end of the year 2026.

Answer: C

Explanation:

Comprehensive and Detailed Explanation From [GAICC ISO/IEC 42001/Course Guide/topics]:

The inception and rapid global adoption of ISO/IEC 42001 are driven by the intersection of four critical operational forces: evolving legal compliance (such as the EU AI Act and emerging national frameworks), rigorous commercial procurement diligence, acute reputational risks stemming from publicized model failures, and the expanding delegation of high-stakes, consequential decisions to autonomous systems. Informal corporate AI ethics statements lack enforceable verification, audit mechanisms, and systematic lifecycle controls, often inviting accusations of " ethics washing. " In contrast, ISO/IEC 42001 addresses these mounting industry pressures by codifying an internationally auditable standard. Organizations implement the standard to prove governance rigor to enterprise buyers, withstand regulatory audits, prevent systemic operational harms, and safeguard enterprise reputation through documented, verifiable conformity.

Question: 2

A foundation case workshop closes with a scenario in which a charity is about to launch an AI tool that helps caseworkers prioritise vulnerable-client outreach. The AIMS lead is asked which set of considerations the launch checklist should reflect, drawing on the responsible-AI principles in ISO/IEC 42001 Annex B together with the relevant management-system clauses. Which response BEST integrates the standard ' s expectations for a deployment of this kind?

- A. Verify the model ' s predictive accuracy meets the agreed target, document the result in a one-page summary signed by the head of technology, and proceed to launch without further reference to other responsible-AI considerations for this charitable use case.

- B. Confirm that the vendor has provided a model card, treat that document as a complete responsible-AI record for the deployment, and rely on the vendor ' s representations rather than performing an internal review of the model ' s fitness for the charity ' s specific population of clients.
- C. Postpone any structured impact assessment until after the first quarter of operational data has been gathered, on the basis that the charity will be better placed to evaluate impact once real-world caseworker usage patterns and outcome distributions have been observed.
- D. Complete an AI System Impact Assessment under Clause 6.1.4 covering fairness, transparency, human oversight, privacy, and safety considerations, define acceptance criteria, assign role responsibilities, and gain documented approval before launch.

Answer: D

Explanation:

Comprehensive and Detailed Explanation From [GAICC ISO/IEC 42001/Course Guide/topics]:
Deploying an algorithm that affects vulnerable individuals requires an end-to-end integration of risk treatment, ethical safeguards, and management system governance. Clause 6.1.4 (AI system impact assessment) mandates that organizations establish, implement, and maintain processes for assessing the potential impacts of the AI system on individuals, groups, and society. In a high-consequence charitable triage scenario, impact assessment cannot be deferred until post-deployment or reduced solely to verifying statistical accuracy. The assessment must evaluate core responsible AI principles outlined in Annex B, including fairness across marginalized subgroups, human oversight to ensure caseworkers retain override discretion, transparency regarding prioritization criteria, data privacy, and unintended harms. Deploying entities must define objective acceptance thresholds, formally assign operational monitoring responsibilities under Clause 5.3, and obtain sign-off before operational launch.

Question: 3

A foundation workshop case describes a public-transport agency deploying an AI tool that adjusts bus arrival predictions for passenger displays. The agency lists employees, the transport regulator, and a software vendor as interested parties in its draft AIMS documentation. A learner is asked whether any meaningful interested-party group is missing for a tool with public-facing outputs. Which response BEST reflects the intent of Clause 4.2?

- A. The list is acceptable as drafted, since interested parties under Clause 4.2 refer chiefly to internal stakeholders and contracted suppliers; broader public groups do not typically appear in the AIMS interested parties record for an operational tool of this nature.
- B. The list should be reduced to focus on the regulator and the software vendor, on the basis that employees are sufficiently covered by general human-resources processes and do not require separate treatment in the AIMS interested-parties documentation.
- C. Passengers who rely on the bus arrival displays are a relevant interested party and their expectations should be identified, since they are individuals affected by the AI system ' s outputs even though they have no direct contractual relationship with the agency.
- D. The list should add the company that supplies passenger-display screens as hardware vendor, instead of considering passengers themselves, since the agency interacts contractually with the display vendor rather than with the travelling public.

Answer: C

Explanation:

Comprehensive and Detailed Explanation From [GAICC ISO/IEC 42001/Course Guide/topics]:

Clause 4.2 (Understanding the needs and expectations of interested parties) requires the organization to identify not only stakeholders holding direct contractual or regulatory relationships, but also individuals and communities affected, or perceiving themselves to be affected, by the outputs of an AI system. For an operational algorithm that dynamically recalculates public transit arrival schedules, passengers relying on these displays represent primary end-users and affected persons. Inaccurate or biased model predictions directly impact their travel, safety, and schedules. Consequently, their expectations regarding accuracy, timeliness, transparency, and failure disclosures must be formally documented within the AIMS register of interested parties. Excluding the general public simply because no commercial contract exists between the commuter and the agency violates the foundational stakeholder inclusiveness mandated across ISO/IEC 42001 governance controls.

Question: 4

A retail bank's procurement team has begun receiving requests from enterprise clients asking the bank to demonstrate how it governs the AI models used in credit decisioning. The Chief Risk Officer wants a single, internationally recognised framework that addresses AI specifically—not just general quality or information-security controls—and that can be independently certified. Which standard BEST fits this need under the GAICC Foundation view of why ISO/IEC 42001 was published?

- A. ISO/IEC 42001, the first international management system standard dedicated to artificial intelligence and capable of third-party certification.
- B. ISO 9001, the international quality management system standard, which already covers AI quality assurance for regulated banking workloads.
- C. ISO/IEC 27001, the information security management system standard, which fully addresses AI governance through its existing Annex A control set.
- D. The OECD AI Principles, which provide an internationally agreed policy framework for trustworthy AI and a basis for third-party certification.

Answer: A

Explanation:

Comprehensive and Detailed Explanation From [GAICC ISO/IEC 42001/Course Guide/topics]:

ISO/IEC 42001 was developed jointly by ISO and IEC (through JTC 1/SC 42) to establish the world's first certifiable Artificial Intelligence Management System (AIMS) standard. While ISO 9001 addresses overarching quality processes and ISO/IEC 27001 governs information security, neither framework provides specialized, auditable criteria for unique AI risks, including model hallucinations, statistical bias, algorithmic drift, lack of explainability, data poisoning, and autonomous decision opacity. Furthermore, while the OECD AI Principles define high-level global policy benchmarks for trustworthy AI, they are non-binding policy guidance that lack formal conformity assessment specifications. ISO/IEC 42001 fills this gap by delivering an auditable, Harmonized Structure management system against which accredited conformity assessment bodies can perform independent third-party audits and issue formal organizational certification.

Question: 5

A government agency is establishing AIMS roles for its first ISO/IEC 42001 implementation. The chief information officer proposes that the AI Ethics Committee, made up of subject-matter experts drawn from across business units, owns AIMS performance reporting. The chief legal officer suggests the role sits with the procurement team because most AI tools are vendor-supplied. A foundation learner is asked what Clause 5.3 actually requires for the reporting-on-performance responsibility. Which response is BEST?

- A. Reporting on AIMS performance can rest with the AI Ethics Committee in its current advisory form, since cross-functional expertise is well placed to interpret AI risk and benefit signals across the agency 's varied business areas and to provide nuanced commentary.
- B. Reporting on AIMS performance should sit with the procurement team, because vendor-supplied AI tools dominate the agency ' s portfolio and procurement holds the contractual levers needed to manage supplier obligations through purchase agreements.
- C. Reporting on AIMS performance should be split between the AI Ethics Committee and the procurement team on a shared-accountability basis, with each function presenting its segment of performance data to top management at separate review meetings each quarter.
- D. Top management must assign the responsibility and authority for reporting on the performance of the AIMS to a specific role or roles, and that assignment must be communicated within the organisation so the reporting line is unambiguous.

Answer: D

Explanation:

Comprehensive and Detailed Explanation From [GAICC ISO/IEC 42001/Course Guide/topics]:
Clause 5.3 (Organizational roles, responsibilities and authorities) requires top management to ensure that responsibilities and authorities for reporting on the performance of the AI management system to top management are formally assigned and communicated throughout the organization. The standard intentionally does not dictate the organizational title or functional department where this role must reside—it can be assigned to an AI Ethics Officer, Chief AI Officer, Head of Compliance, or a dedicated steering committee lead—provided the assignment is formally defined, backed by appropriate authority, and clearly communicated to eliminate ambiguity. Leaving governance reporting dispersed across uncoordinated committees or shared informally across multiple departments without clear ownership creates organizational blind spots, conflicting reporting streams, and accountability gaps.

Thank You for Trying Our Product

For More Information – **Visit link below:**

<https://www.examsboost.com/>

15 USD Discount Coupon Code:

G74JA8UF

FEATURES

- ✓ **90 Days Free Updates**
- ✓ **Money Back Pass Guarantee**
- ✓ **Instant Download or Email Attachment**
- ✓ **24/7 Live Chat Support**
- ✓ **PDF file could be used at any Platform**
- ✓ **50,000 Happy Customer**



Visit us at: <https://www.examsboost.com/test/iso-iec-42001-foundation>