



TECHNICAL LEARNING AND ASSESSMENT DOSSIER

ISO 9001:2026 – Quality management systems

Course + certificate

510,00 €

VAT excluded

Course code

ISO9001-2026

Minimum duration

450 min

Final pass score

70%

Dossier issue

13/10/2026

1. Course identity, purpose and scope

Advanced pathway on ISO 9001:2026: requirements, changes from 2015, quality culture, ethical behaviour, separated risks and opportunities, change management, implementation and audit readiness.

This extended technical dossier describes the pathway as published in CIWZ Academy on the issue date. It consolidates purpose, references, learning architecture, module contents, assessment system, passing criteria and certificate conditions. It does not replace the official texts of the standards, laws, guidelines or schemes referenced.

2. Normative, regulatory and technical references

ISO 9001:2026; supporting references ISO 9000, ISO 9002, ISO 9004 and ISO 19011

References are used as the learning and assessment framework within the limits of published content and available sources. For professional application, the official and current versions of the referenced documents always prevail.

3. Learning architecture and assessment system

- 10 structured learning modules
- minimum tracked time: 450 min
- intermediate-check bank: 304 questions
- active final-exam bank: 240 questions
- final exam: 30 questions selected from the bank
- passing threshold: 70%
- Access to the pathway through the personal Academy profile or a corporate assignment.
- Sequential study of the modules, with server-side recording of progress and required minimum time.
- Intermediate checks linked to modules to verify understanding, application capability and quality of reasoning.

- Final exam unlock only after the pathway requirements have been completed.
- Protected final exam assembled by the platform through selection from the active course question bank.
- Recording of the result and, where applicable, the option to request the final certificate.

4. Official catalogue technical information

Course technical sheet

Advanced bilingual ISO 9001:2026 course with 10 chapters, 12 slides per chapter, no-repeat intermediate checks and a scenario-based final bank. Learning duration: 450 minutes; final exam: 30 questions from a dedicated bank, 60 minutes.

5. Detailed course syllabus

The following syllabus is derived from the active modules published on the platform. Each module shows its minimum study time and the size of its available intermediate-check bank.

01 ISO 9001:2026: architecture, principles and sixth-edition changes

Minimum time: 35 min | Intermediate questions: 32

02 Terms, context, interested parties, climate, scope and processes

Minimum time: 45 min | Intermediate questions: 32

03 Leadership, customer focus, quality culture and ethical behaviour

Minimum time: 45 min | Intermediate questions: 32

04 Planning: risks, opportunities, objectives and structured change mana...

Minimum time: 50 min | Intermediate questions: 32

05 Support: resources, infrastructure, environment, measurement, knowled...

Minimum time: 55 min | Intermediate questions: 32

06 Operations I: planning, product/service requirements and customer rel...

Minimum time: 55 min | Intermediate questions: 32

07 Operations II: design, external providers, production/services, relea...

Minimum time: 60 min | Intermediate questions: 32

08 Performance evaluation: data, customer satisfaction, internal audit a...

Minimum time: 45 min | Intermediate questions: 32

09 Continual improvement, nonconformity, causes and corrective action

Minimum time: 35 min | Intermediate questions: 24

10 Annex A, applicability, terminology, transition and audit readiness

Minimum time: 25 min | Intermediate questions: 24

6. Developed module-by-module contents

The following pages analytically describe the content actually associated with each platform module. The structure is designed so that learners, companies, HR, Quality, HSE or CISO functions can understand precisely what is studied and assessed.

MODULE 01**ISO 9001:2026: architecture, principles and sixth-edition changes**

- Minimum required time: 35 min
- Available intermediate-check bank: 32 questions

1. Orientation and learning outcomes

The new edition retains the management-system and process approaches while making several governance elements more explicit: key terms in the standard, quality culture and ethical behaviour, separation between risks and opportunities, and more structured change management.

This chapter is designed to move from understanding the principle to recognizing evidence, making decisions and evaluating effectiveness. The guiding theme is “customer focus and value”. Memorizing definitions is not enough: you should be able to connect requirement, process, risk, accountability and result.

- Explain the topic in your own words without reducing it to documentation.
- Identify the process or organizational decision affected by the topic.
- Distinguish implementation evidence from effectiveness evidence.
- Recognize when a favourable result may hide a weak control.

2. Standard framework and system connections

Quality management connects strategic direction, culture, processes, customer requirements, risks and opportunities, resources, operational control, performance evaluation and improvement. The 2026 edition places even clearer emphasis on quality as organizational behaviour, leadership, and the distinction between risks and opportunities.

“ISO 9001:2026: architecture, principles and sixth-edition changes” does not exist in isolation. In a mature management system, decisions in this area must align with context, policy, objectives, resources, operational control and review. Missing connections often create merely formal conformity.

- Read the requirement in the organization's context.
- Look for interactions with other processes and relevant interested parties.
- Identify the expected result and how it will be measured.

3. From the standard to operational process

Understand the overall QMS logic, the relationship among processes, PDCA, risk-based thinking and opportunity-based thinking, and plan a transition focused on substantive changes rather than document-only revision.

A robust method starts from a real situation, defines decision criteria, assigns an owner, establishes proportionate controls and produces usable information. The sequence should remain reconstructable months later to support continuity, auditability and learning.

- Define the input that triggers the process and the expected output.
- Set criteria and thresholds before judging results.
- Assign responsibility and authority proportionate to risk.

- Embed controls in normal work rather than in a parallel compliance process.
- Review effectiveness when conditions or evidence change.

4. Decisions, risks and proportionality

The topic requires a proportionate decision. Not every situation needs the same level of formalization, but every material decision should be explainable. Consider consequences, likelihood or exposure where relevant, dependencies, applicable requirements and the reliability of available information.

Avoid both over-control that adds no value and weak control justified only by the absence of adverse events. Maturity means selecting an appropriate control level and reviewing it against results.

- What event or change should trigger reassessment?
- Which assumption, if wrong, would change the conclusion?
- Which control prevents the issue and which detects its effects?
- How is the residual risk or resulting performance shown to be acceptable?

5. Roles, leadership and competence

Effectiveness depends on clear accountability. Top management sets direction and priorities, process owners govern criteria and results, people apply controls and report anomalies, and support functions provide competence and tools. Outsourcing an activity does not automatically outsource accountability for the management system.

Competence should be demonstrated in the context of the task. Training, experience and instructions are means; the intended result is the ability to perform correctly and respond to deviations.

- Who decides?
- Who performs?
- Who verifies?
- Who should be consulted or informed?
- Who authorizes exceptions and changes?

6. Evidence: what really demonstrates implementation

Process map, transition criteria, gap analysis, update plan, responsibilities, indicators and decisions showing how the 2026 changes are integrated into the real system.

A single record is rarely enough. Strong evidence comes from triangulating documented criteria, process observation, result data and interviews with people doing the work. Sources should be coherent; divergence is itself information that deserves investigation.

- Sample more than one period or case for repetitive processes.
- Compare planned practice with actual practice.
- Verify effectiveness, not just control presence.
- Maintain traceability between decision, evidence and conclusion.

7. Data, indicators and weak signals

For this chapter, a useful indicator may be “complaints and recurring causes”, read together with “response time and commitment fulfilment”. A single metric can mislead: understand its definition, source, frequency, threshold, owner and the decision expected when it deviates.

A positive trend needs interpretation. It may result from genuine improvement, a method change, reduced activity or incomplete data. Before concluding, check comparability and use leading signals alongside final outcomes.

- Outcome indicator: what happened?
- Leading indicator: what condition may predict a problem?
- Threshold: when is action required?
- Decision: who acts and by when?

8. Common failure modes and how to avoid them

One recurring failure mode is measuring volume but not output quality. Another is recording training without evaluating effectiveness. These behaviours can create an orderly-looking system that cannot prevent recurrence or demonstrate results.

Correct the approach by returning to three questions: what result is needed, what evidence demonstrates it, and what decision will be taken if the result is unsatisfactory?

- Do not confuse documentary conformity with operational control.
- Do not use absence of problems as the only proof of effectiveness.
- Do not leave criteria implicit or dependent on one person's memory.
- Do not close actions without later checking their effect.

9. Applied case

An organization updates every procedure with the new standard reference but does not change leadership, risk management or change planning: the transition is formal rather than substantive.

Analyse the case as the process owner. Separate facts from assumptions, identify relevant requirements and interested parties, evaluate possible consequences and define the evidence you need before choosing an action and an effectiveness check.

- What is the real problem and what may only be a symptom?
- Which requirement or criterion is involved?
- Which people or processes must participate?
- What evidence would show that the solution remains effective?

10. Audit lens

During an audit, follow the chain requirement -> decision -> implementation -> evidence -> result. The question is not "does the document exist?" but "does the system reliably produce the expected result and react when it does not?"

When evidence conflicts, extend the sample and determine whether the issue is isolated or systemic. Conclusions should be supported by verifiable evidence and clear criteria.

- Follow a recent example from start to finish.
- Use at least two independent sources for significant risk.
- Verify implementation and effectiveness.
- Distinguish an exception from a local deviation and a systemic issue.

11. Decision laboratory

Imagine that tomorrow a major condition changes: a supplier, technology, requirement, workload or responsibility. Build

a five-step response: impact, criterion, decision, evidence, review. The exercise turns the requirement into operational capability.

If your answer relies on “we have always done it this way”, a criterion is missing. If it relies only on a procedure, outcome verification is missing. If it relies on one data point, robustness is missing.

- Impact: what changes?
- Criterion: what will the decision be based on?
- Action: what will be done?
- Evidence: how will implementation be demonstrated?
- Review: when and how will effectiveness be checked?

12. Summary and preparation for the check

Before taking the check, make sure you can explain the chapter without reading the slides. The questions are scenario-based and require you to distinguish a substantive response from a merely formal one.

Key point: “ISO 9001:2026: architecture, principles and sixth-edition changes” is effective when context, accountability, criteria, implementation, evidence and results are coherent and reviewed. The system should show not only that an activity occurred, but that it achieved its intended effect.

- Can you connect the topic to a real process?
- Can you identify at least two independent pieces of evidence?
- Can you distinguish a useful indicator from a misleading one?
- Can you choose a proportionate action in a new scenario?

MODULE 02**Terms, context, interested parties, climate, scope and processes**

- Minimum required time: 45 min
- Available intermediate-check bank: 32 questions

1. Orientation and learning outcomes

Clause 3 includes a core set of fundamental terms and clause 4 requires the QMS to be grounded in the real context. Climate change must be considered as a potentially relevant issue, and interested parties may have climate-related requirements. Scope and processes should reflect actual boundaries, dependencies, products and services.

This chapter is designed to move from understanding the principle to recognizing evidence, making decisions and evaluating effectiveness. The guiding theme is “process approach and interactions”. Memorizing definitions is not enough: you should be able to connect requirement, process, risk, accountability and result.

- Explain the topic in your own words without reducing it to documentation.
- Identify the process or organizational decision affected by the topic.
- Distinguish implementation evidence from effectiveness evidence.
- Recognize when a favourable result may hide a weak control.

2. Standard framework and system connections

Quality management connects strategic direction, culture, processes, customer requirements, risks and opportunities, resources, operational control, performance evaluation and improvement. The 2026 edition places even clearer emphasis on quality as organizational behaviour, leadership, and the distinction between risks and opportunities.

“Terms, context, interested parties, climate, scope and processes” does not exist in isolation. In a mature management system, decisions in this area must align with context, policy, objectives, resources, operational control and review. Missing connections often create merely formal conformity.

- Read the requirement in the organization's context.
- Look for interactions with other processes and relevant interested parties.
- Identify the expected result and how it will be measured.

3. From the standard to operational process

Link internal and external issues, interested parties, requirements, scope, processes, inputs/outputs, interactions, criteria, indicators, resources and responsibilities; support any non-applicability decision with evidence.

A robust method starts from a real situation, defines decision criteria, assigns an owner, establishes proportionate controls and produces usable information. The sequence should remain reconstructable months later to support continuity, auditability and learning.

- Define the input that triggers the process and the expected output.
- Set criteria and thresholds before judging results.
- Assign responsibility and authority proportionate to risk.

- Embed controls in normal work rather than in a parallel compliance process.
- Review effectiveness when conditions or evidence change.

4. Decisions, risks and proportionality

The topic requires a proportionate decision. Not every situation needs the same level of formalization, but every material decision should be explainable. Consider consequences, likelihood or exposure where relevant, dependencies, applicable requirements and the reliability of available information.

Avoid both over-control that adds no value and weak control justified only by the absence of adverse events. Maturity means selecting an appropriate control level and reviewing it against results.

- What event or change should trigger reassessment?
- Which assumption, if wrong, would change the conclusion?
- Which control prevents the issue and which detects its effects?
- How is the residual risk or resulting performance shown to be acceptable?

5. Roles, leadership and competence

Effectiveness depends on clear accountability. Top management sets direction and priorities, process owners govern criteria and results, people apply controls and report anomalies, and support functions provide competence and tools. Outsourcing an activity does not automatically outsource accountability for the management system.

Competence should be demonstrated in the context of the task. Training, experience and instructions are means; the intended result is the ability to perform correctly and respond to deviations.

- Who decides?
- Who performs?
- Who verifies?
- Who should be consulted or informed?
- Who authorizes exceptions and changes?

6. Evidence: what really demonstrates implementation

Current context analysis, stakeholder map, documented scope, process map, process KPIs, owners, control criteria and reviews of context changes.

A single record is rarely enough. Strong evidence comes from triangulating documented criteria, process observation, result data and interviews with people doing the work. Sources should be coherent; divergence is itself information that deserves investigation.

- Sample more than one period or case for repetitive processes.
- Compare planned practice with actual practice.
- Verify effectiveness, not just control presence.
- Maintain traceability between decision, evidence and conclusion.

7. Data, indicators and weak signals

For this chapter, a useful indicator may be “first-pass output conformity”, read together with “on-the-job training effectiveness”. A single metric can mislead: understand its definition, source, frequency, threshold, owner and the decision expected when it deviates.

A positive trend needs interpretation. It may result from genuine improvement, a method change, reduced activity or incomplete data. Before concluding, check comparability and use leading signals alongside final outcomes.

- Outcome indicator: what happened?
- Leading indicator: what condition may predict a problem?
- Threshold: when is action required?
- Decision: who acts and by when?

8. Common failure modes and how to avoid them

One recurring failure mode is confusing an approved procedure with an effective process. Another is assessing suppliers on price alone. These behaviours can create an orderly-looking system that cannot prevent recurrence or demonstrate results.

Correct the approach by returning to three questions: what result is needed, what evidence demonstrates it, and what decision will be taken if the result is unsatisfactory?

- Do not confuse documentary conformity with operational control.
- Do not use absence of problems as the only proof of effectiveness.
- Do not leave criteria implicit or dependent on one person's memory.
- Do not close actions without later checking their effect.

9. Applied case

A critical digital service is excluded from scope because it is outsourced, but it directly affects the ability to meet customer requirements: the exclusion should be reconsidered in light of real interfaces and accountability.

Analyse the case as the process owner. Separate facts from assumptions, identify relevant requirements and interested parties, evaluate possible consequences and define the evidence you need before choosing an action and an effectiveness check.

- What is the real problem and what may only be a symptom?
- Which requirement or criterion is involved?
- Which people or processes must participate?
- What evidence would show that the solution remains effective?

10. Audit lens

During an audit, follow the chain requirement -> decision -> implementation -> evidence -> result. The question is not "does the document exist?" but "does the system reliably produce the expected result and react when it does not?".

When evidence conflicts, extend the sample and determine whether the issue is isolated or systemic. Conclusions should be supported by verifiable evidence and clear criteria.

- Follow a recent example from start to finish.
- Use at least two independent sources for significant risk.
- Verify implementation and effectiveness.
- Distinguish an exception from a local deviation and a systemic issue.

11. Decision laboratory

Imagine that tomorrow a major condition changes: a supplier, technology, requirement, workload or responsibility. Build

a five-step response: impact, criterion, decision, evidence, review. The exercise turns the requirement into operational capability.

If your answer relies on “we have always done it this way”, a criterion is missing. If it relies only on a procedure, outcome verification is missing. If it relies on one data point, robustness is missing.

- Impact: what changes?
- Criterion: what will the decision be based on?
- Action: what will be done?
- Evidence: how will implementation be demonstrated?
- Review: when and how will effectiveness be checked?

12. Summary and preparation for the check

Before taking the check, make sure you can explain the chapter without reading the slides. The questions are scenario-based and require you to distinguish a substantive response from a merely formal one.

Key point: “Terms, context, interested parties, climate, scope and processes” is effective when context, accountability, criteria, implementation, evidence and results are coherent and reviewed. The system should show not only that an activity occurred, but that it achieved its intended effect.

- Can you connect the topic to a real process?
- Can you identify at least two independent pieces of evidence?
- Can you distinguish a useful indicator from a misleading one?
- Can you choose a proportionate action in a new scenario?

MODULE 03**Leadership, customer focus, quality culture and ethical behaviour**

- Minimum required time: 45 min
- Available intermediate-check bank: 32 questions

1. Orientation and learning outcomes

Leadership is more explicit in 2026: top management should integrate the QMS into business, support the process approach, promote risk- and opportunity-based thinking, quality culture and ethical behaviour, while remaining accountable for system effectiveness.

This chapter is designed to move from understanding the principle to recognizing evidence, making decisions and evaluating effectiveness. The guiding theme is “leadership and quality culture”. Memorizing definitions is not enough: you should be able to connect requirement, process, risk, accountability and result.

- Explain the topic in your own words without reducing it to documentation.
- Identify the process or organizational decision affected by the topic.
- Distinguish implementation evidence from effectiveness evidence.
- Recognize when a favourable result may hide a weak control.

2. Standard framework and system connections

Quality management connects strategic direction, culture, processes, customer requirements, risks and opportunities, resources, operational control, performance evaluation and improvement. The 2026 edition places even clearer emphasis on quality as organizational behaviour, leadership, and the distinction between risks and opportunities.

“Leadership, customer focus, quality culture and ethical behaviour” does not exist in isolation. In a mature management system, decisions in this area must align with context, policy, objectives, resources, operational control and review. Missing connections often create merely formal conformity.

- Read the requirement in the organization’s context.
- Look for interactions with other processes and relevant interested parties.
- Identify the expected result and how it will be measured.

3. From the standard to operational process

Translate policy, objectives, responsibilities and culture into observable choices: priorities, resource allocation, escalation behaviour, handling of conflicts among time/cost/quality, and consistency with customer needs.

A robust method starts from a real situation, defines decision criteria, assigns an owner, establishes proportionate controls and produces usable information. The sequence should remain reconstructable months later to support continuity, auditability and learning.

- Define the input that triggers the process and the expected output.
- Set criteria and thresholds before judging results.
- Assign responsibility and authority proportionate to risk.

- Embed controls in normal work rather than in a parallel compliance process.
- Review effectiveness when conditions or evidence change.

4. Decisions, risks and proportionality

The topic requires a proportionate decision. Not every situation needs the same level of formalization, but every material decision should be explainable. Consider consequences, likelihood or exposure where relevant, dependencies, applicable requirements and the reliability of available information.

Avoid both over-control that adds no value and weak control justified only by the absence of adverse events. Maturity means selecting an appropriate control level and reviewing it against results.

- What event or change should trigger reassessment?
- Which assumption, if wrong, would change the conclusion?
- Which control prevents the issue and which detects its effects?
- How is the residual risk or resulting performance shown to be acceptable?

5. Roles, leadership and competence

Effectiveness depends on clear accountability. Top management sets direction and priorities, process owners govern criteria and results, people apply controls and report anomalies, and support functions provide competence and tools. Outsourcing an activity does not automatically outsource accountability for the management system.

Competence should be demonstrated in the context of the task. Training, experience and instructions are means; the intended result is the ability to perform correctly and respond to deviations.

- Who decides?
- Who performs?
- Who verifies?
- Who should be consulted or informed?
- Who authorizes exceptions and changes?

6. Evidence: what really demonstrates implementation

Management reviews, investment decisions, communications, objectives, interviews, exception handling and cases where management protected quality and ethics under pressure.

A single record is rarely enough. Strong evidence comes from triangulating documented criteria, process observation, result data and interviews with people doing the work. Sources should be coherent; divergence is itself information that deserves investigation.

- Sample more than one period or case for repetitive processes.
- Compare planned practice with actual practice.
- Verify effectiveness, not just control presence.
- Maintain traceability between decision, evidence and conclusion.

7. Data, indicators and weak signals

For this chapter, a useful indicator may be “process stability and capability”, read together with “critical supplier performance”. A single metric can mislead: understand its definition, source, frequency, threshold, owner and the decision expected when it deviates.

A positive trend needs interpretation. It may result from genuine improvement, a method change, reduced activity or incomplete data. Before concluding, check comparability and use leading signals alongside final outcomes.

- Outcome indicator: what happened?
- Leading indicator: what condition may predict a problem?
- Threshold: when is action required?
- Decision: who acts and by when?

8. Common failure modes and how to avoid them

One recurring failure mode is treating risk without checking action effectiveness. Another is closing a nonconformity without addressing cause. These behaviours can create an orderly-looking system that cannot prevent recurrence or demonstrate results.

Correct the approach by returning to three questions: what result is needed, what evidence demonstrates it, and what decision will be taken if the result is unsatisfactory?

- Do not confuse documentary conformity with operational control.
- Do not use absence of problems as the only proof of effectiveness.
- Do not leave criteria implicit or dependent on one person's memory.
- Do not close actions without later checking their effect.

9. Applied case

A manager asks to bypass a control to meet a deadline. The real culture indicator is not the displayed policy but the actual decision and how pressure is managed.

Analyse the case as the process owner. Separate facts from assumptions, identify relevant requirements and interested parties, evaluate possible consequences and define the evidence you need before choosing an action and an effectiveness check.

- What is the real problem and what may only be a symptom?
- Which requirement or criterion is involved?
- Which people or processes must participate?
- What evidence would show that the solution remains effective?

10. Audit lens

During an audit, follow the chain requirement -> decision -> implementation -> evidence -> result. The question is not "does the document exist?" but "does the system reliably produce the expected result and react when it does not?"

When evidence conflicts, extend the sample and determine whether the issue is isolated or systemic. Conclusions should be supported by verifiable evidence and clear criteria.

- Follow a recent example from start to finish.
- Use at least two independent sources for significant risk.
- Verify implementation and effectiveness.
- Distinguish an exception from a local deviation and a systemic issue.

11. Decision laboratory

Imagine that tomorrow a major condition changes: a supplier, technology, requirement, workload or responsibility. Build

a five-step response: impact, criterion, decision, evidence, review. The exercise turns the requirement into operational capability.

If your answer relies on “we have always done it this way”, a criterion is missing. If it relies only on a procedure, outcome verification is missing. If it relies on one data point, robustness is missing.

- Impact: what changes?
- Criterion: what will the decision be based on?
- Action: what will be done?
- Evidence: how will implementation be demonstrated?
- Review: when and how will effectiveness be checked?

12. Summary and preparation for the check

Before taking the check, make sure you can explain the chapter without reading the slides. The questions are scenario-based and require you to distinguish a substantive response from a merely formal one.

Key point: “Leadership, customer focus, quality culture and ethical behaviour” is effective when context, accountability, criteria, implementation, evidence and results are coherent and reviewed. The system should show not only that an activity occurred, but that it achieved its intended effect.

- Can you connect the topic to a real process?
- Can you identify at least two independent pieces of evidence?
- Can you distinguish a useful indicator from a misleading one?
- Can you choose a proportionate action in a new scenario?

MODULE 04**Planning: risks, opportunities, objectives and structured change management**

- Minimum required time: 50 min
- Available intermediate-check bank: 32 questions

1. Orientation and learning outcomes

ISO 9001:2026 clearly separates risks from opportunities and requires each to be determined, analysed and weighed according to its nature. Change planning is strengthened: purpose, consequences, QMS integrity, resources, responsibilities, communications and effectiveness review should be considered.

This chapter is designed to move from understanding the principle to recognizing evidence, making decisions and evaluating effectiveness. The guiding theme is “risks, opportunities and change”. Memorizing definitions is not enough: you should be able to connect requirement, process, risk, accountability and result.

- Explain the topic in your own words without reducing it to documentation.
- Identify the process or organizational decision affected by the topic.
- Distinguish implementation evidence from effectiveness evidence.
- Recognize when a favourable result may hide a weak control.

2. Standard framework and system connections

Quality management connects strategic direction, culture, processes, customer requirements, risks and opportunities, resources, operational control, performance evaluation and improvement. The 2026 edition places even clearer emphasis on quality as organizational behaviour, leadership, and the distinction between risks and opportunities.

“Planning: risks, opportunities, objectives and structured change management” does not exist in isolation. In a mature management system, decisions in this area must align with context, policy, objectives, resources, operational control and review. Missing connections often create merely formal conformity.

- Read the requirement in the organization’s context.
- Look for interactions with other processes and relevant interested parties.
- Identify the expected result and how it will be measured.

3. From the standard to operational process

Define transparent criteria for risks and opportunities, integrate actions into processes, link measurable objectives to results, and apply change-management discipline proportionate to the significance of the change.

A robust method starts from a real situation, defines decision criteria, assigns an owner, establishes proportionate controls and produces usable information. The sequence should remain reconstructable months later to support continuity, auditability and learning.

- Define the input that triggers the process and the expected output.
- Set criteria and thresholds before judging results.
- Assign responsibility and authority proportionate to risk.

- Embed controls in normal work rather than in a parallel compliance process.
- Review effectiveness when conditions or evidence change.

4. Decisions, risks and proportionality

The topic requires a proportionate decision. Not every situation needs the same level of formalization, but every material decision should be explainable. Consider consequences, likelihood or exposure where relevant, dependencies, applicable requirements and the reliability of available information.

Avoid both over-control that adds no value and weak control justified only by the absence of adverse events. Maturity means selecting an appropriate control level and reviewing it against results.

- What event or change should trigger reassessment?
- Which assumption, if wrong, would change the conclusion?
- Which control prevents the issue and which detects its effects?
- How is the residual risk or resulting performance shown to be acceptable?

5. Roles, leadership and competence

Effectiveness depends on clear accountability. Top management sets direction and priorities, process owners govern criteria and results, people apply controls and report anomalies, and support functions provide competence and tools. Outsourcing an activity does not automatically outsource accountability for the management system.

Competence should be demonstrated in the context of the task. Training, experience and instructions are means; the intended result is the ability to perform correctly and respond to deviations.

- Who decides?
- Who performs?
- Who verifies?
- Who should be consulted or informed?
- Who authorizes exceptions and changes?

6. Evidence: what really demonstrates implementation

Separate or clearly distinguishable risk/opportunity records, plans, owners, indicators, effectiveness checks, change requests, impact assessments, approvals and post-implementation reviews.

A single record is rarely enough. Strong evidence comes from triangulating documented criteria, process observation, result data and interviews with people doing the work. Sources should be coherent; divergence is itself information that deserves investigation.

- Sample more than one period or case for repetitive processes.
- Compare planned practice with actual practice.
- Verify effectiveness, not just control presence.
- Maintain traceability between decision, evidence and conclusion.

7. Data, indicators and weak signals

For this chapter, a useful indicator may be “response time and commitment fulfilment”, read together with “scrap, rework and cost of poor quality”. A single metric can mislead: understand its definition, source, frequency, threshold, owner and the decision expected when it deviates.

A positive trend needs interpretation. It may result from genuine improvement, a method change, reduced activity or incomplete data. Before concluding, check comparability and use leading signals alongside final outcomes.

- Outcome indicator: what happened?
- Leading indicator: what condition may predict a problem?
- Threshold: when is action required?
- Decision: who acts and by when?

8. Common failure modes and how to avoid them

One recurring failure mode is using indicators unrelated to objectives. Another is treating management review as a formal meeting. These behaviours can create an orderly-looking system that cannot prevent recurrence or demonstrate results.

Correct the approach by returning to three questions: what result is needed, what evidence demonstrates it, and what decision will be taken if the result is unsatisfactory?

- Do not confuse documentary conformity with operational control.
- Do not use absence of problems as the only proof of effectiveness.
- Do not leave criteria implicit or dependent on one person's memory.
- Do not close actions without later checking their effect.

9. Applied case

Introducing AI into customer care improves speed and capability but creates accuracy and traceability risks: opportunities and risks should be handled separately while being integrated into the same decision process.

Analyse the case as the process owner. Separate facts from assumptions, identify relevant requirements and interested parties, evaluate possible consequences and define the evidence you need before choosing an action and an effectiveness check.

- What is the real problem and what may only be a symptom?
- Which requirement or criterion is involved?
- Which people or processes must participate?
- What evidence would show that the solution remains effective?

10. Audit lens

During an audit, follow the chain requirement -> decision -> implementation -> evidence -> result. The question is not "does the document exist?" but "does the system reliably produce the expected result and react when it does not?".

When evidence conflicts, extend the sample and determine whether the issue is isolated or systemic. Conclusions should be supported by verifiable evidence and clear criteria.

- Follow a recent example from start to finish.
- Use at least two independent sources for significant risk.
- Verify implementation and effectiveness.
- Distinguish an exception from a local deviation and a systemic issue.

11. Decision laboratory

Imagine that tomorrow a major condition changes: a supplier, technology, requirement, workload or responsibility. Build

a five-step response: impact, criterion, decision, evidence, review. The exercise turns the requirement into operational capability.

If your answer relies on “we have always done it this way”, a criterion is missing. If it relies only on a procedure, outcome verification is missing. If it relies on one data point, robustness is missing.

- Impact: what changes?
- Criterion: what will the decision be based on?
- Action: what will be done?
- Evidence: how will implementation be demonstrated?
- Review: when and how will effectiveness be checked?

12. Summary and preparation for the check

Before taking the check, make sure you can explain the chapter without reading the slides. The questions are scenario-based and require you to distinguish a substantive response from a merely formal one.

Key point: “Planning: risks, opportunities, objectives and structured change management” is effective when context, accountability, criteria, implementation, evidence and results are coherent and reviewed. The system should show not only that an activity occurred, but that it achieved its intended effect.

- Can you connect the topic to a real process?
- Can you identify at least two independent pieces of evidence?
- Can you distinguish a useful indicator from a misleading one?
- Can you choose a proportionate action in a new scenario?

MODULE 05**Support: resources, infrastructure, environment, measurement, knowledge, competence and documentation**

- Minimum required time: 55 min
- Available intermediate-check bank: 32 questions

1. Orientation and learning outcomes

Support covers people, infrastructure including digital and hybrid arrangements, physical/social/psychological environment, monitoring and measurement resources, organizational knowledge, competence, awareness, communication and documented information. Culture and ethical behaviour can directly influence the working environment.

This chapter is designed to move from understanding the principle to recognizing evidence, making decisions and evaluating effectiveness. The guiding theme is “competence and organizational knowledge”. Memorizing definitions is not enough: you should be able to connect requirement, process, risk, accountability and result.

- Explain the topic in your own words without reducing it to documentation.
- Identify the process or organizational decision affected by the topic.
- Distinguish implementation evidence from effectiveness evidence.
- Recognize when a favourable result may hide a weak control.

2. Standard framework and system connections

Quality management connects strategic direction, culture, processes, customer requirements, risks and opportunities, resources, operational control, performance evaluation and improvement. The 2026 edition places even clearer emphasis on quality as organizational behaviour, leadership, and the distinction between risks and opportunities.

“Support: resources, infrastructure, environment, measurement, knowledge, competence and documentation” does not exist in isolation. In a mature management system, decisions in this area must align with context, policy, objectives, resources, operational control and review. Missing connections often create merely formal conformity.

- Read the requirement in the organization’s context.
- Look for interactions with other processes and relevant interested parties.
- Identify the expected result and how it will be measured.

3. From the standard to operational process

Determine what processes need, protect data and measurement quality, preserve critical knowledge, verify competence effectiveness and control creation, versioning, access, retention and protection of documented information.

A robust method starts from a real situation, defines decision criteria, assigns an owner, establishes proportionate controls and produces usable information. The sequence should remain reconstructable months later to support continuity, auditability and learning.

- Define the input that triggers the process and the expected output.
- Set criteria and thresholds before judging results.

- Assign responsibility and authority proportionate to risk.
- Embed controls in normal work rather than in a parallel compliance process.
- Review effectiveness when conditions or evidence change.

4. Decisions, risks and proportionality

The topic requires a proportionate decision. Not every situation needs the same level of formalization, but every material decision should be explainable. Consider consequences, likelihood or exposure where relevant, dependencies, applicable requirements and the reliability of available information.

Avoid both over-control that adds no value and weak control justified only by the absence of adverse events. Maturity means selecting an appropriate control level and reviewing it against results.

- What event or change should trigger reassessment?
- Which assumption, if wrong, would change the conclusion?
- Which control prevents the issue and which detects its effects?
- How is the residual risk or resulting performance shown to be acceptable?

5. Roles, leadership and competence

Effectiveness depends on clear accountability. Top management sets direction and priorities, process owners govern criteria and results, people apply controls and report anomalies, and support functions provide competence and tools. Outsourcing an activity does not automatically outsource accountability for the management system.

Competence should be demonstrated in the context of the task. Training, experience and instructions are means; the intended result is the ability to perform correctly and respond to deviations.

- Who decides?
- Who performs?
- Who verifies?
- Who should be consulted or informed?
- Who authorizes exceptions and changes?

6. Evidence: what really demonstrates implementation

Competence matrices, effectiveness checks, maintenance, calibration/verification, knowledge bases, succession planning, IT systems, change logs, authorizations, document control and checks on remote/hybrid work.

A single record is rarely enough. Strong evidence comes from triangulating documented criteria, process observation, result data and interviews with people doing the work. Sources should be coherent; divergence is itself information that deserves investigation.

- Sample more than one period or case for repetitive processes.
- Compare planned practice with actual practice.
- Verify effectiveness, not just control presence.
- Maintain traceability between decision, evidence and conclusion.

7. Data, indicators and weak signals

For this chapter, a useful indicator may be “on-the-job training effectiveness”, read together with “satisfaction trends and improvement actions”. A single metric can mislead: understand its definition, source, frequency, threshold,

owner and the decision expected when it deviates.

A positive trend needs interpretation. It may result from genuine improvement, a method change, reduced activity or incomplete data. Before concluding, check comparability and use leading signals alongside final outcomes.

- Outcome indicator: what happened?
- Leading indicator: what condition may predict a problem?
- Threshold: when is action required?
- Decision: who acts and by when?

8. Common failure modes and how to avoid them

One recurring failure mode is recording training without evaluating effectiveness. Another is measuring volume but not output quality. These behaviours can create an orderly-looking system that cannot prevent recurrence or demonstrate results.

Correct the approach by returning to three questions: what result is needed, what evidence demonstrates it, and what decision will be taken if the result is unsatisfactory?

- Do not confuse documentary conformity with operational control.
- Do not use absence of problems as the only proof of effectiveness.
- Do not leave criteria implicit or dependent on one person's memory.
- Do not close actions without later checking their effect.

9. Applied case

An experienced technician leaves and undocumented knowledge critical to a special process disappears with them: this is a knowledge and continuity risk, not merely an HR issue.

Analyse the case as the process owner. Separate facts from assumptions, identify relevant requirements and interested parties, evaluate possible consequences and define the evidence you need before choosing an action and an effectiveness check.

- What is the real problem and what may only be a symptom?
- Which requirement or criterion is involved?
- Which people or processes must participate?
- What evidence would show that the solution remains effective?

10. Audit lens

During an audit, follow the chain requirement -> decision -> implementation -> evidence -> result. The question is not “does the document exist?” but “does the system reliably produce the expected result and react when it does not?”.

When evidence conflicts, extend the sample and determine whether the issue is isolated or systemic. Conclusions should be supported by verifiable evidence and clear criteria.

- Follow a recent example from start to finish.
- Use at least two independent sources for significant risk.
- Verify implementation and effectiveness.
- Distinguish an exception from a local deviation and a systemic issue.

11. Decision laboratory

Imagine that tomorrow a major condition changes: a supplier, technology, requirement, workload or responsibility. Build a five-step response: impact, criterion, decision, evidence, review. The exercise turns the requirement into operational capability.

If your answer relies on “we have always done it this way”, a criterion is missing. If it relies only on a procedure, outcome verification is missing. If it relies on one data point, robustness is missing.

- Impact: what changes?
- Criterion: what will the decision be based on?
- Action: what will be done?
- Evidence: how will implementation be demonstrated?
- Review: when and how will effectiveness be checked?

12. Summary and preparation for the check

Before taking the check, make sure you can explain the chapter without reading the slides. The questions are scenario-based and require you to distinguish a substantive response from a merely formal one.

Key point: “Support: resources, infrastructure, environment, measurement, knowledge, competence and documentation” is effective when context, accountability, criteria, implementation, evidence and results are coherent and reviewed. The system should show not only that an activity occurred, but that it achieved its intended effect.

- Can you connect the topic to a real process?
- Can you identify at least two independent pieces of evidence?
- Can you distinguish a useful indicator from a misleading one?
- Can you choose a proportionate action in a new scenario?

MODULE 06**Operations I: planning, product/service requirements and customer relationship**

- Minimum required time: 55 min
- Available intermediate-check bank: 32 questions

1. Orientation and learning outcomes

Operational control starts with criteria and resources, continues through determination and review of requirements, and includes customer communication covering feedback, complaints, customer property and, where relevant, information about emergency measures or supply interruptions.

This chapter is designed to move from understanding the principle to recognizing evidence, making decisions and evaluating effectiveness. The guiding theme is “controlled design and delivery”. Memorizing definitions is not enough: you should be able to connect requirement, process, risk, accountability and result.

- Explain the topic in your own words without reducing it to documentation.
- Identify the process or organizational decision affected by the topic.
- Distinguish implementation evidence from effectiveness evidence.
- Recognize when a favourable result may hide a weak control.

2. Standard framework and system connections

Quality management connects strategic direction, culture, processes, customer requirements, risks and opportunities, resources, operational control, performance evaluation and improvement. The 2026 edition places even clearer emphasis on quality as organizational behaviour, leadership, and the distinction between risks and opportunities.

“Operations I: planning, product/service requirements and customer relationship” does not exist in isolation. In a mature management system, decisions in this area must align with context, policy, objectives, resources, operational control and review. Missing connections often create merely formal conformity.

- Read the requirement in the organization's context.
- Look for interactions with other processes and relevant interested parties.
- Identify the expected result and how it will be measured.

3. From the standard to operational process

Ensure explicit, implicit, regulatory and internal requirements are understood before commitment; manage changes and contractual differences; design operational controls and communications consistent with nonconformity risk.

A robust method starts from a real situation, defines decision criteria, assigns an owner, establishes proportionate controls and produces usable information. The sequence should remain reconstructable months later to support continuity, auditability and learning.

- Define the input that triggers the process and the expected output.
- Set criteria and thresholds before judging results.
- Assign responsibility and authority proportionate to risk.

- Embed controls in normal work rather than in a parallel compliance process.
- Review effectiveness when conditions or evidence change.

4. Decisions, risks and proportionality

The topic requires a proportionate decision. Not every situation needs the same level of formalization, but every material decision should be explainable. Consider consequences, likelihood or exposure where relevant, dependencies, applicable requirements and the reliability of available information.

Avoid both over-control that adds no value and weak control justified only by the absence of adverse events. Maturity means selecting an appropriate control level and reviewing it against results.

- What event or change should trigger reassessment?
- Which assumption, if wrong, would change the conclusion?
- Which control prevents the issue and which detects its effects?
- How is the residual risk or resulting performance shown to be acceptable?

5. Roles, leadership and competence

Effectiveness depends on clear accountability. Top management sets direction and priorities, process owners govern criteria and results, people apply controls and report anomalies, and support functions provide competence and tools. Outsourcing an activity does not automatically outsource accountability for the management system.

Competence should be demonstrated in the context of the task. Training, experience and instructions are means; the intended result is the ability to perform correctly and respond to deviations.

- Who decides?
- Who performs?
- Who verifies?
- Who should be consulted or informed?
- Who authorizes exceptions and changes?

6. Evidence: what really demonstrates implementation

Quote/order reviews, requirement records, customer communications, acceptance criteria, change controls, escalation and operational-continuity plans linked to the commercial promise.

A single record is rarely enough. Strong evidence comes from triangulating documented criteria, process observation, result data and interviews with people doing the work. Sources should be coherent; divergence is itself information that deserves investigation.

- Sample more than one period or case for repetitive processes.
- Compare planned practice with actual practice.
- Verify effectiveness, not just control presence.
- Maintain traceability between decision, evidence and conclusion.

7. Data, indicators and weak signals

For this chapter, a useful indicator may be “critical supplier performance”, read together with “complaints and recurring causes”. A single metric can mislead: understand its definition, source, frequency, threshold, owner and the decision expected when it deviates.

A positive trend needs interpretation. It may result from genuine improvement, a method change, reduced activity or incomplete data. Before concluding, check comparability and use leading signals alongside final outcomes.

- Outcome indicator: what happened?
- Leading indicator: what condition may predict a problem?
- Threshold: when is action required?
- Decision: who acts and by when?

8. Common failure modes and how to avoid them

One recurring failure mode is assessing suppliers on price alone. Another is confusing an approved procedure with an effective process. These behaviours can create an orderly-looking system that cannot prevent recurrence or demonstrate results.

Correct the approach by returning to three questions: what result is needed, what evidence demonstrates it, and what decision will be taken if the result is unsatisfactory?

- Do not confuse documentary conformity with operational control.
- Do not use absence of problems as the only proof of effectiveness.
- Do not leave criteria implicit or dependent on one person's memory.
- Do not close actions without later checking their effect.

9. Applied case

An online order does not allow a formal individual review. The organization still needs to show that information, configurations and acceptance rules ensure proper determination of requirements.

Analyse the case as the process owner. Separate facts from assumptions, identify relevant requirements and interested parties, evaluate possible consequences and define the evidence you need before choosing an action and an effectiveness check.

- What is the real problem and what may only be a symptom?
- Which requirement or criterion is involved?
- Which people or processes must participate?
- What evidence would show that the solution remains effective?

10. Audit lens

During an audit, follow the chain requirement -> decision -> implementation -> evidence -> result. The question is not "does the document exist?" but "does the system reliably produce the expected result and react when it does not?"

When evidence conflicts, extend the sample and determine whether the issue is isolated or systemic. Conclusions should be supported by verifiable evidence and clear criteria.

- Follow a recent example from start to finish.
- Use at least two independent sources for significant risk.
- Verify implementation and effectiveness.
- Distinguish an exception from a local deviation and a systemic issue.

11. Decision laboratory

Imagine that tomorrow a major condition changes: a supplier, technology, requirement, workload or responsibility. Build

a five-step response: impact, criterion, decision, evidence, review. The exercise turns the requirement into operational capability.

If your answer relies on “we have always done it this way”, a criterion is missing. If it relies only on a procedure, outcome verification is missing. If it relies on one data point, robustness is missing.

- Impact: what changes?
- Criterion: what will the decision be based on?
- Action: what will be done?
- Evidence: how will implementation be demonstrated?
- Review: when and how will effectiveness be checked?

12. Summary and preparation for the check

Before taking the check, make sure you can explain the chapter without reading the slides. The questions are scenario-based and require you to distinguish a substantive response from a merely formal one.

Key point: “Operations I: planning, product/service requirements and customer relationship” is effective when context, accountability, criteria, implementation, evidence and results are coherent and reviewed. The system should show not only that an activity occurred, but that it achieved its intended effect.

- Can you connect the topic to a real process?
- Can you identify at least two independent pieces of evidence?
- Can you distinguish a useful indicator from a misleading one?
- Can you choose a proportionate action in a new scenario?

MODULE 07**Operations II: design, external providers, production/services, release and nonconformity**

- Minimum required time: 60 min
- Available intermediate-check bank: 32 questions

1. Orientation and learning outcomes

Design may be iterative and should control inputs, reviews, verification, validation, outputs and changes. Outsourced processes remain under organizational accountability. Production and services require controlled conditions, human-error prevention, identification/traceability where needed, preservation, post-delivery activities and change control.

This chapter is designed to move from understanding the principle to recognizing evidence, making decisions and evaluating effectiveness. The guiding theme is “external providers and value chain”. Memorizing definitions is not enough: you should be able to connect requirement, process, risk, accountability and result.

- Explain the topic in your own words without reducing it to documentation.
- Identify the process or organizational decision affected by the topic.
- Distinguish implementation evidence from effectiveness evidence.
- Recognize when a favourable result may hide a weak control.

2. Standard framework and system connections

Quality management connects strategic direction, culture, processes, customer requirements, risks and opportunities, resources, operational control, performance evaluation and improvement. The 2026 edition places even clearer emphasis on quality as organizational behaviour, leadership, and the distinction between risks and opportunities.

“Operations II: design, external providers, production/services, release and nonconformity” does not exist in isolation. In a mature management system, decisions in this area must align with context, policy, objectives, resources, operational control and review. Missing connections often create merely formal conformity.

- Read the requirement in the organization's context.
- Look for interactions with other processes and relevant interested parties.
- Identify the expected result and how it will be measured.

3. From the standard to operational process

Apply controls proportionate to providers and outputs, retain design evidence, validate processes where outputs cannot be verified afterward, authorize release against criteria, and control nonconforming outputs.

A robust method starts from a real situation, defines decision criteria, assigns an owner, establishes proportionate controls and produces usable information. The sequence should remain reconstructable months later to support continuity, auditability and learning.

- Define the input that triggers the process and the expected output.
- Set criteria and thresholds before judging results.

- Assign responsibility and authority proportionate to risk.
- Embed controls in normal work rather than in a parallel compliance process.
- Review effectiveness when conditions or evidence change.

4. Decisions, risks and proportionality

The topic requires a proportionate decision. Not every situation needs the same level of formalization, but every material decision should be explainable. Consider consequences, likelihood or exposure where relevant, dependencies, applicable requirements and the reliability of available information.

Avoid both over-control that adds no value and weak control justified only by the absence of adverse events. Maturity means selecting an appropriate control level and reviewing it against results.

- What event or change should trigger reassessment?
- Which assumption, if wrong, would change the conclusion?
- Which control prevents the issue and which detects its effects?
- How is the residual risk or resulting performance shown to be acceptable?

5. Roles, leadership and competence

Effectiveness depends on clear accountability. Top management sets direction and priorities, process owners govern criteria and results, people apply controls and report anomalies, and support functions provide competence and tools. Outsourcing an activity does not automatically outsource accountability for the management system.

Competence should be demonstrated in the context of the task. Training, experience and instructions are means; the intended result is the ability to perform correctly and respond to deviations.

- Who decides?
- Who performs?
- Who verifies?
- Who should be consulted or informed?
- Who authorizes exceptions and changes?

6. Evidence: what really demonstrates implementation

Design files, supplier qualification, service levels, verification/validation, change records, traceability, release authorization, segregation/concession records and subsequent verification of corrections.

A single record is rarely enough. Strong evidence comes from triangulating documented criteria, process observation, result data and interviews with people doing the work. Sources should be coherent; divergence is itself information that deserves investigation.

- Sample more than one period or case for repetitive processes.
- Compare planned practice with actual practice.
- Verify effectiveness, not just control presence.
- Maintain traceability between decision, evidence and conclusion.

7. Data, indicators and weak signals

For this chapter, a useful indicator may be “scrap, rework and cost of poor quality”, read together with “first-pass output conformity”. A single metric can mislead: understand its definition, source, frequency, threshold, owner and

the decision expected when it deviates.

A positive trend needs interpretation. It may result from genuine improvement, a method change, reduced activity or incomplete data. Before concluding, check comparability and use leading signals alongside final outcomes.

- Outcome indicator: what happened?
- Leading indicator: what condition may predict a problem?
- Threshold: when is action required?
- Decision: who acts and by when?

8. Common failure modes and how to avoid them

One recurring failure mode is closing a nonconformity without addressing cause. Another is treating risk without checking action effectiveness. These behaviours can create an orderly-looking system that cannot prevent recurrence or demonstrate results.

Correct the approach by returning to three questions: what result is needed, what evidence demonstrates it, and what decision will be taken if the result is unsatisfactory?

- Do not confuse documentary conformity with operational control.
- Do not use absence of problems as the only proof of effectiveness.
- Do not leave criteria implicit or dependent on one person's memory.
- Do not close actions without later checking their effect.

9. Applied case

An external provider performs a critical stage. The contract is complete but the organization no longer monitors control effectiveness: accountability for conformity is not transferred by outsourcing.

Analyse the case as the process owner. Separate facts from assumptions, identify relevant requirements and interested parties, evaluate possible consequences and define the evidence you need before choosing an action and an effectiveness check.

- What is the real problem and what may only be a symptom?
- Which requirement or criterion is involved?
- Which people or processes must participate?
- What evidence would show that the solution remains effective?

10. Audit lens

During an audit, follow the chain requirement -> decision -> implementation -> evidence -> result. The question is not “does the document exist?” but “does the system reliably produce the expected result and react when it does not?”.

When evidence conflicts, extend the sample and determine whether the issue is isolated or systemic. Conclusions should be supported by verifiable evidence and clear criteria.

- Follow a recent example from start to finish.
- Use at least two independent sources for significant risk.
- Verify implementation and effectiveness.
- Distinguish an exception from a local deviation and a systemic issue.

11. Decision laboratory

Imagine that tomorrow a major condition changes: a supplier, technology, requirement, workload or responsibility. Build a five-step response: impact, criterion, decision, evidence, review. The exercise turns the requirement into operational capability.

If your answer relies on “we have always done it this way”, a criterion is missing. If it relies only on a procedure, outcome verification is missing. If it relies on one data point, robustness is missing.

- Impact: what changes?
- Criterion: what will the decision be based on?
- Action: what will be done?
- Evidence: how will implementation be demonstrated?
- Review: when and how will effectiveness be checked?

12. Summary and preparation for the check

Before taking the check, make sure you can explain the chapter without reading the slides. The questions are scenario-based and require you to distinguish a substantive response from a merely formal one.

Key point: “Operations II: design, external providers, production/services, release and nonconformity” is effective when context, accountability, criteria, implementation, evidence and results are coherent and reviewed. The system should show not only that an activity occurred, but that it achieved its intended effect.

- Can you connect the topic to a real process?
- Can you identify at least two independent pieces of evidence?
- Can you distinguish a useful indicator from a misleading one?
- Can you choose a proportionate action in a new scenario?

MODULE 08**Performance evaluation: data, customer satisfaction, internal audit and management review**

- Minimum required time: 45 min
- Available intermediate-check bank: 32 questions

1. Orientation and learning outcomes

Monitoring and measurement should produce valid data; analysis should evaluate conformity, satisfaction, QMS effectiveness, plan implementation, risk/opportunity actions, suppliers and improvement needs. Audit and management review translate evidence into decisions.

This chapter is designed to move from understanding the principle to recognizing evidence, making decisions and evaluating effectiveness. The guiding theme is “measurement, audit and improvement”. Memorizing definitions is not enough: you should be able to connect requirement, process, risk, accountability and result.

- Explain the topic in your own words without reducing it to documentation.
- Identify the process or organizational decision affected by the topic.
- Distinguish implementation evidence from effectiveness evidence.
- Recognize when a favourable result may hide a weak control.

2. Standard framework and system connections

Quality management connects strategic direction, culture, processes, customer requirements, risks and opportunities, resources, operational control, performance evaluation and improvement. The 2026 edition places even clearer emphasis on quality as organizational behaviour, leadership, and the distinction between risks and opportunities.

“Performance evaluation: data, customer satisfaction, internal audit and management review” does not exist in isolation. In a mature management system, decisions in this area must align with context, policy, objectives, resources, operational control and review. Missing connections often create merely formal conformity.

- Read the requirement in the organization's context.
- Look for interactions with other processes and relevant interested parties.
- Identify the expected result and how it will be measured.

3. From the standard to operational process

Define what, how and when to monitor; verify data quality and comparability; plan audits based on importance, changes and prior results; ensure management review covers trends, resources, risks, opportunities and resulting decisions.

A robust method starts from a real situation, defines decision criteria, assigns an owner, establishes proportionate controls and produces usable information. The sequence should remain reconstructable months later to support continuity, auditability and learning.

- Define the input that triggers the process and the expected output.
- Set criteria and thresholds before judging results.
- Assign responsibility and authority proportionate to risk.

- Embed controls in normal work rather than in a parallel compliance process.
- Review effectiveness when conditions or evidence change.

4. Decisions, risks and proportionality

The topic requires a proportionate decision. Not every situation needs the same level of formalization, but every material decision should be explainable. Consider consequences, likelihood or exposure where relevant, dependencies, applicable requirements and the reliability of available information.

Avoid both over-control that adds no value and weak control justified only by the absence of adverse events. Maturity means selecting an appropriate control level and reviewing it against results.

- What event or change should trigger reassessment?
- Which assumption, if wrong, would change the conclusion?
- Which control prevents the issue and which detects its effects?
- How is the residual risk or resulting performance shown to be acceptable?

5. Roles, leadership and competence

Effectiveness depends on clear accountability. Top management sets direction and priorities, process owners govern criteria and results, people apply controls and report anomalies, and support functions provide competence and tools. Outsourcing an activity does not automatically outsource accountability for the management system.

Competence should be demonstrated in the context of the task. Training, experience and instructions are means; the intended result is the ability to perform correctly and respond to deviations.

- Who decides?
- Who performs?
- Who verifies?
- Who should be consulted or informed?
- Who authorizes exceptions and changes?

6. Evidence: what really demonstrates implementation

KPI definitions, raw data, customer feedback, audit programme, sampling rationale, findings, follow-up, management-review inputs/outputs, decisions, resource allocations and action tracking.

A single record is rarely enough. Strong evidence comes from triangulating documented criteria, process observation, result data and interviews with people doing the work. Sources should be coherent; divergence is itself information that deserves investigation.

- Sample more than one period or case for repetitive processes.
- Compare planned practice with actual practice.
- Verify effectiveness, not just control presence.
- Maintain traceability between decision, evidence and conclusion.

7. Data, indicators and weak signals

For this chapter, a useful indicator may be “satisfaction trends and improvement actions”, read together with “process stability and capability”. A single metric can mislead: understand its definition, source, frequency, threshold, owner and the decision expected when it deviates.

A positive trend needs interpretation. It may result from genuine improvement, a method change, reduced activity or incomplete data. Before concluding, check comparability and use leading signals alongside final outcomes.

- Outcome indicator: what happened?
- Leading indicator: what condition may predict a problem?
- Threshold: when is action required?
- Decision: who acts and by when?

8. Common failure modes and how to avoid them

One recurring failure mode is treating management review as a formal meeting. Another is using indicators unrelated to objectives. These behaviours can create an orderly-looking system that cannot prevent recurrence or demonstrate results.

Correct the approach by returning to three questions: what result is needed, what evidence demonstrates it, and what decision will be taken if the result is unsatisfactory?

- Do not confuse documentary conformity with operational control.
- Do not use absence of problems as the only proof of effectiveness.
- Do not leave criteria implicit or dependent on one person's memory.
- Do not close actions without later checking their effect.

9. Applied case

Customer satisfaction appears to improve, but the collection method changed and the sample shrank: the trend is not reliable until comparability and representativeness are checked.

Analyse the case as the process owner. Separate facts from assumptions, identify relevant requirements and interested parties, evaluate possible consequences and define the evidence you need before choosing an action and an effectiveness check.

- What is the real problem and what may only be a symptom?
- Which requirement or criterion is involved?
- Which people or processes must participate?
- What evidence would show that the solution remains effective?

10. Audit lens

During an audit, follow the chain requirement -> decision -> implementation -> evidence -> result. The question is not "does the document exist?" but "does the system reliably produce the expected result and react when it does not?".

When evidence conflicts, extend the sample and determine whether the issue is isolated or systemic. Conclusions should be supported by verifiable evidence and clear criteria.

- Follow a recent example from start to finish.
- Use at least two independent sources for significant risk.
- Verify implementation and effectiveness.
- Distinguish an exception from a local deviation and a systemic issue.

11. Decision laboratory

Imagine that tomorrow a major condition changes: a supplier, technology, requirement, workload or responsibility. Build

a five-step response: impact, criterion, decision, evidence, review. The exercise turns the requirement into operational capability.

If your answer relies on “we have always done it this way”, a criterion is missing. If it relies only on a procedure, outcome verification is missing. If it relies on one data point, robustness is missing.

- Impact: what changes?
- Criterion: what will the decision be based on?
- Action: what will be done?
- Evidence: how will implementation be demonstrated?
- Review: when and how will effectiveness be checked?

12. Summary and preparation for the check

Before taking the check, make sure you can explain the chapter without reading the slides. The questions are scenario-based and require you to distinguish a substantive response from a merely formal one.

Key point: “Performance evaluation: data, customer satisfaction, internal audit and management review” is effective when context, accountability, criteria, implementation, evidence and results are coherent and reviewed. The system should show not only that an activity occurred, but that it achieved its intended effect.

- Can you connect the topic to a real process?
- Can you identify at least two independent pieces of evidence?
- Can you distinguish a useful indicator from a misleading one?
- Can you choose a proportionate action in a new scenario?

MODULE 09**Continual improvement, nonconformity, causes and corrective action**

- Minimum required time: 35 min
- Available intermediate-check bank: 24 questions

1. Orientation and learning outcomes

Continual improvement addresses QMS suitability, adequacy and effectiveness and uses data, reviews, nonconformities and opportunities. Corrective action is not the same as correction: it requires cause analysis, consideration of potential recurrence, action, effectiveness review and, where necessary, updates to risks/opportunities and the system.

This chapter is designed to move from understanding the principle to recognizing evidence, making decisions and evaluating effectiveness. The guiding theme is “customer focus and value”. Memorizing definitions is not enough: you should be able to connect requirement, process, risk, accountability and result.

- Explain the topic in your own words without reducing it to documentation.
- Identify the process or organizational decision affected by the topic.
- Distinguish implementation evidence from effectiveness evidence.
- Recognize when a favourable result may hide a weak control.

2. Standard framework and system connections

Quality management connects strategic direction, culture, processes, customer requirements, risks and opportunities, resources, operational control, performance evaluation and improvement. The 2026 edition places even clearer emphasis on quality as organizational behaviour, leadership, and the distinction between risks and opportunities.

“Continual improvement, nonconformity, causes and corrective action” does not exist in isolation. In a mature management system, decisions in this area must align with context, policy, objectives, resources, operational control and review. Missing connections often create merely formal conformity.

- Read the requirement in the organization’s context.
- Look for interactions with other processes and relevant interested parties.
- Identify the expected result and how it will be measured.

3. From the standard to operational process

Build a problem-solving process that separates containment, correction, cause, corrective action and effectiveness review; use complaints and weak signals to identify systemic issues and opportunities.

A robust method starts from a real situation, defines decision criteria, assigns an owner, establishes proportionate controls and produces usable information. The sequence should remain reconstructable months later to support continuity, auditability and learning.

- Define the input that triggers the process and the expected output.
- Set criteria and thresholds before judging results.

- Assign responsibility and authority proportionate to risk.
- Embed controls in normal work rather than in a parallel compliance process.
- Review effectiveness when conditions or evidence change.

4. Decisions, risks and proportionality

The topic requires a proportionate decision. Not every situation needs the same level of formalization, but every material decision should be explainable. Consider consequences, likelihood or exposure where relevant, dependencies, applicable requirements and the reliability of available information.

Avoid both over-control that adds no value and weak control justified only by the absence of adverse events. Maturity means selecting an appropriate control level and reviewing it against results.

- What event or change should trigger reassessment?
- Which assumption, if wrong, would change the conclusion?
- Which control prevents the issue and which detects its effects?
- How is the residual risk or resulting performance shown to be acceptable?

5. Roles, leadership and competence

Effectiveness depends on clear accountability. Top management sets direction and priorities, process owners govern criteria and results, people apply controls and report anomalies, and support functions provide competence and tools. Outsourcing an activity does not automatically outsource accountability for the management system.

Competence should be demonstrated in the context of the task. Training, experience and instructions are means; the intended result is the ability to perform correctly and respond to deviations.

- Who decides?
- Who performs?
- Who verifies?
- Who should be consulted or informed?
- Who authorizes exceptions and changes?

6. Evidence: what really demonstrates implementation

Nonconformity records, root-cause evidence, similar-case search, action plans, effectiveness criteria, follow-up data, updated risks, process changes and lessons learned.

A single record is rarely enough. Strong evidence comes from triangulating documented criteria, process observation, result data and interviews with people doing the work. Sources should be coherent; divergence is itself information that deserves investigation.

- Sample more than one period or case for repetitive processes.
- Compare planned practice with actual practice.
- Verify effectiveness, not just control presence.
- Maintain traceability between decision, evidence and conclusion.

7. Data, indicators and weak signals

For this chapter, a useful indicator may be “complaints and recurring causes”, read together with “response time and commitment fulfilment”. A single metric can mislead: understand its definition, source, frequency, threshold,

owner and the decision expected when it deviates.

A positive trend needs interpretation. It may result from genuine improvement, a method change, reduced activity or incomplete data. Before concluding, check comparability and use leading signals alongside final outcomes.

- Outcome indicator: what happened?
- Leading indicator: what condition may predict a problem?
- Threshold: when is action required?
- Decision: who acts and by when?

8. Common failure modes and how to avoid them

One recurring failure mode is measuring volume but not output quality. Another is recording training without evaluating effectiveness. These behaviours can create an orderly-looking system that cannot prevent recurrence or demonstrate results.

Correct the approach by returning to three questions: what result is needed, what evidence demonstrates it, and what decision will be taken if the result is unsatisfactory?

- Do not confuse documentary conformity with operational control.
- Do not use absence of problems as the only proof of effectiveness.
- Do not leave criteria implicit or dependent on one person's memory.
- Do not close actions without later checking their effect.

9. Applied case

The same deviation appears in different departments and is corrected locally each time: recurrence suggests a common-process cause and requires cross-functional analysis.

Analyse the case as the process owner. Separate facts from assumptions, identify relevant requirements and interested parties, evaluate possible consequences and define the evidence you need before choosing an action and an effectiveness check.

- What is the real problem and what may only be a symptom?
- Which requirement or criterion is involved?
- Which people or processes must participate?
- What evidence would show that the solution remains effective?

10. Audit lens

During an audit, follow the chain requirement -> decision -> implementation -> evidence -> result. The question is not “does the document exist?” but “does the system reliably produce the expected result and react when it does not?”.

When evidence conflicts, extend the sample and determine whether the issue is isolated or systemic. Conclusions should be supported by verifiable evidence and clear criteria.

- Follow a recent example from start to finish.
- Use at least two independent sources for significant risk.
- Verify implementation and effectiveness.
- Distinguish an exception from a local deviation and a systemic issue.

11. Decision laboratory

Imagine that tomorrow a major condition changes: a supplier, technology, requirement, workload or responsibility. Build a five-step response: impact, criterion, decision, evidence, review. The exercise turns the requirement into operational capability.

If your answer relies on “we have always done it this way”, a criterion is missing. If it relies only on a procedure, outcome verification is missing. If it relies on one data point, robustness is missing.

- Impact: what changes?
- Criterion: what will the decision be based on?
- Action: what will be done?
- Evidence: how will implementation be demonstrated?
- Review: when and how will effectiveness be checked?

12. Summary and preparation for the check

Before taking the check, make sure you can explain the chapter without reading the slides. The questions are scenario-based and require you to distinguish a substantive response from a merely formal one.

Key point: “Continual improvement, nonconformity, causes and corrective action” is effective when context, accountability, criteria, implementation, evidence and results are coherent and reviewed. The system should show not only that an activity occurred, but that it achieved its intended effect.

- Can you connect the topic to a real process?
- Can you identify at least two independent pieces of evidence?
- Can you distinguish a useful indicator from a misleading one?
- Can you choose a proportionate action in a new scenario?

MODULE 10**Annex A, applicability, terminology, transition and audit readiness**

- Minimum required time: 25 min
- Available intermediate-check bank: 24 questions

1. Orientation and learning outcomes

The 2026 Annex A clarifies structure, terminology and intent without adding requirements. It is important to distinguish concepts such as appropriate/applicable, consider/take into account, continual/continuous and ensure/directly perform. The standard structure does not require documentation to mirror its clause structure.

This chapter is designed to move from understanding the principle to recognizing evidence, making decisions and evaluating effectiveness. The guiding theme is “process approach and interactions”. Memorizing definitions is not enough: you should be able to connect requirement, process, risk, accountability and result.

- Explain the topic in your own words without reducing it to documentation.
- Identify the process or organizational decision affected by the topic.
- Distinguish implementation evidence from effectiveness evidence.
- Recognize when a favourable result may hide a weak control.

2. Standard framework and system connections

Quality management connects strategic direction, culture, processes, customer requirements, risks and opportunities, resources, operational control, performance evaluation and improvement. The 2026 edition places even clearer emphasis on quality as organizational behaviour, leadership, and the distinction between risks and opportunities.

“Annex A, applicability, terminology, transition and audit readiness” does not exist in isolation. In a mature management system, decisions in this area must align with context, policy, objectives, resources, operational control and review. Missing connections often create merely formal conformity.

- Read the requirement in the organization's context.
- Look for interactions with other processes and relevant interested parties.
- Identify the expected result and how it will be measured.

3. From the standard to operational process

Use the clarifications to avoid over-documentation and mechanical interpretation; build an evidence-based transition checklist; prepare audit trails linking requirement, decision, implementation, result and improvement.

A robust method starts from a real situation, defines decision criteria, assigns an owner, establishes proportionate controls and produces usable information. The sequence should remain reconstructable months later to support continuity, auditability and learning.

- Define the input that triggers the process and the expected output.
- Set criteria and thresholds before judging results.
- Assign responsibility and authority proportionate to risk.

- Embed controls in normal work rather than in a parallel compliance process.
- Review effectiveness when conditions or evidence change.

4. Decisions, risks and proportionality

The topic requires a proportionate decision. Not every situation needs the same level of formalization, but every material decision should be explainable. Consider consequences, likelihood or exposure where relevant, dependencies, applicable requirements and the reliability of available information.

Avoid both over-control that adds no value and weak control justified only by the absence of adverse events. Maturity means selecting an appropriate control level and reviewing it against results.

- What event or change should trigger reassessment?
- Which assumption, if wrong, would change the conclusion?
- Which control prevents the issue and which detects its effects?
- How is the residual risk or resulting performance shown to be acceptable?

5. Roles, leadership and competence

Effectiveness depends on clear accountability. Top management sets direction and priorities, process owners govern criteria and results, people apply controls and report anomalies, and support functions provide competence and tools. Outsourcing an activity does not automatically outsource accountability for the management system.

Competence should be demonstrated in the context of the task. Training, experience and instructions are means; the intended result is the ability to perform correctly and respond to deviations.

- Who decides?
- Who performs?
- Who verifies?
- Who should be consulted or informed?
- Who authorizes exceptions and changes?

6. Evidence: what really demonstrates implementation

Requirement-evidence matrix, applicability decisions, rationale, gap closure, process audit trails, sampling, interviews and effectiveness checks for transition changes.

A single record is rarely enough. Strong evidence comes from triangulating documented criteria, process observation, result data and interviews with people doing the work. Sources should be coherent; divergence is itself information that deserves investigation.

- Sample more than one period or case for repetitive processes.
- Compare planned practice with actual practice.
- Verify effectiveness, not just control presence.
- Maintain traceability between decision, evidence and conclusion.

7. Data, indicators and weak signals

For this chapter, a useful indicator may be “first-pass output conformity”, read together with “on-the-job training effectiveness”. A single metric can mislead: understand its definition, source, frequency, threshold, owner and the decision expected when it deviates.

A positive trend needs interpretation. It may result from genuine improvement, a method change, reduced activity or incomplete data. Before concluding, check comparability and use leading signals alongside final outcomes.

- Outcome indicator: what happened?
- Leading indicator: what condition may predict a problem?
- Threshold: when is action required?
- Decision: who acts and by when?

8. Common failure modes and how to avoid them

One recurring failure mode is confusing an approved procedure with an effective process. Another is assessing suppliers on price alone. These behaviours can create an orderly-looking system that cannot prevent recurrence or demonstrate results.

Correct the approach by returning to three questions: what result is needed, what evidence demonstrates it, and what decision will be taken if the result is unsatisfactory?

- Do not confuse documentary conformity with operational control.
- Do not use absence of problems as the only proof of effectiveness.
- Do not leave criteria implicit or dependent on one person's memory.
- Do not close actions without later checking their effect.

9. Applied case

The company restructures its manual into the same ten clauses as the standard but real processes are not linked to those sections: editorial alignment is not evidence of conformity or effectiveness.

Analyse the case as the process owner. Separate facts from assumptions, identify relevant requirements and interested parties, evaluate possible consequences and define the evidence you need before choosing an action and an effectiveness check.

- What is the real problem and what may only be a symptom?
- Which requirement or criterion is involved?
- Which people or processes must participate?
- What evidence would show that the solution remains effective?

10. Audit lens

During an audit, follow the chain requirement -> decision -> implementation -> evidence -> result. The question is not "does the document exist?" but "does the system reliably produce the expected result and react when it does not?".

When evidence conflicts, extend the sample and determine whether the issue is isolated or systemic. Conclusions should be supported by verifiable evidence and clear criteria.

- Follow a recent example from start to finish.
- Use at least two independent sources for significant risk.
- Verify implementation and effectiveness.
- Distinguish an exception from a local deviation and a systemic issue.

11. Decision laboratory

Imagine that tomorrow a major condition changes: a supplier, technology, requirement, workload or responsibility. Build

a five-step response: impact, criterion, decision, evidence, review. The exercise turns the requirement into operational capability.

If your answer relies on “we have always done it this way”, a criterion is missing. If it relies only on a procedure, outcome verification is missing. If it relies on one data point, robustness is missing.

- Impact: what changes?
- Criterion: what will the decision be based on?
- Action: what will be done?
- Evidence: how will implementation be demonstrated?
- Review: when and how will effectiveness be checked?

12. Summary and preparation for the check

Before taking the check, make sure you can explain the chapter without reading the slides. The questions are scenario-based and require you to distinguish a substantive response from a merely formal one.

Key point: “Annex A, applicability, terminology, transition and audit readiness” is effective when context, accountability, criteria, implementation, evidence and results are coherent and reviewed. The system should show not only that an activity occurred, but that it achieved its intended effect.

- Can you connect the topic to a real process?
- Can you identify at least two independent pieces of evidence?
- Can you distinguish a useful indicator from a misleading one?
- Can you choose a proportionate action in a new scenario?

7. Assessment system, final exam and passing criteria

- Intermediate checks are linked to individual modules and provide progressive learning control before access to the final assessment.
- The final assessment consists of 30 questions selected from the active course bank. The platform applies an anti-repetition logic for new attempts when the bank size allows it.
- Final question-bank size detected at generation time: 240 active questions.
- Published passing threshold for the course: 70%.
- Questions are intended to assess not only recall but also interpretation, application, evidence selection, scenario assessment and quality of decision-making, depending on the subject matter.

8. Tracking, learning continuity and session integrity

- Path status, completed modules and recorded time are managed server-side when the course uses the Academy learning mode.
- The platform allows the pathway to resume from the recorded point and retains the results of required checks.
- Assessment sessions may be subject to the integrity and proctoring controls enabled by the platform and described in the applicable usage rules.
- Technical and integrity events support assessment and do not replace professional judgement where human review is required.

9. Certificate, use and limitations

The CIWZ certificate, where provided by the pathway and requested after passing, records the result achieved in the stated CIWZ pathway or assessment. It does not automatically replace personnel certification, professional registration, statutory licence, legal qualification or credentials issued by third-party bodies where such requirements are imposed by the applicable scheme.

10. Commercial and tax conditions

- Course + certificate: 510,00 € VAT excluded.
- UAE VAT is applied to UAE customers according to billing data and the applicable tax rules.
- Any specific commercial terms, agreements or corporate orders override the public price only when formally accepted by Certificato IWZ FZCO.

11. Dossier document control

- Document automatically generated by CIWZ Academy from the course data published at the time of the request.

- Course code: ISO9001-2026
- Document language: EN
- Generation date: 13/10/2026
- For normative and professional application, the current official sources and any applicable procedures/schemes prevail.