GAICC

ISO/IEC 42001 Senior Lead Auditor

Examination Content Outline

This Examination Content Outline defines what the ISO/IEC 42001 Senior Lead Auditor examination assesses. Every scored item on every form traces to a task listed here. Candidates should treat it as the definitive statement of scope; anything not derivable from this outline is not examined.

Field	Value
Document ID	GAICC-ECO-SLA42001-001
Version	1.3
Issued	30 October 2026
Credential	ISO/IEC 42001 Senior Lead Auditor
Subject standard	ISO/IEC 42001:2023, First edition, 2023-12
Scored items	80
Time allowed	120 minutes
Pass mark	70%
Scheme document	GAICC-SCH-SLA42001-001
Fact authority	GAICC-QMS-FR-42001-001 (Standard Fact Register v1.0) and GAICC-QMS-FR-AUDIT-001 (Audit Standards Fact Register v1.0)

This document contains no fee information. Examination and membership fees are published in the Candidate Handbook and on certifications.gaicc.org, which is the single source of truth for fees. Training prices never appear in any GAICC certification document.

1. How to use this outline

The outline is organized into domains. Each domain contains tasks, and each task is supported by enablers that describe the knowledge required to perform it.

Element	What it means
Domain	A major area of competence. Its weighting fixes how many items it contributes to a form.
Task	Something the certified person can do. Items are written to tasks, never to topics in the abstract.
Enabler	The knowledge or evidence that makes the task performable. Enablers are illustrative, not exhaustive.
Clause reference	The ISO/IEC 42001:2023 clauses and Annex A controls the task draws on.

An item may address more than one enabler, but it is tagged to exactly one domain and one task for blueprint purposes.

2. Domains and weightings

Domain	Title	Weighting	Items
I	Strategic Governance and Leadership in AI Management Systems	25%	20
II	Advanced Audit of Implementation and Operational Control	35%	28
III	Performance, Maturity and Continual Improvement	25%	20
IV	Ethics, Transparency and Cross-Border Engagement	15%	12
	TOTAL	100%	80

2.1 Cognitive depth

Items are distributed across cognitive levels as follows. This distribution reflects what the credential asserts about its holder: complex engagements. The learner designs audit programs across multiple sites, standards and jurisdictions, judges governance maturity rather than clause conformity, audits agentic and generative systems, and arbitrates where evidence, law and ethics conflict. They set precedent for other auditors.

Cognitive level	Share	Items
Remember	0%	0
Understand	10%	8
Apply	20%	16
Analyze	30%	24
Evaluate	40%	32

Difficulty. hard to very hard, center of gravity very hard. The permitted difficulty vocabulary is easy, moderate, hard and very-hard.

3. Domains, tasks and enablers

Domain I. Strategic Governance and Leadership in AI Management Systems

Property	Value
Weighting	25% (approximately 20 items)
Curriculum modules	M0, M1, M2, M3, M4, M5, M17
Clauses covered	1, 2, 3, 4, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 5, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 8
Annex A coverage	A, B, C, D, A.2, A.3

Task I.1 State the Senior Lead Auditor examination specification: 80 scored items, 120 minutes, four domains weighted 25, 35, 25 and 15 percent

Module M0 | Not clause specific

Task I.2 Position the credential against the accreditation architecture: ISO/IEC 17021-1:2015, ISO/IEC 42006:2025 and ISO/IEC 17024:2026, and say which applies to whom

Module M0 | Not clause specific

Task I.3 Explain what a senior lead auditor is accountable for that a lead auditor is not: program design, precedent, and arbitration between conflicting criteria

Module M0 | Not clause specific

Task I.4 Frame the capstone engagement that runs through the program

Module M0 | Not clause specific

Task I.5 Design an assurance strategy that combines internal audit, certification and independent technical assessment, and justify what each contributes

Module M1 | Clauses 1

Task I.6 Adjudicate between stakeholders who want a certificate to mean different things

Module M1 | Clauses 1

Task I.7 Set the boundary of what an AIMS audit can responsibly conclude

Module M1 | Clauses 1

Task I.8 Explain the full accreditation chain and the role of each body in it

Module M2 | Not clause specific

Task I.9 Design a certification audit program for a multi-site, multi-jurisdiction client

Module M2 | Not clause specific

Task I.10 Adjudicate a scope dispute where the AIMS boundary and the legal entity boundary differ

Module M2 | Not clause specific

Task I.11 Judge whether a certification decision is defensible on the evidence recorded

Module M2 | Not clause specific

Task I.12 Reconcile audit criteria drawn from ISO/IEC 42001, a sector standard and a legal instrument in a single engagement

Module M3 | Clauses 2, 3 | Annex A, B, C, D

Task I.13 Arbitrate where two criteria sets impose incompatible obligations

Module M3 | Clauses 2, 3 | Annex A, B, C, D

Task I.14 Set a house position on citation practice that other auditors will follow

Module M3 | Clauses 2, 3 | Annex A, B, C, D

Task I.15 Design a scope and sampling plan across multiple sites and legal entities

Module M4 | Clauses 4, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4

Task I.16 Adjudicate where a group AIMS and a subsidiary's local obligations conflict

Module M4 | Clauses 4, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4

Task I.17 Set precedent on scope for AI capability embedded in third-party platforms

Module M4 | Clauses 4, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4

Task I.18 Judge governance maturity across a group and distinguish it from local compliance

Module M5 | Clauses 5, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3 | Annex A.2, A.3

Task I.19 Arbitrate accountability where an AI decision crosses legal entities

Module M5 | Clauses 5, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3 | Annex A.2, A.3

Task I.20 Advise a board on the governance gap an audit has revealed without crossing into consultancy

Module M5 | Clauses 5, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3 | Annex A.2, A.3

Task I.21 Use Annex B, which is normative implementation guidance, to test whether an Annex A control is implemented in substance

Module M17 | Clauses 8 | Annex B

Task I.22 Distinguish auditing against Annex A control intent from auditing against Annex B guidance

Module M17 | Clauses 8 | Annex B

Task I.23 Judge control maturity using Annex B rather than presence or absence

Module M17 | Clauses 8 | Annex B

Task I.24 Integrate Annex B evidence into a process-based audit

Module M17 | Clauses 8 | Annex B

Enablers

- How the credential is structured and assessed
- Exam format, cut score, and what the Exam Content Outline governs
- How to use the workbook, handouts and toolkit together
- The Standard Fact Register and why every factual claim is traceable
- Learner conduct, appeals and recertification in outline
- What problem an AI management system solves that existing controls do not
- Scope of ISO/IEC 42001 (Clause 1) and what it deliberately excludes
- Why AI needs a management system: opacity, drift, data dependence, autonomy, distributed accountability
- The management system family and the harmonized structure (formerly Annex SL)
- The regulatory and assurance landscape the standard sits inside
- How management system certification works: accreditation, certification body, audit stages

- ISO/IEC 42006 and requirements for bodies auditing AI management systems
- Stage 1 and Stage 2 audits, surveillance and recertification
- Nonconformity grading under 3.12 and 3.13 of ISO/IEC 17021-1, and corrective action under its 9.4.9 and 9.4.10
- The distinction between organizational certification and personnel certification
- Clause 2: exactly one normative reference, ISO/IEC 22989:2022
- The difference between a normative reference, a SOURCE attribution and a Bibliography entry
- Clause 3: 26 defined terms, 3.1 to 3.26, a flat list with no groups
- The four SOURCE attributed terms and the two terms original to ISO/IEC 42001
- Annex status: A and B normative, C and D informative
- Annex A: 38 controls, 9 control clauses, 10 objectives, identifiers A.2.2 to A.10.4
- The harmonized structure and Clauses 4 to 10
- Clause 4.1 external and internal issues, including the climate change determination
- Clause 4.2 interested parties and their relevant requirements
- Clause 4.3 determining the scope of the AI management system
- Clause 4.4 the AI management system itself and its processes
- Determining roles for each AI system, with the roles NOTE 1 to Clause 4.1 lists: provider, producer, customer (including AI users), partner, subject, relevant authority
- How role determines which requirements and controls apply
- Clause 5.1 leadership and commitment
- Clause 5.2 the AI policy
- Clause 5.3 roles, responsibilities and authorities
- Controls A.2.2 AI policy, A.2.3 alignment with other organizational policies, A.2.4 review of the AI policy
- Controls A.3.2 AI roles and responsibilities, A.3.3 reporting of concerns
- The governing body (3.22) and its relationship to top management (3.3)
- Annex B is normative implementation guidance for the Annex A controls
- Working through Annex B guidance control by control
- Integration of the AIMS with ISO/IEC 27001, ISO 9001 and privacy management systems
- Shared controls, shared evidence and single audit efficiency

Forward looking enablers

These are examined at awareness level and are reviewed at each scheme review so the credential does not go stale.

- The AIMS accreditation criteria set as at least one accreditation body publishes it: ISO/IEC 42001:2023, ISO/IEC 17021-1:2015 and ISO/IEC 42006:2025
- Auditing agentic systems, where the auditee changes its own behavior between Stage 1 and Stage 2
- Assurance for foundation models an organization uses but does not control
- Where certification, regulatory conformity assessment and AI assurance schemes overlap and diverge
- Scheme fragmentation across jurisdictions and mutual recognition

- What a certification body owes when a certified AI system causes harm
- Criteria architecture when a client is audited against 42001, a legal instrument and a sector regulator in one visit
- Scope for federated and jointly operated AI systems with no single controller
- Governance of agentic systems that commission other systems
- Annex B applied to controls for generative and agentic systems
- Where Annex B guidance and sector practice diverge

Domain II. Advanced Audit of Implementation and Operational Control

Property	Value
Weighting	35% (approximately 28 items)
Curriculum modules	M8, M9, M10, M11, M12, M16, M18, M19
Clauses covered	6, 6.1, 6.1.1, 6.1.2, 6.1.3, 6.1.4, 6.2, 6.3, 7, 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.4, 7.5, 8.1, 8, 8.2, 8.3, 8.4, 4, 5, 9, 10, 4.1
Annex A coverage	A.5, A.4, A.6.2.3, A.6.2.7, A.6.2.8, A.8, A.6, A.7, A.10, A, C, D

Task II.1 Judge the coherence of a risk framework across an entire AI estate rather than a single system

Module M8 | Clauses 6, 6.1, 6.1.1, 6.1.2, 6.1.3, 6.1.4, 6.2, 6.3 | Annex A.5

Task II.2 Arbitrate where AI risk assessment and enterprise risk management reach different conclusions

Module M8 | Clauses 6, 6.1, 6.1.1, 6.1.2, 6.1.3, 6.1.4, 6.2, 6.3 | Annex A.5

Task II.3 Set precedent on what constitutes an adequate 6.1.3 b) comparison for a large control set

Module M8 | Clauses 6, 6.1, 6.1.1, 6.1.2, 6.1.3, 6.1.4, 6.2, 6.3 | Annex A.5

Task II.4 Judge whether resourcing is proportionate to the risk the AI estate carries

Module M9 | Clauses 7, 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.4, 7.5 | Annex A.4

Task II.5 Adjudicate competence disputes where the client asserts that no one in the market meets the bar

Module M9 | Clauses 7, 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.4, 7.5 | Annex A.4

Task II.6 Set expectations for oversight competence that other auditors can apply

Module M9 | Clauses 7, 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.4, 7.5 | Annex A.4

Task II.7 Design an evidence expectation for a client whose AI systems generate their own records

Module M10 | Clauses 7.5, 8.1 | Annex A.6.2.3, A.6.2.7, A.6.2.8, A.8

Task II.8 Judge the reliability of machine-generated audit evidence

Module M10 | Clauses 7.5, 8.1 | Annex A.6.2.3, A.6.2.7, A.6.2.8, A.8

Task II.9 Arbitrate where evidence exists but cannot be disclosed for legal reasons

Module M10 | Clauses 7.5, 8.1 | Annex A.6.2.3, A.6.2.7, A.6.2.8, A.8

Task II.10 Judge control effectiveness across a portfolio where individual systems pass and the portfolio does not

Module M11 | Clauses 8, 8.1, 8.2, 8.3, 8.4 | Annex A.6, A.7

Task II.11 Adjudicate where an operational control conflicts with a safety or legal obligation

Module M11 | Clauses 8, 8.1, 8.2, 8.3, 8.4 | Annex A.6, A.7

Task II.12 Set testing expectations for agentic systems that act without a per-action human decision

Module M11 | Clauses 8, 8.1, 8.2, 8.3, 8.4 | Annex A.6, A.7

Task II.13 Judge systemic and aggregate risk across an estate and across a supply chain

Module M12 | Clauses 6.1.2, 8.2 | Annex A.5, A.10

Task II.14 Arbitrate where a risk is real, material and has no available treatment

Module M12 | Clauses 6.1.2, 8.2 | Annex A.5, A.10

Task II.15 Set audit expectations for risks the standard does not yet name

Module M12 | Clauses 6.1.2, 8.2 | Annex A.5, A.10

Task II.16 Direct a multi-team certification audit and integrate findings from several auditors into one coherent conclusion

Module M16 | Clauses 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 | Annex A

Task II.17 Adjudicate between auditors who grade the same evidence differently

Module M16 | Clauses 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 | Annex A

Task II.18 Defend a certification decision under accreditation assessment

Module M16 | Clauses 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 | Annex A

Task II.19 Use Annex C, which is informative, to test the completeness of an organization's risk source identification

Module M18 | Clauses 6.2 | Annex C

Task II.20 Evaluate AI objectives against the organizational objectives they are meant to serve

Module M18 | Clauses 6.2 | Annex C

Task II.21 Rule on whether an omitted risk source is a nonconformity or an opportunity for improvement, given that Annex C is informative

Module M18 | Clauses 6.2 | Annex C

Task II.22 Apply Annex D, which is informative, when auditing an AIMS in a regulated sector

Module M19 | Clauses 4.1 | Annex D

Task II.23 Integrate sector regulatory criteria with ISO/IEC 42001 criteria in one audit plan

Module M19 | Clauses 4.1 | Annex D

Task II.24 Judge where sector obligation exceeds management system requirement and report accordingly

Module M19 | Clauses 4.1 | Annex D

Enablers

- Clause 6.1.1 actions to address risks and opportunities
- Clause 6.1.2 AI risk assessment: criteria, process, repeatability
- Clause 6.1.3 AI risk treatment and the Statement of Applicability

- Clause 6.1.3 b) comparison against the whole of Annex A to verify no necessary control is omitted
- Clause 6.1.4 AI system impact assessment within planning
- ISO/IEC 42005:2025 as guidance a client may adopt for its impact assessment, and how an adopted method becomes criteria
- Clause 6.2 AI objectives and planning to achieve them
- Clause 6.3 planning of changes
- ISO/IEC 23894 as risk method
- Clause 7.1 resources
- Clause 7.2 competence and Clause 7.3 awareness
- Clause 7.4 communication
- Clause 7.5 documented information: creating, updating and controlling
- Controls A.4.2 to A.4.6 covering resource documentation, data, tooling, system and computing, and human resources
- What documented information ISO/IEC 42001 explicitly requires
- Control A.6.2.3 documentation of AI system design and development
- Control A.6.2.7 AI system technical documentation
- Control A.6.2.8 AI system recording of event logs
- Controls A.8.2 to A.8.5 information for interested parties
- The Statement of Applicability as a controlled document
- Why the AIMS manual is not a requirement of the standard
- Clause 8.1 operational planning and control
- Clause 8.2 AI risk assessment in operation, Clause 8.3 AI risk treatment, Clause 8.4 AI system impact assessment
- Controls A.6.1.2 and A.6.1.3 management guidance for responsible development
- Controls A.6.2.2 to A.6.2.8 covering the AI system life cycle
- Controls A.7.2 to A.7.6 covering data for AI systems
- Nine controls under A.6 and five under A.7
- Risk sources catalogued in Annex C and how to use an informative annex properly
- Generative and foundation model risks: hallucination, prompt injection, data leakage, misuse
- Third party and supply chain risk, controls A.10.2 to A.10.4
- Model drift, data drift and performance degradation
- Security risks specific to AI systems
- Readiness assessment against every clause and all 38 controls
- Assembling the evidence pack
- Common audit findings and how to evidence and grade them
- Examination preparation and the Exam Content Outline
- Annex C is informative: potential AI related organizational objectives and risk sources
- How to use an informative annex without treating it as a checklist of requirements
- Deriving measurable AI objectives from organizational objectives
- Mapping risk sources to controls and to treatment
- Annex D is informative: use of the AI management system across domains or sectors

- Sector specific obligations layering on top of the AIMS
- Healthcare, financial services, public sector, employment and safety critical contexts
- Where sector regulation is stricter than the standard

Forward looking enablers

These are examined at awareness level and are reviewed at each scheme review so the credential does not go stale.

- Aggregate and systemic risk that no individual system assessment surfaces
- Auditing risk for agentic systems whose action space is not enumerable in advance
- Competence architecture for organizations operating autonomous agents at scale
- Cryptographic and provenance-based evidence for model lineage
- Auditing multi-agent systems where responsibility for an outcome is distributed
- Frontier and agentic capability risk within a management-system audit
- Auditing where the risk is to third parties rather than to the organization
- Integrated audits across AIMS, ISMS and privacy in a single engagement
- Risk sources that Annex C does not yet enumerate
- Sector-specific AI regulation and its interaction with certification

Domain III. Performance, Maturity and Continual Improvement

Property	Value
Weighting	25% (approximately 20 items)
Curriculum modules	M13, M14, M15, M20, M23
Clauses covered	9, 9.1, 9.2, 9.3, 10, 10.1, 10.2, 7.1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8
Annex A coverage	A.4.4, A, B, C, D

Task III.1 Judge whether a performance regime is capable of detecting the failures that matter

Module M13 | Clauses 9, 9.1, 9.2, 9.3

Task III.2 Distinguish maturity from conformity and evidence the distinction

Module M13 | Clauses 9, 9.1, 9.2, 9.3

Task III.3 Adjudicate where measured performance is good and outcomes are poor

Module M13 | Clauses 9, 9.1, 9.2, 9.3

Task III.4 Judge whether an organization learns or merely closes actions

Module M14 | Clauses 10, 10.1, 10.2

Task III.5 Arbitrate where corrective action for one system creates risk in another

Module M14 | Clauses 10, 10.1, 10.2

Task III.6 Set expectations for effectiveness verification across an estate

Module M14 | Clauses 10, 10.1, 10.2

Task III.7 Set a house policy on AI use in audit that satisfies impartiality and competence requirements

Module M15 | Clauses 7.1, 9.1 | Annex A.4.4

Task III.8 Judge whether an AI-assisted conclusion is defensible to an accreditation assessor

Module M15 | Clauses 7.1, 9.1 | Annex A.4.4

Task III.9 Arbitrate where audit tooling and auditee systems share a supplier

Module M15 | Clauses 7.1, 9.1 | Annex A.4.4

Task III.10 Assess AIMS maturity beyond binary conformity and evidence the assessment

Module M20 | Clauses 9.1, 10.1

Task III.11 Communicate a maturity judgment without converting it into a nonconformity

Module M20 | Clauses 9.1, 10.1

Task III.12 Compare maturity across sites and explain divergence

Module M20 | Clauses 9.1, 10.1

Task III.13 Plan, conduct and report a complete multi-site AIMS certification audit

Module M23 | Clauses 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 | Annex A, B, C, D

Task III.14 Integrate findings from several auditors and grade them consistently

Module M23 | Clauses 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 | Annex A, B, C, D

Task III.15 Present a certification recommendation to an executive audience and defend it

Module M23 | Clauses 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 | Annex A, B, C, D

Task III.16 Withstand challenge on scope, evidence sufficiency and grading

Module M23 | Clauses 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 | Annex A, B, C, D

Enablers

- Clause 9.1 monitoring, measurement, analysis and evaluation
- Clause 9.2 internal audit and the audit program
- Clause 9.3 management review, its inputs and outputs
- Choosing indicators that measure AIMS effectiveness rather than activity
- Clause 10.1 continual improvement
- Clause 10.2 nonconformity and corrective action
- Cause analysis that reaches system causes rather than individual blame
- Closing the loop from incident to control change
- Where AI assistance genuinely helps AIMS operation and where it does not
- Control A.4.4 tooling resources for the AI system, and where AIMS tooling falls instead (7.1, A.4.2, A.9.2 to A.9.4, A.10.3)
- Tool assisted evidence gathering, monitoring and documentation drafting
- The governance paradox: governing the tools used to govern AI
- Verification obligations when AI output enters the evidence trail
- Maturity models and their proper use as diagnostic rather than target
- The GAICC Framework, Maturity Model and Implementation Roadmap
- Benchmarking AI governance capability
- Designing a maturity progression that survives leadership change
- Full simulation across a complex multi jurisdiction organization
- Contested evidence, incomplete information and competing stakeholder demands
- Defending decisions under adversarial challenge

- Integration of every module into a single judged performance

Forward looking enablers

These are examined at awareness level and are reviewed at each scheme review so the credential does not go stale.

- Outcome-based assurance alongside conformity-based audit
- Learning loops between AI incidents and management system change
- ISO/IEC 17024:2026 provisions on AI-based assessment tools in certification of persons, and what they signal for audit tooling
- Maturity models for autonomous and agentic governance
- A capstone scenario that includes an agentic system and a cross-border constraint

Domain IV. Ethics, Transparency and Cross-Border Engagement

Property	Value
Weighting	15% (approximately 12 items)
Curriculum modules	M6, M7, M21, M22
Clauses covered	4.2, 6.1.4, 4, 5, 4.1, 8.1, 9.2
Annex A coverage	A.5, A.9, A.2, A.3, A.7, A.10

Task IV.1 Adjudicate where an audit obligation and a legal obligation in another jurisdiction conflict

Module M6 | Clauses 4.2, 6.1.4 | Annex A.5, A.9

Task IV.2 Set a position on disclosure when an audit uncovers harm outside the audit scope

Module M6 | Clauses 4.2, 6.1.4 | Annex A.5, A.9

Task IV.3 Judge whether an impartiality threat has been mitigated or merely documented

Module M6 | Clauses 4.2, 6.1.4 | Annex A.5, A.9

Task IV.4 Design a three-year audit program across sites, standards and jurisdictions

Module M7 | Clauses 4, 5, 6.1.4 | Annex A.2, A.3, A.5, A.9

Task IV.5 Justify audit time, team composition and remote deployment against the applicable requirements

Module M7 | Clauses 4, 5, 6.1.4 | Annex A.2, A.3, A.5, A.9

Task IV.6 Defend the program to an accreditation assessor

Module M7 | Clauses 4, 5, 6.1.4 | Annex A.2, A.3, A.5, A.9

Task IV.7 Plan an audit where evidence cannot lawfully leave a jurisdiction

Module M21 | Clauses 4.1, 4.2, 8.1 | Annex A.7, A.10

Task IV.8 Adjudicate where data protection law constrains the audit itself

Module M21 | Clauses 4.1, 4.2, 8.1 | Annex A.7, A.10

Task IV.9 Reconcile conflicting national obligations in one certification scope

Module M21 | Clauses 4.1, 4.2, 8.1 | Annex A.7, A.10

Task IV.10 Design audit approaches for agentic systems that act without per-action human approval

Module M22 | Clauses 9.2

Task IV.11 Judge assurance for foundation models the client does not control

Module M22 | Clauses 9.2

Task IV.12 Set audit expectations where no control set is yet established

Module M22 | Clauses 9.2

Enablers

- What responsible AI means inside a management system, as distinct from ethical aspiration
- Clause 6.1.4 AI system impact assessment as a requirement
- Controls A.5.2 to A.5.5 on assessing impacts on individuals or groups of individuals, and on societies
- Controls A.9.2 to A.9.4 on responsible use of AI systems
- Fairness, transparency, explainability, robustness and safety as engineering properties, not slogans
- Where ISO/IEC 23894, cited in the notes to Clause 6.1.1, supplies risk method
- End to end application of everything covered so far to a single worked organization
- From context and scope through policy and roles to a first impact assessment
- Identifying where the organization is not yet conformant, and recording it without advising on the fix
- Divergent AI regulatory regimes and their extraterritorial reach
- Data localization, transfer mechanisms and their interaction with AI training and inference
- Model and data residency
- Contractual allocation of obligation across borders
- Technology trajectories that will stress the current control set
- Agentic systems, multimodal models, on device inference, synthetic data
- Evolving AI audit practice and assurance techniques
- Building an AIMS that absorbs change rather than resisting it

Forward looking enablers

These are examined at awareness level and are reviewed at each scheme review so the credential does not go stale.

- Auditor obligations when a finding implicates a system already deployed to the public
- Cross-border data protection constraints on the audit evidence itself
- Program design when the client's AI estate changes faster than the cycle
- Data localization and its effect on remote audit
- Auditing models trained across jurisdictions with incompatible consent bases
- Agentic AI, tool use and delegated authority as audit subjects
- Continuous assurance replacing point-in-time audit

4. Examination structure

Property	Value
Scored items	80
Format	60 single answer multiple choice with four options A to D, and 20 multi answer with five options A to E, select all that apply, no partial credit
Time allowed	120 minutes
Pass mark	70%, confirmed per form by a modified Angoff standard setting study
Delivery	Online only, AI proctored on the GAICC hub (no test center option)
Open book	No, closed book
Languages	English, other languages on request
Attempts	One attempt per registration, plus one free resit within 12 months of registration
Results	Provisional result on screen at completion; the Certification Decision Authority confirms the certification decision within 72 hours

5. Reference material

Candidates are expected to work from the standard itself and the GAICC course materials. The following are the references from which examinable content is drawn.

Reference	Status
ISO/IEC 42001:2023	The subject standard. Primary source for every item.
ISO/IEC 22989:2022	The single normative reference of ISO/IEC 42001. Vocabulary applies by reference.
ISO/IEC 23894	Guidance on AI risk management. Examined at awareness level only.
ISO/IEC 42005:2025	Guidance on AI system impact assessment. Criteria only where the client adopts it. Awareness level.
ISO/IEC 42006:2025	Requirements for bodies providing audit and certification of AI management systems. Supplements ISO/IEC 17021-1. Examined on the clauses the course teaches.
ISO/IEC 17021-1:2015	Requirements for bodies providing audit and certification of management systems. Examined on the clauses the course teaches, including the major and minor nonconformity definitions at 3.12 and 3.13.
ISO 19011:2026	Guidelines for auditing management systems. Guidance only, and binds no one. Its seven principles at 4.2 to 4.8 are examined.
ISO/IEC 17024:2026	Requirements for bodies certifying persons. GAICC's schemes

Reference	Status
	are designed against it. Examined on the clauses the course teaches.
GAICC course materials	Slides, class handouts and student workbook for this credential.

Candidates must obtain a licensed copy of any ISO standard they wish to read in full. GAICC materials do not reproduce the normative text.

6. Factual governance

Every item and every rationale is checked against GAICC-QMS-FR-42001-001 (Standard Fact Register v1.0) and GAICC-QMS-FR-AUDIT-001 (Audit Standards Fact Register v1.0) before it can appear on a form. The following facts are stated here because they were previously taught incorrectly in GAICC materials, and because they are commonly stated incorrectly across AI governance training generally.

Fact	Correct position
Clause 2 normative references	Exactly one: ISO/IEC 22989:2022
ISO 9000	Does not appear anywhere in ISO/IEC 42001:2023
ISO 31000 and ISO/IEC 27000	SOURCE attributions for terms 3.21 and 3.23, and Bibliography entries. Not normative references.
Clause 3 defined terms	26 terms, 3.1 to 3.26, a flat list with no groups
Annex A controls	38 controls, 9 control clauses, 10 objectives
Annex status	A and B normative; C and D informative
Control identifiers	A.2.2 to A.10.4. A.6.1 contains only A.6.1.2 and A.6.1.3.
3.12 in ISO/IEC 42001	Continual improvement. A grade cites 3.12 or 3.13 of ISO/IEC 17021-1 by name, never a bare number
ISO 19011:2026	Guidance, written in should. Not certifiable, and no nonconformity can be raised against it. The 2018 edition was withdrawn on 27 May 2026
Principles of auditing	Seven, at 4.2 to 4.8 of ISO 19011:2026
ISO/IEC 17021-1:2015	Defines nonconformity, major nonconformity and minor nonconformity at 3.11, 3.12 and 3.13. Under 9.4.5, a nonconformity is never recorded as an opportunity for improvement
ISO/IEC 42006:2025	Published July 2025. Supplements ISO/IEC 17021-1 and does not replace it. Audit time sits at 9.1.4, with Annex A normative
ISO/IEC 17024:2026	Sets requirements for bodies that certify persons, and GAICC's schemes are designed against it. The 2012 edition was withdrawn on 31 March 2026

No item may assert otherwise, including in its answer key or rationale. An item found to contradict the register is withdrawn, and every candidate whose result was affected is identified and remediated.

7. Revision history

Version	Date	Change
1.0	25 August 2026	Reissued against the corrected fact base. Tasks now trace to curriculum modules and clauses. Fee sections removed so that fees have a single source of truth.
1.1	29 September 2026	Reissued against the Audit Standards Fact Register. Task I.1 now states 80 items, all scored, matching the format table. Task I.2 dates the accreditation standards. Task II.21 rules an omitted Annex C risk source a nonconformity or an opportunity for improvement, not an observation. ISO/IEC 17024:2026 is no longer said to govern audit tooling. ISO/IEC 42005 is removed from the enablers and references, and ISO/IEC 17021-1, ISO 19011 and ISO/IEC 17024 are added as references. The NOTE 1 to Clause 4.1 roles are corrected and the audit standard facts are added. Spelling is American English outside quoted standard wording. Task numbering, domains and weightings are unchanged.
1.2	12 October 2026	Reissued to match the corrected Senior Lead Auditor course. Criteria architecture names "a legal instrument" in place of "an AI act". The harmonized structure is described as formerly Annex SL. The AI roles add AI customer (including AI users), as NOTE 1 to Clause 4.1 lists them. The A.4.4 enabler distinguishes tooling resources for the AI system from the tools used to operate the AIMS. ISO/IEC 42005:2025 is restored at awareness level, as guidance a client may adopt and as criteria only where adopted, in the Domain II enablers and the references. Task numbering, domains and weightings are unchanged. Any item written to a removed or reworded line is withdrawn or rekeyed before the next form is assembled.
1.3	30 October 2026	Examination format table: delivery is online only, AI proctored, with no test center option; attempts are one per registration plus one free resit within 12 months of registration. Examination content is unchanged.