



Mapping of SPiCE 1-2-1 for Automotive SPiCE PAM 3.1 Rule-Checker IDs to Blau-Gold-Band Rule-IDs

referring to Tool SW-Version 3.3.25 and Automotive SPiCE Guidelines, 1st edition, September 2017

rules/recom: 287/208 (Sum:495) - Automatically can be identified as 'satisfied': 488									
Σ tool checkable: 491 check if met (115 full auto check)									
at Level 1/2/3: 401/65/29									
ID	Typ	Dom	RuleTextEN	Page BlueGold	checkable	comment	Precon. CLmin	Scope	
[TAC.RC.1]	recom		If the granularity is not at least on the lowest granularity mentioned above, the traceability indicator should be downrated.	36	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.2 SYS.3 SYS.4 SYS.5 SWE.1 SWE.2 SWE.3 SWE.4 SWE.5 SWE.6 SUP.10	
[TAC.RC.2]	recom		If there is no documented evidence for the traceability between related work products on the required granularity (see above) the Traceability indicator should be downrated.	37	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.2 SYS.3 SYS.4 SYS.5 SWE.1 SWE.2 SWE.3 SWE.4 SWE.5 SWE.6 SUP.10	
[TAC.RC.3]	recom		If the project is not using an automatized tool based approach but sample based check confirmed that project complexity is covered sufficiently by maintaining the traceability manually, this should not be used to downrate the Traceability indicator.	38	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.2 SYS.3 SYS.4 SYS.5 SWE.1 SWE.2 SWE.3 SWE.4 SWE.5 SWE.6 SUP.10	
[TAC.RL.1]	rule		If there is no documented evidence for the consistency between related work products on the required granularity (see above) the consistency indicator shall be downrated.	39	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.2 SYS.3 SYS.4 SYS.5 SWE.1 SWE.2 SWE.3 SWE.4 SWE.5 SWE.6 MAN.3	
[TAC.RC.4]	recom		If for engineering processes the traceability indicator is downrated, the consistency indicator should not be rated higher.	40	yes	Needs to be implemented with 10 rules; one for each affected process: RaiseWarning if SYS.2.BP7 > SYS.2.BP6; or SYS.3.BP7 > SYS.3.BP6; or SYS.4.BP8 > SYS.4.BP7; or SYS.5.BP6 > SYS.5.BP5; or SWE.1.BP7 > SWE.1.BP6; or SWE.2.BP8 > SWE.2.BP7; or SWE.3.BP6 > SWE.3.BP5; or SWE.4.BP6 > SWE.4.BP5; or SWE.5.BP8 > SWE.5.BP7; or SWE.6.BP6 > SWE.5.BP5	1	SYS.2 SYS.3 SYS.4 SYS.5 SWE.1 SWE.2 SWE.3 SWE.4 SWE.5 SWE.6	
[TAC.RL.2]	rule		If traceability and consistency is only established for one path and not for the other redundant path, the 'Traceability' indicator must not be downrated.	41	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.2 SYS.3 SWE.1 SWE.2 SWE.3	

ID	Typ	Dom	RuleTextEN	Page BlueGold	checkable	comment	Precon. CLmin	Scope
[TAC.RL.3]	rule		If only one path is explicitly established and the other path can't be derived from the established path, the Traceability indicator shall be downrated.	41	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.2 SYS.3 SWE.1 SWE.2 SWE.3
[SAC.RC.1]	recom		If the BP for communication of workproducts (e.g. SYS.2.BP8 for agreed system requirements) is downrated or the BP for summarize and communicate of test results is downrated, this should be in line with the rating of the indicator GP 2.1.7.	43	yes	Needs to be implemented with several rules... e.g.: RaiseWarning if SYS.2.BP8 != SYS.2.GP 2.1.7 etc.	2	ACQ.4 SUP.1 SYS.2 SYS.3 SYS.4 SYS.5 SWE.1 SWE.2 SWE.3 SWE.4 SWE.5 SWE.6 MAN.3
[SAC.RC.2]	recom		If there are evidences that necessary information is not provided to all relevant stakeholders (see examples in the list above), the indicator for "communicate agreed..." and/or the indicator for "summarize and communicate..." should be downrated.	43	no	Assessor judgement.	1	ACQ.4 SUP.1 SYS.2 SYS.3 SYS.4 SYS.5 SWE.1 SWE.2 SWE.3 SWE.4 SWE.5 SWE.6 MAN.3
[SAC.RL.1]	rule		If there are evidences that work products are communicated but not agreed, the respective indicator for communicate must not be rated higher than P.	44	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.2 SYS.3 SWE.1 SWE.2 SWE.3
[SAC.RL.2]	rule		If test results are not summarized appropriately to cover the aspects a) and b), the respective indicator for "summarize and communicate" must not be rated higher than P	45	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.4 SYS.5 SWE.4 SWE.5 SWE.6
[SAC.RC.3]	recom		If test results are not summarized appropriately to cover all aspects above, the respective indicator for "summarize and communicate" should be downrated.	45	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.4 SYS.5 SWE.4 SWE.5 SWE.6
[SAC.RC.4]	recom		If automated emailing is used to inform all project participants about status changes of work products, the respective indicator for communicate should not be downrated	46	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.2 SYS.3 SYS.4 SYS.5 SWE.1 SWE.2 SWE.4 SWE.5 SWE.6

ID	Typ	Dom	RuleTextEN	Page BlueGold	checkable	comment	Precon. CLmin	Scope
[SAC.RC.5]	recom		If automated emailing is used to inform all project participants about status changes of work products and evidence is gathered that eMails are systematically not read, the respective indicator for communicate should be downrated	46	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.2 SYS.3 SYS.4 SYS.5 SWE.1 SWE.2 SWE.4 SWE.5 SWE.6
[SAC.RC.6]	recom		If automated emailing is used to inform all project participants about status changes of work products without customizing to meet the specific information needs of the project participants, the indicator GP 2.1.7 for the respective process should be downrated.	46	no	Assessor judgement.	1	*
[VEC.RL.1]	rule		If one of the aspects a), b) or f) is missing in the verification criteria, the indicator SYS.2.BP5 / SWE.1.BP5 must not be rated higher than P.	48	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.2 SWE.1
[VEC.RL.2]	rule		If the corresponding requirements or corresponding work products (e.g. test plan) contain all aspects above and there are no additional verification criteria defined, the indicators SYS2.BP5 / SWE1.BP5 must not be downrated.	48	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.2 SWE.1
[SAP.RL.1]	rule		If a strategy is not documented as an extra text processing document titled "strategy" but there is evidence of a strategy known by all relevant parties (see examples above) the strategy-related indicators must not be downrated.	51	no	Assessor judgement.	1	ACQ.14 SYS.4 SYS.4 SYS.5 SYS.5 SWE.4 SWE.5 SWE.5 SWE.6 SUP.1 SUP.7 SUP.8 SUP.9 SUP.10 MAN.5 MAN.6 REU.2
[SAP.RL.2]	rule		If a strategy is not effective in terms of achieving the process outcomes, or not adhered to by all relevant parties, then the strategy-related indicators shall be downrated.	51	no	Assessor judgement.	1	ACQ.14 SYS.4 SYS.4 SYS.5 SWE.4 SWE.5 SWE.5 SWE.6 SUP.1 SUP.7 SUP.8 SUP.9 SUP.10 MAN.5 MAN.6 REU.2

ID	Typ	Dom	RuleTextEN	Page BlueGold	checkable	comment	Precon. CLmin	Scope
[SAP.RL.3]	rule		If the work product characteristics as explained by the generic work product characteristics "08-00"Plan are missing, this must not be used to downrate the Strategy-BP of the assessed process.	52	no	Assessor judgement.	1	ACQ.14 SYS.4 SYS.4 SYS.5 SWE.4 SWE.5 SWE.5 SWE.6 SUP.1 SUP.7 SUP.8 SUP.9 SUP.10 MAN.5 MAN.6 REU.2
[SAP.RL.4]	rule		If the strategies of different processes are combined in the same document the corresponding strategy-BPs shall not be downrated.	54	no	Assessor judgement.	1	ACQ.14 SYS.4 SYS.4 SYS.5 SWE.4 SWE.5 SWE.5 SWE.6 SUP.1 SUP.7 SUP.8 SUP.9 SUP.10 MAN.5 MAN.6 REU.2
[MBD.RL.1]	rule	MBD	If the use cases for the modelling are not explicitly defined and this aspect is significant in the context of the corresponding indicator, the corresponding indicator shall be downrated.	55	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.1 SWE.3 SWE.3 SWE.3
[MBD.RL.2]	rule	MBD	If the syntax and semantics of the model notation is not defined or not appropriate for the use case and this aspect is significant in the context of the corresponding indicator, the corresponding indicator shall be downrated.	55	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.1 SWE.3 SWE.3 SWE.3
[MBD.RL.3]	rule	MBD	If the additional description is missing or insufficient and this aspect is significant in the context of the corresponding indicator, the corresponding indicator shall be downrated.	55	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.1 SWE.3 SWE.3 SWE.3
[MBD.RL.4]	rule	MBD	If the additional description is documented in the model, the corresponding indicator must not be downrated.	56	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.1 SWE.3 SWE.3 SWE.3
[MBD.RL.5]	rule	MBD	If the additional description in natural language of the model is not considered in the following development process and this aspect is significant in the context of the corresponding indicator, the corresponding indicator must not be rated F.	56	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.1 SWE.3
[MBD.RL.6]	rule	MBD	If there is no or not sufficient evidence for compliance of the parts of the model for code generation with the detailed design or the parts of the model for the detailed design and with the non-functional software requirements and this aspect is significant in the context of the SWE.3.BP6, the indicator SWE.3.BP6 must not be rated higher than P. If the parts of the model for code generation are not verified using static verification and not tested to provide evidence for compliance of the software units with the software detailed design and with the non-functional software requirements and this aspect is significant in the context of SWE.4.BP3, the indicator SWE.4.BP3 shall be downrated.	57	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.3
[MBD.RL.7]	rule	MBD	If software units that are generated from the verified model by using a qualified tool chain (and without any further modification after generation) are not static verified, the indicator SWE.4.BP3 must not be downrated.	57	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.4
[MBD.RL.8]	rule	MBD	If software units that are generated from the verified model by using a qualified tool chain (and without any further modification after generation) are not unit tested, the indicator SWE.4.BP4 must not be downrated.	57	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.4
[MBD.RL.9]	rule	MBD	If software units generated from the verified model are modified and not explicitly static verified, the indicator SWE.4.BP3 shall be downrated.	57	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.4
[MBD.RL.10]	rule	MBD	If software units generated from the verified model are modified and not explicitly unit tested, the indicator SWE.4.BP4 shall be downrated.	57	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.4
[AGE.RC.1]	recom	AGE	If evidences from project planning (e.g. backlog, burn down chart and/or sprint planning) show gaps regarding the release planning and this aspect is significant in the context of MAN.3.BP4, MAN.3.BP9 and SPL.2.BP1, the base practices MAN.3.BP4, MAN.3.BP9 and SPL.2.BP1 should be downrated.	59	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3 MAN.3 SPL.2
[AGE.RC.2]	recom	AGE	If the defined project life cycle does not fit to project scope, requirements, deliveries, etc., the base practices MAN.3.BP2 should be downrated.	60	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3

ID	Typ	Dom	RuleTextEN	Page BlueGold	checkable	comment	Precon. CLmin	Scope
[AGE.RC.3]	recom	AGE	If the project development is based on change management without a complete and consistent overview of all project requirements and this aspect is significant in the context of SWE.1.BP3 (for software) and SYS.2.BP3 (for system), the base practices SWE.1.BP3 (for software) and SYS.2.BP3 (for system) should be downrated.	60	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.1 SYS.2
[AGE.RC.4]	recom	AGE	If risk management is required for the project but not integrated in the agile project, the base practices MAN.3.BP5 and MAN.5.BP1 should be downrated.	61	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3 MAN.5
[AGE.RC.5]	recom	AGE	If no software architecture is developed and maintained, the base practice SWE.2.BP1 should be downrated.	61	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.2
[AGE.RC.6]	recom	AGE	If the software architecture is modified incrementally including impact analysis, this should not be used to downrate the indicator SWE.2.BP1.	61	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.2
[AGE.RC.7]	recom	AGE	If the test level Software Unit Verification is not consistently integrated in the agile life cycle, the base practices SWE.4.BP1 should be downrated.	62	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.4
[AGE.RC.8]	recom	AGE	If the test level Software Integration Test is not consistently integrated in the agile life cycle, the base practices SWE.5.BP1 should be downrated.	62	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.5
[AGE.RC.9]	recom	AGE	If the test level Software Qualification Tests is not consistently integrated in the agile life cycle, the base practices SWE.6.BP1 should be downrated.	62	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.6
[AGE.RC.10]	recom	AGE	If the project does not ensure that work product and process quality assurance is performed at project level independently and objectively without conflicts of interest, the base practices SUP.1.BP1 should be downrated.	62	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.1
[AGE.RC.11]	recom	AGE	If used pair programming method is not in conflict with code review requirements (e.g. inspection is required due to safety context), the base practices SUP.1.BP2 and SWE.4.BP3 should not be downrated.	62	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.1 SWE.4
[DID.RL.1]	rule	DID	If the scope of work is not defined for all sub-projects, the indicator MAN.3.BP1 must not be rated higher than L.	64	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3
[DID.RL.2]	rule	DID	If the plans of the overall project and sub-projects show inconsistencies and this aspect is significant in the context of Man.3.BP9, the indicator MAN.3.BP9 shall be downrated.	64	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3
[DID.RL.3]	rule	DID	If the monitoring of the overall project does not recognize deviations in sub-projects and this aspect is significant in the context of MAN.3.BP4 and/or MAN.3.BP5, the indicator MAN.3.BP4 and/or MAN.3.BP5 shall be downrated.	64	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3
[DID.RL.4]	rule	DID	If the assignment of activities to sub-projects does not include a consistent and suitable set of responsibilities and/or commitments for a distributed environment, the indicator GP 2.1.5 for the respective process shall be downrated.	64	no	Assessor judgement.	2	*
[DID.RL.5]	rule	DID	If sub-projects shall work with the same work environment as the overall project but the provided work environment appears to be insufficient (e.g. visible by floating license limitations, insufficient response time or tool performance), the indicator GP 2.1.6 for the respective process shall be downrated.	64	no	Assessor judgement.	2	*
[DID.RL.6]	rule	DID	If sub-projects shall work with the same status models for work products but status information appears to be incompatible, the indicator GP 2.2.2 for the respective process shall be downrated	64	no	Assessor judgement.	2	*
[DID.RL.7]	rule	DID	If sub-projects do not have the necessary information and work products to perform the process, the indicators GP 2.1.7 for the respective process shall be downrated.	64	no	Assessor judgement.	2	*
[DID.RL.8]	rule	DID	If readiness criteria for work products from sub-projects to be integrated at overall project level are missing, the indicator GP 2.2.1 for the respective process shall be downrated.	65	no	Assessor judgement.	2	*
[DID.RL.9]	rule	DID	If escalation mechanisms are not defined in case of work product requirements are not met and this aspect is significant in the context of SUP.1.BP6, the indicator SUP.1.BP6 shall be downrated.	65	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.1
[DID.RL.10]	rule	DID	If the system and/or software integration strategy does not cover the verification of items that were developed at different locations and this aspect is significant in the context of SWE.5.BP1 and/or SYS.4.BP1, the indicators SWE.5.BP1 and/or SYS.4.BP1 shall be downrated.	65	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.5 SYS.4
[TPS.RC.1]	recom	TPS	If it turns out in the assessment that a valid license agreement is absent for the project (e.g. mass production license is needed but not in place) and this aspect is significant in the context of MAN.3.BP5, the base practice MAN.3.BP5 should be downrated.	66	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3
[TPS.RC.2]	recom	TPS	If the software requirements of the Third Party software are not in line with the functional requirements for the project and this aspect is significant in the context of ACQ.4.BP2 and SWE.1.BP8, the base practice ACQ.4.BP2 and SWE.1.BP8 should be downrated.	67	no	Assessor judgement.	1	ACQ.4 SWE.1
[TPS.RC.3]	recom	TPS	If relevant non-functional software requirements for the project (e.g. quality requirements which are valid for the complete project) are not agreed with the provider of the third party software and this aspect is significant in the context of ACQ.4.BP2 and SWE.1.BP8, the base practice ACQ.4.BP2 and SWE.1.BP8 should be downrated. Excluded is third party software without any support and third party software which is treated as legacy software.	67	no	Assessor judgement.	1	ACQ.4 SWE.1
[TPS.RC.4]	recom	TPS	If third party software is not part of the software architecture and this aspect is significant in the context of SWE.2.BP1, the base practice SWE.2.BP1 should be downrated.	68	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.2

ID	Typ	Dom	RuleTextEN	Page BlueGold	checkable	comment	Precon. CLmin	Scope
[TPS.RC.5]	recom	TPS	If the external interfaces of the third party software are not defined in the software architecture and this aspect is significant in the context of SWE.2.BP3, the base practice SWE.2.BP3 should be downrated.	68	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.2
[TPS.RC.6]	recom	TPS	If free and open source software is not managed according to rules, which ensure that the open source software fits to software requirement and this aspect is significant in the context of SWE.2.BP1, the base practices SWE.2.BP1 should be downrated.	68	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.2
[TPS.RC.7]	recom	TPS	If open source software is not managed according to rules, which ensure that the open source software License Agreement is fulfilled and this aspect is significant in the context of MAN.3.BP5, the base practices MAN.3.BP5 should be downrated.	68	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3
[TPS.RC.8]	recom	TPS	If the supplier project does not comply with the agreements and the agreed rules for the supplied customer software and this aspect is significant in the context of ACQ.4.BP1, the base practice ACQ.4.BP1 should be downrated. Excluded is supplied customer software for which the customer takes over all responsibilities (e.g. customer delivers a software library which over all responsibilities (e.g. customer delivers a software library which the supplier needn't to test and has no responsibility in case of identified non-conformances).	69	no	Assessor judgement.	1	ACQ.4
[TPS.RC.9]	recom	TPS	If the customer does not comply with the agreements and the agreed rules for the supplied customer software, the base practice ACQ.4.BP1 should not be downrated but the non compliance of the customer should be documented in the assessment report.	69	no	Assessor judgement.	1	ACQ.4
[TPS.RC.10]	recom	TPS	If the interface between third party software provider and the project is not defined and agreed and this aspect is significant in the context of ACQ.4.BP1, the base practice ACQ.4.BP1 should be downrated. Excepted is software without any support.	69	no	Assessor judgement.	1	ACQ.4
[TPS.RC.11]	recom	TPS	If no acceptance criteria and tests are defined to check the compliance of acceptance criteria for third party software and this aspect is significant in the context of SWE.5.BP3 and ACQ.4.BP1, the base practices SWE.5.BP3 and ACQ.4.BP1 should be downrated.	70	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.5 ACQ.4
[TPS.RC.12]	recom	TPS	If no acceptance tests are performed to check the compliance of third party software according the defined acceptance criteria and this aspect is significant in the context of SWE.5.BP6 and ACQ.4.BP4, the base practices SWE.5.BP6 and ACQ.4.BP4 should be downrated.	70	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.5 ACQ.4
[TPS.RC.13]	recom	TPS	If the responsibility for the third party software is not defined between third party software provider and the project and this aspect is significant in the context of ACQ.4.BP1 and MAN.3.BP7, the base practices ACQ.4.BP1 and MAN.3.BP7 should be downrated.	70	no	Assessor judgement.	1	ACQ.4 MAN.3
[PLS.RC.1]	recom	PLS	If the boundary to platform and/or legacy software intended for use within the project is not consistently reflected in the scope of the assessed project and this aspect is significant in the context of MAN.3.BP1, the indicator MAN.3.BP1 (scope of work) should be downrated.	72	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3
[PLS.RC.2]	recom	PLS	If the platform and/or legacy software used in the assessed project is not consistently reflected in the software architectural design and this aspect is significant in the context of SWE.2.BP1, the indicator SWE.2.BP1 (software architectural design) should be downrated.	72	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.2
[PLS.RC.3]	recom	PLS	If the responsibility for platform software and/or legacy software is not defined and active or problems concerning responsibility for platform software and/or legacy software were not identified and escalated to the organization and this aspect is significant in the context of MAN.3.BP7, the indicator MAN.3.BP7 (project interfaces) should be downrated.	72	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3
[PLS.RC.4]	recom	PLS	If the functional and non-functional requirements covered by the used platform software are not known in the assessed project and this aspect is significant in the context of SWE.1.BP1, the indicator SWE.1.BP1 (specification of software requirements) should be	73	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.1
[PLS.RC.5]	recom	PLS	If there is no evidence for measures proving that legacy software fits to the project requirements of the assessed project and this aspect is significant in the context of SWE.1.BP1, the indicator SWE.1.BP1 (specification of software requirements) should be downrated.	73	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.1
[PLS.RC.6]	recom	PLS	If change requests are not analyzed with respect to an impact on the used platform software and/or legacy software and this aspect is significant in the context of SUP.10.BP4, the indicator SUP.10.BP4 (analyze change requests) should be downrated.	73	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.10
[PLS.RC.7]	recom	PLS	If the used platform software and/or legacy software is not reflected in the test strategies of the processes SWE.5 and/or SWE.6 and this aspect is significant in the context of the corresponding base practices for developing test strategies, the indicators SWE.5.BP1 (software integration strategy) and/or SWE.5.BP2 (software integration test strategy) and/or SWE.6.BP1 (software qualification test strategy) should be downrated, respectively.	74	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.5 SWE.5 SWE.6
[PLS.RC.8]	recom	PLS	If there is no evidence for derivation of verification criteria for platform and/or legacy software considering the aspects mentioned above and this aspect is significant in the context of SWE.1.BP5, the indicator SWE.1.BP5 (software verification criteria) should be downrated.	74	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.1
[APA.RL.1]	rule	APA	If the requirements are not consistent with the implemented application parameters and their values, and if this aspect is significant in the context of BP1 of SYS.2 and/or SWE.1, respectively, then the indicator BP1 of SYS.2 and/or SWE.1 shall be downrated.	76	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.2 SWE.1
[APA.RL.2]	rule	APA	If the definition of the application parameters is not consistent with their implementation and values, and if this aspect is significant in the context of SWE.3.BP1, then the indicator BP1 of SWE.3 shall be downrated	76	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.3
[APA.RL.3]	rule	APA	If those implemented application parameters, that represent product variants, and their values are not consistent with the requirements related to that variant, and if this aspect is significant in the context of SWE.1.BP1, then the indicator BP1 of SWE.1 shall be downrated.	77	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.2 SWE.1

ID	Typ	Dom	RuleTextEN	Page BlueGold	checkable	comment	Precon. CLmin	Scope
[APA.RC.1]	recom	APA	If application parameter values can be, or are, altered by a party other than the developers of the product, but responsibilities are not clearly defined, and if this aspect is significant in the context of MAN.3.BP7, then the indicator BP7 of MAN.3 should be downrated.	78	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3
[APA.RL.4]	rule	APA	If technical application parameter information is not treated as configuration items, and if this aspect is significant in the context of SUP.8.BP2, then the indicator BP2 of SUP.8 shall be downrated.	78	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.8
[APA.RL.5]	rule	APA	If for change requests their impact on application parameters is not evaluated, and if this aspect is significant in the context of SUP.10.BP4, then the indicator BP4 of SUP.10 shall be downrated.	79	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.10
[APA.RL.6]	rule	APA	If the change request management strategy does not define how changes to application parameters are to be proceeded, and if this aspect is significant in the context of SUP.10.BP1, then the indicator BP1 of SUP.10 shall be downrated.	79	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.10
[APA.RL.7]	rule	APA	If application parameters do not receive quality assurance at least with respect to technical correctness and cross-parameter-consistency, and if this aspect is significant in the context of SUP.1.BP2 then the indicator BP2 of SUP.1 shall be downrated.	79	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.1
[APA.RL.8]	rule	APA	If test methods, and test case definition, do not reflect the respective application parameters, and if this aspect is significant in the context of testing processes, the corresponding indicator BP1 of SWE.4, SWE.5, SWE.6, SYS.4, or SYS.5, respectively, shall be downrated.	81	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.4 SWE.5 SWE.6 SYS.4 SYS.5
[ACQ.4.RL.1]	rule		If not all suppliers, excluded suppliers without any support, involved in the project are monitored according ACQ.4, PA 1.1 must not be rated F.	82	no	Assessor judgement.	1	ACQ.4
[ACQ.4.RL.2]	rule		If agreements between supplier and customer are incomplete due to the aspects above, the indicator BP1 shall be downrated.	83	no	Assessor judgement.	1	ACQ.4
[ACQ.4.RC.1]	rule		If relevant agreed requirements of the customer's customer (e.g. OEM), are not part of agreements between supplier and customer, the indicator BP1 should be downrated.	84	no	Assessor judgement.	1	ACQ.4
[ACQ.4.RL.3]	rule		If BP1 is downrated due to incomplete agreements between supplier and customer (see ACQ.4.RL.2), the corresponding indicators (BP2, BP3, BP4) shall be downrated.	85	no	Assessor judgement.	1	ACQ.4
[ACQ.4.RL.4]	rule		If BP2 is downrated due to incomplete exchange of all agreed information necessary for reviewing technical development, the indicator BP3 shall be downrated.	86	no	Assessor judgement.	1	ACQ.4
[ACQ.4.RL.5]	rule		If BP2 is downrated due to incomplete exchange of all agreed information necessary for reviewing the progress of the supplier, the indicator BP4 shall be downrated	86	no	Assessor judgement.	1	ACQ.4
[ACQ.4.RC.2]	rule		If BP2, BP3 or BP4 is downrated due to identified non-conformances are not managed as corrective actions, the indicator BP5 should be downrated.	86	no	Assessor judgement.	1	ACQ.4
[ACQ.4.RC.3]	rule		If BP1 is downrated due to incomplete agreements between supplier and customer (see ACQ.4.RL.2), this should be in line with the rating of related BPs of relevant processes of the project scope.	86	no	Assessor judgement.	1	ACQ.4

ID	Typ	Dom	RuleTextEN	Page BlueGold	checkable	comment	Precon. CLmin	Scope
[ACQ.4.RC.4]	rule		If BP5 is downrated due to gaps in analyzing, tracking and control of deviations from the agreed project plans, this should be in line with the rating of PA 1.1 of SUP.9 Problem Resolution Management.	86	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.9
[SYS.2.RL.1]	rule		If unclear or inconsistent requirements are not clarified with the individual stakeholders, the indicator BP1 shall be downrated.	88	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.2
[SYS.2.RL.2]	rule		If the system requirements specification is not reflecting the latest changes, the indicator BP1 shall be downrated at least to L.	88	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.2
[SYS.2.RL.3]	rule		If system requirements are not derived from customer requirements but from platform requirements according to a reuse strategy the indicator BP1 must not be downrated.	88	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.2
[SYS.2.RL.4]	rule		If categorization is not appropriate as mentioned above, the indicator BP2 must not be rated higher than L.	88	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.2
[SYS.2.RL.5]	rule		If the mapping of functionality to the releases does not reflect the customer and other stakeholder needs, the indicator BP2 shall be downrated.	89	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.2
[SYS.2.RC.1]	recom		If there is no evidence for prioritization but a release plan exists that demonstrates the assignment of functionality to future releases the indicator BP2 should not be downrated.	89	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.2
[SYS.2.RL.6]	rule		If the system requirements and their interdependencies are not evaluated in terms of correctness, technical feasibility and verifiability the indicator BP3 must not be rated F.	89	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.2
[SYS.2.RC.2]	recom		If the analysis of impact on cost and schedule is covered by the estimation of work packages in the project planning this should not be used to downrate the indicator BP3.	89	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.2
[SYS.2.RC.3]	recom		If the analysis of the impact on the operating environment is not considering aspects from the list above or other aspects that are relevant for the project the indicator BP4 should be downrated.	90	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.2
[SYS.2.RC.4]	recom		Insufficient reserves of memory, processor time and/or peripheral resources are signs for inappropriate analysis of technical feasibility or inappropriate analysis of impact on the operating environment. If this is confirmed during an assessment the indicator BP4 should be downrated.	90	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.2
[SYS.2.RL.7]	rule		If verification criteria are not documented as a separate work product but provable contained in the requirement or test specification the indicator BP5 must not be downrated.	91	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.2
[SYS.2.RL.8]	rule		Customer requirements are not necessarily updated as a result of system requirement analysis. If in this case the result of analysis is documented and comprehensibility and traceability from system requirements to the corresponding sources (customer confirmation e.g. via eMails, meeting records, presentations) is given the indicator BP7 must not be downrated.	92	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.2
[SYS.2.RL.9]	rule		If the specification of system requirements (BP1) is downrated, PA 1.1 shall be downrated as all indicators (BP2, BP3, BP4, BP5, BP6, BP7 and BP8) are affected.	94	yes	Precondition: BP1 rating < F RaiseErr if PA 1.1 rating > BP1 rating	1	SYS.2
[SYS.2.RC.5]	recom		If PA 1.1 for SYS.1 is downrated, this should be in line with the rating of BP1.	94	yes	PreCondition: SYS.1 in scope and SYS.1.PA 1.1 rated RaiseWarning if SYS.2.BP1 rating != SYS.1.PA 1.1	1	SYS.1
[SYS.2.RC.6]	recom		If the indicator BP.3 is downrated, this should be in line with the rating of the indicator about project estimates and resources (MAN.3.BP5).	94	yes	PreCondition: SYS.2 in scope and SYS.2.BP3 rated MAN.3 in scope and MAN.3.BP5 rated RaiseWarning if MAN.3.BP5 != SYS.2.BP3 rating	1	SYS.2
[SYS.2.RC.7]	recom		If the indicator BP.3 is downrated, this should be in line with the rating of the indicator about risk identification (MAN.5.BP3).	94	yes	PreCondition: SYS.2 in scope and SYS.2.BP3 rated MAN.5 in scope and MAN.5.BP3 rated RaiseWarning if MAN.5.BP3 != SYS.2.BP3 rating	1	SYS.2

ID	Typ	Dom	RuleTextEN	Page BlueGold	checkable	comment	Precon. CLmin	Scope
[SYS.2.RC.8]	recom		If PA 1.1 for SYS.1 is downrated, this should be in line with the rating of the indicator BP6 (see 2.3.1).	94	yes	PreCondition: SYS.1 in scope and SYS.1.PA 1.1 rated RaiseWarning if SYS.2.BP6 rating !~ SYS.1.PA 1.1	1	SYS.1
[SYS.2.RC.9]	recom		If PA 1.1 for SYS.1 is downrated, this should be in line with the rating of the indicator BP7.	94	yes	PreCondition: SYS.1 in scope and SYS.1.PA 1.1 rated RaiseWarning if SYS.2.BP7 rating !~ SYS.1.PA 1.1	1	SYS.1
[SYS.3.RL.1]	rule		If the system architecture does not reflect dynamic views the indicator BP1 shall be downrated.	97	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.3
[SYS.3.RL.2]	rule		If the system architecture does not reflect applicable non-functional requirements the indicator BP1 shall be downrated.	97	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.3
[SYS.3.RL.3]	rule		If the allocation of system requirements to elements of the system architectural design is done based on clusters but not on single requirements, the indicator BP2 must not be downrated.	98	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.3
[SYS.3.RL.4]	rule		If the system interface definition is absent or not all links are considered the indicator BP3 shall be downrated.	98	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.3
[SYS.3.RL.5]	rule		If evidence of describing dynamic behavior regarding the topics mentioned above is missing the indicator BP4 shall be downrated.	99	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.3
[SYS.3.RL.6]	rule		If none of the three described approaches for architecture development is observable in the assessed project, PA 1.1 shall be downrated.	101	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.3
[SYS.3.RC.1]	recom		If the used procedure for architecture selection does not involve the required parties or competencies, the indicator BP5 should be downrated.	101	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.3
[SYS.3.RL.7]	rule		If the development of the system architectural design (BP1) is downrated, PA 1.1 shall be downrated as all indicators (BP2, BP3, BP4, BP5, BP6, BP7 and BP8) are affected.	103	yes	Precondition: BP1 rating < F RaiseErr if PA 1.1 rating > BP1 rating	1	SYS.3
[SYS.3.RL.8]	rule		If the allocation of the system requirements to elements of the system architectural design (BP2) is downrated, the indicator BP6 should be downrated.	103	yes	Precondition: BP2 rating < F RaiseError if BP6 rating = F	1	SYS.3
[SYS.3.RC.2]	recom		If PA 1.1 for SYS.2 is downrated, this should be in line with the rating of the indicator BP1.	102	yes	PreCondition: SYS.2 in scope and SYS.2.PA 1.1 rated RaiseWarning if SYS.3.BP1 rating !~ SYS.2.PA 1.1	1	SYS.2
[SYS.3.RC.3]	recom		If PA 1.1 for SYS.2 is downrated, this should be in line with the rating of the indicator BP6.	102	yes	PreCondition: SYS.2 in scope and SYS.2.PA 1.1 rated RaiseWarning if SYS.3.BP6 rating !~ SYS.2.PA 1.1	1	SYS.2

ID	Typ	Dom	RuleTextEN	Page BlueGold	checkable	comment	Precon. CLmin	Scope
[SYS.3.RC.4]	recom		If PA 1.1 for SYS.2 is downrated, this should be in line with the rating of the indicator BP7.	102	yes	PreCondition: SYS.2 in scope and SYS.2.PA 1.1 rated RaiseWarning if SYS.3.BP7 rating != SYS.2.PA 1.1	1	SYS.2
[SYS.4.RL.1]	rule		If the integration strategy does not cover all aspects above, the indicator BP1 must not be rated F.	104	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.4
[SYS.4.RL.2]	rule		If the test strategy does not cover the aspects above, the indicator BP2 must not be rated F.	106	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.4
[SYS.4.RL.3]	rule		If the test strategy does not cover aspect b), c) or d), the indicator BP2 must not be rated higher than P.	106	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.4
[SYS.4.RL.4]	rule		If the test specifications are not based on the architecture and interface specifications, the indicator BP3 must not be rated higher than P.	106	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.4
[SYS.4.RL.5]	rule		If the test case selection does not cover the aspect a) and b), the indicator BP5 must not be rated F.	107	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.4
[SYS.4.RC.1]	recom		If the test case selection does not cover the aspect c) and d), the indicator BP5 should not be rated F.	107	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.4

ID	Typ	Dom	RuleTextEN	Page BlueGold	checkable	comment	Precon. CLmin	Scope
[SYS.4.RL.6]	rule		If the test implementation is not complete in terms of the aspects above, the indicator BP6 must not be rated F.	107	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.4
[SYS.4.RL.7]	rule		If the test logs do not cover the aspect above, the indicator BP6 must not be rated F.	108	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.4
[SYS.4.RL.8]	rule		If the test results contain only a pure passed/failed information without a supporting test log, the indicator BP6 must not be rated higher than P	108	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.4
[SYS.4.RL.9]	rule		If the strategy-related activities are not performed according to the defined strategy (BP2), the indicators BP3 and BP5 shall be downrated.	110	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.4
[SYS.4.RL.10]	rule		If the test strategy is not developed according to the defined integration strategy (BP1), the indicator BP2 shall be downrated.	110	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.4
[SYS.4.RL.11]	rule		If the indicator for developing the test strategy (BP2) is downrated due to missing or non-adequate definitions of methods for test case and test data development, the indicator (BP3) shall be downrated.	110	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.4
[SYS.4.RL.12]	rule		If the strategy-related activities are not performed according to the defined strategy (BP1), the indicator BP4 shall be downrated.	110	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.4
[SYS.4.RL.13]	rule		If the indicator for developing the test specification (BP3) is downrated, the indicator (BP5) must not be rated higher.	110	yes	RaiseErr if BP5 rating > BP3 rating	1	SYS.4
[SYS.4.RL.14]	rule		If the indicator for developing the test strategy (BP2) is downrated due to a missing or non-adequate definition of the test case selecting criteria, the indicator (BP5) shall be downrated.	110	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.4
[SYS.4.RL.15]	rule		If the indicator for selecting test cases (BP5) is rated P or N, the indicator BP6 shall be downrated.	110	yes	Precondition: BP5 rating < L RaiseErr if BP6 rating = F	1	SYS.4
[SYS.4.RC.2]	recom		If project plan or release plan are not adequate, this should not be used to downrate the indicator BP1.	111	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.4
[SYS.4.RC.3]	recom		If the PA 1.1 for SYS.3 is downrated, this should be in line with the rating of the indicator BP1.	111	yes	PreCondition: SYS.3 in scope and SYS.3.PA 1.1 rated RaiseWarning if SYS.4.BP1 rating !~ SYS.3.PA 1.1	1	SYS.3
[SYS.4.RC.4]	recom		If the PA 1.1 for SYS.3 is downrated, this should be in line with the rating of BP3.	111	yes	PreCondition: SYS.3 in scope and SYS.3.PA 1.1 rated RaiseWarning if SYS.4.BP3 rating !~ SYS.3.PA 1.1	1	SYS.3
[SYS.4.RC.5]	recom		If only the release plan is not adequate, but the test case are selected according to the strategy, this should not be used to downrate the indicator BP5	111	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.4
[SYS.4.RC.6]	recom		If PA 1.1 for SYS.3 is downrated, this should be in line with the rating of the indicator BP7.	111	yes	PreCondition: SYS.3 in scope and SYS.3.PA 1.1 rated RaiseWarning if SYS.4.BP7 rating !~ SYS.3.PA 1.1	1	SYS.3
[SYS.4.RC.7]	recom		If PA 1.1 for SYS.3 is downrated, this should be in line with the rating of the indicator BP8.	111	yes	PreCondition: SYS.3 in scope and SYS.3.PA 1.1 rated RaiseWarning if SYS.4.BP8 rating !~ SYS.3.PA 1.1	1	SYS.3

ID	Typ	Dom	RuleTextEN	Page BlueGold	checkable	comment	Precon. CLmin	Scope
[SYS.5.RL.1]	rule		If the test strategy does not cover all aspects above, the indicator BP1 must not be rated F.	113	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.5
[SYS.5.RL.2]	rule		If the test strategy does not cover aspect b), c) or d), the indicator BP1 must not be rated higher than P.	113	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.5
[SYS.5.RL.3]	rule		If the test specifications are not based on the requirement specifications and the verification criteria, the indicator BP2 must not be rated higher than P.	113	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.5
[SYS.5.RL.4]	rule		If the test case selection does not cover the aspect a) and b), the indicator BP3 must not be rated F.	114	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.5
[SYS.5.RC.1]	recom		If the test case selection does not cover the aspect c) and d), the indicator BP3 should not be rated F.	114	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.5
[SYS.5.RL.5]	rule		If the test implementation is not complete in terms of the aspects above, the indicator BP4 must not be rated F.	114	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.5
[SYS.5.RL.6]	rule		If the test logs do not cover the aspect above, the indicator BP4 must not be rated F.	115	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.5
[SYS.5.RL.7]	rule		If the test results contain only a pure passed/failed information without a supporting test log, the indicator BP4 must not be rated higher than P	115	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.5

ID	Typ	Dom	RuleTextEN	Page BlueGold	checkable	comment	Precon. CLmin	Scope
[SYS.5.RL.8]	rule		If the strategy-related activities are not performed according to the defined strategy (BP1), the indicators BP2 and BP3 shall be downrated.	117	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.5 SYS.5
[SYS.5.RL.9]	rule		If the indicator for developing the test strategy (BP1) is downrated due to missing or non-adequate definitions of methods for test case and test data development, the indicator BP2 shall be downrated.	117	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.5
[SYS.5.RL.10]	rule		If the indicator for developing the test specification (BP2) is downrated, the indicator BP3 must not be rated higher.	117	yes	RaiseErr if BP3 rating > BP2 rating	1	SYS.5
[SYS.5.RL.11]	rule		If the indicator for developing the test strategy (BP1) is downrated due to a missing or non-adequate definition of the test case selecting criteria, the indicator select test cases (BP3) shall be downrated.	117	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.5
[SYS.5.RL.12]	rule		If the indicator for selecting test cases (BP3) is rated P or N, the indicator BP4 shall be downrated.	117	yes	Precondition: BP3 rating < L RaiseErr if BP4 rating = F	1	SYS.5
[SYS.5.RC.2]	recom		If project plan or release plan are not adequate, this should not be used to downrate the indicator BP1.	117	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.5
[SYS.5.RC.3]	recom		If the PA 1.1 for SYS.2 is downrated, this should be in line with the rating of the indicator BP2.	117	yes	PreCondition: SYS.2 in scope and SYS.2.PA 1.1 rated RaiseWarning if SYS.5.BP2 rating !~ SYS.2.PA 1.1	1	SYS.2
[SYS.5.RC.4]	recom		If only the release plan is not adequate, but the test cases are selected according to the strategy, this should not be used to downrate the indicator BP3	118	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.5
[SYS.5.RC.5]	recom		If PA 1.1 for SYS.2 is downrated, this should be in line with the rating of the indicator BP5.	118	yes	PreCondition: SYS.2 in scope and SYS.2.PA 1.1 rated RaiseWarning if SYS.5.BP5 rating !~ SYS.2.PA 1.1	1	SYS.2
[SYS.5.RC.6]	recom		If PA 1.1 for SYS.2 is downrated, this should be in line with the rating of the indicator BP6.	118	yes	PreCondition: SYS.2 in scope and SYS.2.PA 1.1 rated RaiseWarning if SYS.5.BP6 rating !~ SYS.2.PA 1.1	1	SYS.2
[SWE.1.RL.1]	rule		If there is no evidence that unclear or inconsistent requirements are not clarified with the respective system requirement owner, the indicator BP1 shall be downrated.	120	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.1
[SWE.1.RL.2]	rule		If the software requirements specification is not reflecting the latest changes, the indicator BP1 must not be rated higher than L.	120	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.1
[SWE.1.RL.3]	rule		If software requirements are not derived from system requirements but from platform requirements according to a reuse strategy the indicator BP1 must not be downrated.	120	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.1
[SWE.1.RL.4]	rule		If categorization is not appropriate as mentioned above, the indicator BP2 must not be rated higher than L.	120	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.1
[SWE.1.RL.5]	rule		If the mapping of functionality to the releases does not reflect the customer and other stakeholder needs, the indicator BP2 shall be downrated.	120	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.1
[SWE.1.RC.1]	recom		If there is no evidence for prioritization but a release plan maps the functionality to future releases the indicator BP2 should not be downrated.	121	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.1
[SWE.1.RL.6]	rule		If the software requirements and their interdependencies are not evaluated in terms of correctness, technical feasibility and verifiability the indicator BP3 must not be rated F.	121	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.1
[SWE.1.RC.2]	recom		If the analysis of impact on cost and schedule is covered by the estimation of work packages in the project planning this should not be used to downrate the indicator BP3.	121	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.1

ID	Typ	Dom	RuleTextEN	Page BlueGold	checkable	comment	Precon. CLmin	Scope
[SWE.1.RC.3]	recom		If the analysis of the impact on the operating environment is not considering aspects from the list above or other aspects that are relevant for the project the indicator BP4 should be downrated.	122	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.1
[SWE.1.RC.4]	recom		If there are insufficient reserves of memory, processor time, and/or peripheral resources the indicator BP4 should be downrated.	122	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.1
[SWE.1.RL.7]	rule		If verification criteria are not documented as a separate work product but provable contained in the requirement or test specification the indicator BP5 must not be downrated.	123	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.1
[SWE.1.RL.8]	rule		In the case of software development only, if the traceability from software requirements to stakeholder requirements is established, the indicator BP6 must not be downrated.	123	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.1
[SWE.1.RL.9]	rule		In the case of software development only, if the consistency from software requirements to stakeholder requirements is established, the indicator BP7 must not be downrated.	123	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.1
[SWE.1.RL.10]	rule		If the specification of software requirements (BP1) is downrated, PA 1.1 shall be downrated as all indicators (BP2, BP3, BP4, BP5, BP6, BP7 and BP8) are affected.	125	yes	Precondition: BP1 rating < F RaiseErr if PA 1.1 rating > BP1 rating	1	SWE.1
[SWE.1.RC.5]	recom		If PA 1.1 for SYS.2 is downrated, this should be in line with the rating of the indicator BP1.	125	yes	PreCondition: SYS.2 in scope and SYS.2.PA 1.1 rated RaiseWarning if SWE.1.BP1 rating !~ SYS.2.PA 1.1	1	SYS.2
[SWE.1.RC.6]	recom		If PA 1.1 for SYS.3 is downrated, this should be in line with the rating of the indicator BP1.	125	yes	PreCondition: SYS.3 in scope and SYS.3.PA 1.1 rated RaiseWarning if SWE.1.BP1 rating !~ SYS.3.PA 1.1	1	SYS.3
[SWE.1.RC.7]	recom		If the indicator BP.3 is downrated, this should be in line with the rating of the indicator determine, monitor and adjust project estimates and resources (MAN.3.BP5)	125	yes	PreCondition: SWE.1 in scope and SWE.1.BP3 rated MAN.3 in scope and MAN.3.BP5 rated RaiseWarning if MAN.3.BP5 !~ SWE.1.BP3 rating	1	SWE.1
[SWE.1.RC.8]	recom		If the indicator BP.3 is downrated, this should be in line with the rating of the indicator evaluate feasibility of the project (MAN.5.BP3) with regard to risks.	125	yes	PreCondition: SWE.1 in scope and SWE.1.BP3 rated MAN.5 in scope and MAN.5.BP3 rated RaiseWarning if MAN.5.BP3 !~ SWE.1.BP3 rating	1	SWE.1
[SWE.1.RC.9]	recom		If PA 1.1 for SYS.2 is downrated, this should be in line with the rating of the indicator BP6 (see 2.1.1).	125	yes	PreCondition: SYS.2 in scope and SYS.2.PA 1.1 rated RaiseWarning if SWE.1.BP6 rating !~ SYS.2.PA 1.1	1	SYS.2
[SWE.1.RC.10]	recom		If PA 1.1 for SYS.3 is downrated, this should be in line with the rating of BP6 (see 2.1.1).	125	yes	PreCondition: SYS.3 in scope and SYS.3.PA 1.1 rated RaiseWarning if SWE.1.BP6 rating !~ SYS.3.PA 1.1	1	SYS.3
[SWE.1.RC.11]	recom		If PA 1.1 for SYS.2 is downrated, this should be in line with the rating of BP7 (see 2.1.1).	125	yes	PreCondition: SYS.2 in scope and SYS.2.PA 1.1 rated RaiseWarning if SWE.1.BP7 rating !~ SYS.2.PA 1.1	1	SYS.2
[SWE.1.RC.12]	recom		If PA 1.1 for SYS.3 is downrated, this should be in line with the rating of BP7 (see 2.1.1).	125	yes	PreCondition: SYS.3 in scope and SYS.3.PA 1.1 rated RaiseWarning if SWE.1.BP7 rating !~ SYS.3.PA 1.1	1	SYS.3
[SWE.2.RL.1]	rule		If the software architecture does not reflect dynamic views the indicator BP1 shall be downrated.	128	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.2
[SWE.2.RL.2]	rule		If the software architecture does not reflect applicable non-functional requirements the indicator BP1 shall be downrated.	128	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.2

ID	Typ	Dom	RuleTextEN	Page BlueGold	checkable	comment	Precon. CLmin	Scope
[SWE.2.RL.3]	rule		If the allocation of software requirements to elements of the software architectural design is done based on clusters but not on single requirements, the indicator BP2 must not be downrated.	129	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.2
[SWE.2.RL.4]	rule		If the software interface definition is absent or incomplete regarding the definition above the indicator BP3 shall be downrated.	129	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.2
[SWE.2.RL.5]	rule		If evidence of describing dynamic behavior regarding the topics mentioned above is missing the indicator BP4 shall be downrated.	130	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.2
[SWE.2.RL.6]	rule		If evidence of describing resource consumption objectives regarding the definition mentioned above is missing the indicator BP5 shall be downrated.	130	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.2
[SWE.2.RL.7]	rule		If none of the three described approaches for architecture development is observable in the assessed project, PA 1.1 shall be downrated.	132	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.2
[SWE.2.RC.1]	recom		If the used procedure for architecture selection does not involve the required parties or competencies, the indicator BP6 should be downrated.	132	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.2
[SWE.2.RL.8]	rule		If the development of the software architectural design (BP1) is downrated, PA 1.1 shall be downrated as all indicators (BP2, BP3, BP4, BP5, BP6, BP7, BP8 and BP9) are affected.	134	yes	Precondition: BP1 rating < F RaiseErr if PA 1.1 rating > BP1 rating	1	SWE.2
[SWE.2.RL.9]	recom		If the allocation of the software requirements to elements of the software architectural design BP2 is downrated, the indicator BP7 should be downrated.	134	yes	Precondition: BP2 rating < F RaiseError if BP7 rating = F	1	SWE.2
[SWE.2.RC.3]	recom		If PA 1.1 for SWE.1 is downrated, this should be in line with the rating of BP1.	134	yes	PreCondition: SWE.1 in scope and SWE.1.PA 1.1 rated RaiseWarning if SWE.2.BP1 rating !~ SWE.1.PA 1.1	1	SWE.1
[SWE.2.RC.4]	recom		If PA 1.1 for SWE.1 is downrated, this should be in line with the rating of BP7.	134	yes	PreCondition: SWE.1 in scope and SWE.1.PA 1.1 rated RaiseWarning if SWE.2.BP7 rating !~ SWE.1.PA 1.1	1	SWE.1

ID	Typ	Dom	RuleTextEN	Page BlueGold	checkable	comment	Precon. CLmin	Scope
[SWE.2.RC.5]	recom		If PA 1.1 for SWE.1 is downrated, this should be in line with the rating of BP8.	134	yes	PreCondition: SWE.1 in scope and SWE.1.PA 1.1 rated RaiseWarning if SWE.2.BP8 rating != SWE.1.PA 1.1	1	SWE.1
[SWE.3.RL.1]	rule		If the software detailed design does not reflect dynamic views the indicator BP1 shall be downrated.	137	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.3
[SWE.3.RL.2]	rule		If the software detailed design does not reflect applicable non-functional requirements the indicator BP1 shall be downrated.	137	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.3
[SWE.3.RL.3]	rule		If the software interface definition is absent or incomplete regarding the definition above the indicator BP2 shall be downrated.	138	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.3
[SWE.3.RL.4]	rule		If evidence of describing dynamic behavior regarding the topics mentioned above is missing the indicator BP3 shall be downrated.	139	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.3
[SWE.3.RL.5]	rule		If none of the three described approaches for detailed design development is observable in the assessed project, PA 1.1 shall be downrated.	141	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.3
[SWE.3.RC.1]	rule		If the used procedure for detailed design selection does not involve the required parties or competencies, the indicator BP4 should be downrated.	141	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.3
[SWE.3.RL.6]	rule		If software units contain content which is not described in detailed design, the indicator BP8 shall be downrated.	141	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.3
[SWE.3.RL.7]	rule		If the development of the software detailed design (BP1) is downrated, PA 1.1 shall be downrated as all indicators (BP2, BP3, BP4, BP5, BP6, BP7, and BP8) are affected.	143	yes	Precondition: BP1 rating < F RaiseErr if PA 1.1 rating > BP1 rating	1	SWE.3
[SWE.3.RC.2]	recom		If PA 1.1 for SWE.1 is downrated, this should be in line with the rating of BP1.	143	yes	PreCondition: SWE.1 in scope and SWE.1.PA 1.1 rated RaiseWarning if SWE.3.BP1 rating > SWE.1.PA 1.1	1	SWE.1
[SWE.3.RC.3]	recom		If PA 1.1 for SWE.2 is downrated, this should be in line with the rating of BP1.	143	yes	PreCondition: SWE.2 in scope and SWE.2.PA 1.1 rated RaiseWarning if SWE.3.BP1 rating > SWE.2.PA 1.1	1	SWE.2

ID	Typ	Dom	RuleTextEN	Page BlueGold	checkable	comment	Precon. CLmin	Scope
[SWE.3.RC.4]	recom		If PA 1.1 for SWE.1 is downrated, this should be in line with the rating of BP5.	143	yes	PreCondition: SWE.1 in scope and SWE.1.PA 1.1 rated RaiseWarning if SWE.3.BP5 rating > SWE.1.PA 1.1	1	SWE.1
[SWE.3.RC.5]	recom		If PA 1.1 for SWE.2 is downrated, this should be in line with the rating of BP5.	143	yes	PreCondition: SWE.2 in scope and SWE.2.PA 1.1 rated RaiseWarning if SWE.3.BP5 rating > SWE.2.PA 1.1	1	SWE.2
[SWE.3.RC.6]	recom		If PA 1.1 for SWE.1 is downrated, this should be in line with the rating of BP6.	143	yes	PreCondition: SWE.1 in scope and SWE.1.PA 1.1 rated RaiseWarning if SWE.3.BP6 rating > SWE.1.PA 1.1	1	SWE.1
[SWE.3.RC.7]	recom		If PA 1.1 for SWE.2 is downrated, this should be in line with the rating of BP6.	143	yes	PreCondition: SWE.2 in scope and SWE.2.PA 1.1 rated RaiseWarning if SWE.3.BP6 rating > SWE.2.PA 1.1	1	SWE.2
[SWE.4.RL.1]	rule		If the software unit verification strategy does not cover all aspects above, the indicator BP1 must not be rated F.	145	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.4
[SWE.4.RL.2]	rule		If the software unit verification strategy does not cover aspect b), c) or d), the indicator BP1 must not be rated higher than P.	145	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.4
[SWE.4.RL.3]	rule		If the verification logs of static verification do not cover the aspect above, the indicator BP3 must not be rated F.	145	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.4
[SWE.4.RL.4]	rule		If the verification logs of unit test do not cover the aspect above, the indicator BP4 must not be rated F.	145	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.4
[SWE.4.RL.5]	rule		If the verification results of static verification contain only a pure passed/failed information without a supporting verification log, the indicator BP3 must not be rated higher than P.	145	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.4
[SWE.4.RL.6]	rule		If the verification results of unit test contain only a pure passed/failed information without a supporting verification log, the indicator BP4 must not be rated higher than P.	145	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.4
[SWE.4.RL.7]	rule		If the strategy-related activities are not performed according to the defined strategy (BP1), the indicators BP2 and BP4, <i>respectively</i> , shall be downrated.	148	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.4 SWE.4

ID	Typ	Dom	RuleTextEN	Page BlueGold	checkable	comment	Precon. CLmin	Scope
[SWE.4.RL.8]	rule		If developing criteria for unit verification (BP2) is downrated due to missing or non-adequate definitions of criteria for static verification of software units, the indicator BP3 shall be downrated.	148	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.4
[SWE.4.RL.9]	rule		If the indicator for developing criteria for unit verification (BP2) is downrated due to missing or non-adequate definitions of criteria for unit test specification, the indicator for testing software units (BP4) shall be downrated.	148	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.4
[SWE.4.RL.10]	rule		If the indicator for performing static verification of software units (BP3) is rated P or N, the indicator for summarizing and communicating the results BP7 shall be downrated.	148	yes	Precondition: BP3 rating < L RaiseErr if BP7 rating = F	1	SWE.4
[SWE.4.RL.11]	rule		If the indicator for testing software units (BP4) is rated P or N, the indicator for summarizing and communicating the results BP7 shall be downrated.	148	yes	Precondition: BP4 rating < L RaiseErr if BP7 rating = F	1	SWE.4
[SWE.4.RC.1]	recom		If the PA 1.1 for SWE.1 is downrated due to missing or non-adequate non-functional requirements, this should be in line with the rating of the indicator BP2.	149	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.1
[SWE.4.RC.2]	recom		If the PA 1.1 for SWE.3 is downrated due to missing or non-adequate detailed design, this should be in line with the rating of the indicator BP2.	149	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.3
[SWE.4.RC.3]	recom		If PA 1.1 for SWE.3 is downrated, this should be in line with the rating of the indicator BP5.	149	yes	PreCondition: SWE.3 in scope and SWE.3.PA 1.1 rated RaiseWarning if SWE.4.BP5 rating !~ SWE.3.PA 1.1	1	SWE.3
[SWE.4.RC.4]	recom		If PA 1.1 for SWE.3 is downrated, this should be in line with the rating of the indicator BP6.	149	yes	PreCondition: SWE.3 in scope and SWE.3.PA 1.1 rated RaiseWarning if SWE.4.BP6 rating !~ SWE.3.PA 1.1	1	SWE.3
[SWE.5.RL.1]	rule		If the integration strategy does not cover all aspects above, the indicator BP1 must not be rated F.	150	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.5
[SWE.5.RL.2]	rule		If the test strategy does not cover the aspects above, the indicator BP2 must not be rated F.	152	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.5

ID	Typ	Dom	RuleTextEN	Page BlueGold	checkable	comment	Precon. CLmin	Scope
[SWE.5.RL.3]	rule		If the test strategy does not cover aspect b), c) or d), the indicator BP2 must not be rated higher than P.	152	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.5
[SWE.5.RL.4]	rule		If the test specifications are not based on the architecture and interface specifications, the indicator BP3 must not be rated higher than P.	152	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.5
[SWE.5.RL.5]	rule		If the test case selection does not cover the aspect a) and b), the indicator BP5 must not be rated F.	153	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.5
[SWE.5.RC.1]	rule		If the test case selection does not cover the aspect c) and d), the indicator BP5 should not be rated F.	153	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.5
[SWE.5.RL.6]	rule		If the test implementation is not complete in terms of the aspects above, the indicator BP6 must not be rated F.	153	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.5
[SWE.5.RL.7]	rule		If the test logs do not cover the aspect above, the indicator BP6 must not be rated F.	154	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.5
[SWE.5.RL.8]	rule		If the test results contain only a pure passed/failed information without a supporting test log, the indicator BP6 must not be rated higher than P	154	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.5
[SWE.5.RL.9]	rule		If the strategy-related activities are not performed according to the defined strategy (BP2), the indicators BP3 and BP5, respectively, shall be downrated.	156	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.5 SWE.5
[SWE.5.RL.10]	rule		If the test strategy is not developed according to the defined integration strategy (BP1), the indicator BP2 shall be downrated.	156	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.5
[SWE.5.RL.11]	rule		If the indicator for developing the test strategy (BP2) is downrated due to missing or non-adequate definitions of methods for test case and test data development, the indicator for development of the test specification (BP3) shall be downrated.	156	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.5
[SWE.5.RL.12]	rule		If the strategy-related activities are not performed according to the defined strategy (BP1), the indicator BP4 shall be downrated.	156	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.5
[SWE.5.RL.13]	rule		If the indicator for developing the test specification (BP3) is downrated, the indicator BP5 must not be rated higher.	156	yes	RaiseErr if BP5 rating > BP3 rating	1	SWE.5

ID	Typ	Dom	RuleTextEN	Page BlueGold	checkable	comment	Precon. CLmin	Scope
[SWE.5.RL.14]	rule		If the indicator for developing the test strategy (BP2) is downrated due to a missing or non-adequate definition of the test case selecting criteria, the indicator select test cases (BP5) shall be downrated.	156	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.5
[SWE.5.RL.15]	rule		If the indicator for selecting test cases (BP5) is rated P or N, the indicator (BP6) shall be downrated.	156	yes	PreCondition: BP5 rating < L RaiseErr if BP6 rating = F	1	SWE.5
[SWE.5.RC.2]	recom		If project plan or release plan are not adequate, this should not be used to downrate the indicator BP1.	157	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.5
[SWE.5.RC.3]	recom		If the PA 1.1 for SWE2 is downrated, this should be in line with the rating of BP1.	157	yes	PreCondition: SWE.2 in scope and SWE.2.PA 1.1 rated RaiseWarning if SWE.5.BP1 rating !~ SWE.2.PA 1.1	1	SWE.2
[SWE.5.RC.4]	recom		If the PA 1.1 for SWE2 is downrated, this should be in line with the rating of BP3.	157	yes	PreCondition: SWE.2 in scope and SWE.2.PA 1.1 rated RaiseWarning if SWE.5.BP3 rating !~ SWE.2.PA 1.1	1	SWE.2
[SWE.5.RC.5]	recom		If only the release plan is not adequate, but the test case are selected according to the strategy, this should not be used to downrate the indicator BP5.	157	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.5
[SWE.5.RC.6]	recom		If PA 1.1 for SWE.2 is downrated, this should be in line with the rating of the indicator BP7.	157	yes	PreCondition: SWE.2 in scope and SWE.2.PA 1.1 rated RaiseWarning if SWE.5.BP7 rating !~ SWE.2.PA 1.1	1	SWE.2
[SWE.5.RC.7]	recom		If PA 1.1 for SWE.2 is downrated, this should be in line with the rating of the indicator BP8.	157	yes	PreCondition: SWE.2 in scope and SWE.2.PA 1.1 rated RaiseWarning if SWE.5.BP8 rating !~ SWE.2.PA 1.1	1	SWE.2
[SWE.6.RL.1]	rule		If the test strategy does not cover all aspects above, the indicator BP1 must not be rated F.	159	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.6
[SWE.6.RL.2]	rule		If the test strategy does not cover aspect b), c) or d), the indicator BP1 must not be rated higher than P.	159	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.6

ID	Typ	Dom	RuleTextEN	Page BlueGold	checkable	comment	Precon. CLmin	Scope
[SWE.6.RL.3]	rule		If the test specifications are not based on the requirement specifications and the verification criteria, the indicator BP2 must not be rated higher than P.	159	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.6
[SWE.6.RL.4]	rule		If the test case selection does not cover the aspect a) and b), the indicator BP3 must not be rated F.	160	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.6
[SWE.6.RC.1]	recom		If the test case selection does not cover the aspect c) and d), the indicator BP3 should not be rated F.	160	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.6
[SWE.6.RL.5]	rule		If the test implementation is not complete in terms of the aspects above, the indicator BP4 must not be rated F.	160	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.6
[SWE.6.RL.6]	rule		If the test logs do not cover the aspect above, the indicator BP4 must not be rated F.	161	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.6
[SWE.6.RL.7]	rule		If the test results contain only a pure passed/failed information without a supporting test log, the indicator BP4 must not be rated higher than P.	161	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.6
[SWE.6.RL.8]	rule		If the strategy-related activities are not performed according to the defined strategy (BP1), the indicators BP2 and BP3, respectively, shall be downrated.	163	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.6 SWE.6
[SWE.6.RL.9]	rule		If the indicator for developing the test strategy (BP1) is downrated due to missing or non-adequate definitions of methods for test case and test data development, the indicator for development of the test specification BP2 shall be downrated.	163	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.6
[SWE.6.RL.10]	rule		If the indicator for developing the test specification (BP2) is downrated, the indicator BP3 must not be rated higher.	163	yes	Precondition: BP2 rating < F RaiseErr if BP3 rating > BP2 rating	1	SWE.6
[SWE.6.RL.11]	rule		If the indicator for developing the test strategy (BP1) is downrated due to a missing or non-adequate definition of the test case selecting criteria, the indicator select test cases BP3 shall be downrated.	163	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.6
[SWE.6.RL.12]	rule		If the indicator for selecting test cases (BP3) is rated P or N, the indicator BP4 shall be downrated.	163	yes	Precondition: BP3 rating < L RaiseErr if BP4 rating = F	1	SWE.6
[SWE.6.RC.2]	recom		If project plan or release plan are not adequate, this should not be used to downrate the indicator BP1.	163	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.6
[SWE.6.RC.3]	recom		If the PA 1.1 for SWE.1 is downrated, this should be in line with the rating of BP2.	164	yes	PreCondition: SWE.1 in scope and SWE.1.PA 1.1 rated RaiseWarning if SWE.6.BP2 rating !~ SWE.1.PA 1.1	1	SWE.1
[SWE.6.RC.4]	recom		If only the release plan is not adequate, but the test cases are selected according to the strategy, this should not be used to downrate the indicator BP3.	164	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.6
[SWE.6.RC.5]	recom		If PA 1.1 for SWE.1 is downrated, this should be in line with the rating of the indicator BP5.	164	yes	PreCondition: SWE.1 in scope and SWE.1.PA 1.1 rated RaiseWarning if SWE.6.BP5 rating !~ SWE.1.PA 1.1	1	SWE.1

ID	Typ	Dom	RuleTextEN	Page BlueGold	checkable	comment	Precon. CLmin	Scope
[SWE.6.RC.6]	recom		If PA 1.1 for SWE.1 is downrated, this should be in line with the rating of the indicator BP6.	164	yes	PreCondition: SWE.1 in scope and SWE.1.PA 1.1 rated RaiseWarning if SWE.6.BP6 rating != SWE.1.PA 1.1	1	SWE.1
[SUP.1.RL.1]	rule		If predefined provisions are not considered in the quality strategy, BP1 must not be higher than P.	165	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.1
[SUP.1.RL.2]	rule		If there are no quality criteria defined BP1 must not be higher than P.	165	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.1
[SUP.1.RL.3]	rule		If the quality assurance strategy includes criteria for software source code only, the indicator BP1 must not be rated higher than P.	166	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.1
[SUP.1.RL.4]	rule		If review methods, review criteria, review frequency, review coverage, or involvement of relevant parties are not part of the quality assurance strategy, or not documented in the review evidence, the indicator BP1 shall be downrated.	166	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.1
[SUP.1.RL.5]	rule		If quality assurance strategy does not cover the quality assurance of supplier deliveries, BP1 must not be higher than L.	167	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.1
[SUP.1.RC.1]	recom		If the approach for guaranteeing objectivity is in conflict with subject matter competence, the process attribute BP1 should not be rated higher than P.	167	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.1
[SUP.1.RC.2]	recom		If Quality Assurance is not organized in terms of distinct organizational departments or separate independent person, BP1 should not be downrated.	167	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.1
[SUP.1.RL.6]	rule		If process quality assurance is based on performing process assessments (either by a customer or internally) only, the indicator BP3 must not be rated higher than P.	167	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.1
[SUP.1.RL.7]	rule		If work product quality assurance is done based on checking for pure work product existence only, the indicator BP2 must not be rated higher than P.	168	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.1
[SUP.1.RL.8]	rule		If escalations are not followed up by corrective actions, the indicator BP6 must not be rated higher than P.	168	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.1
[SUP.1.RL.9]	rule		If non-conformances are not tracked, not closed in a timely manner, or not escalated, then the indicator BP5 must not be rated higher than P.	168	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.1
[SUP.1.RC.3]	rule		If work product or process non-conformances are not identified or documented even if the defined quality assurance methods were applied, then BP2 or BP3, respectively, should be downrated.	169	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.1 SUP.1
[SUP.1.RC.4]	recom		If the quality of work products (BP2) is downrated, the indicators BP4, BP5, and BP6, respectively, should be downrated.	170	yes	implemented as 3 rules: Precondition: BP2 rating < F RaiseWarning if BP4 rating = F; or RaiseWarning if BP5 rating = F; or RaiseWarning if BP6 rating = F	1	SUP.1
[SUP.1.RL.10]	rule		If the quality of work products (BP2) is rated N or P, PA 1.1 must not be rated higher than L.	171	yes	Precondition: BP2 rating < L RaiseErr if PA 1.1 rating = F	1	SUP.1
[SUP.1.RC.5]	recom		If the quality of process activities (BP3) is downrated, the indicators BP4, BP5, and BP6, respectively, should be downrated.	171	yes	implemented as 3 rules: Precondition: BP3 rating < F RaiseWarning if BP4 rating = F; or RaiseWarning if BP5 rating = F; or RaiseWarning if BP6 rating = F	1	SUP.1
[SUP.1.RL.11]	rule		If the quality of process activities (BP3) is rated N or P, PA 1.1 must not be rated higher than L.	171	yes	Precondition: BP3 rating < L RaiseErr if PA 1.1 rating = F	1	SUP.1
[SUP.1.RC.6]	recom		If the strategy (BP1) is downrated because of a missing verification approach for work products, or because of missing reporting methods, or because of an inappropriate escalation mechanism, or because of inadequate objectivity and independence approach, then the indicator BP2 should be downrated.	171	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.1

ID	Typ	Dom	RuleTextEN	Page BlueGold	checkable	comment	Precon. CLmin	Scope
[SUP.1.RC.7]	recom		If the strategy (BP1) is downrated because of a missing verification approach for processes, or because of missing reporting methods, or because of an inappropriate escalation mechanism, or because of inadequate objectivity and independence approach, then the indicator BP3 should be downrated.	171	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.1
[SUP.1.RC.8]	recom		If quality non-conformances are to be treated as problems according to the problem resolution strategy, then the rating of BP5 and BP6 should be in line with the rating of PA 1.1 of SUP.9.	172	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.9 SUP.9
[SUP.1.RC.9]	recom		If the indicator verifies the information about configured items (SUP.8.BP8) is downrated because of missing or inadequate activities such as baseline audits, baseline reproduction checks, or check-in comments of configuration items, this should be in line with the rating of the indicator BP2.	172	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.1
[SUP.8.RL.1]	recom		If the strategy does not include the aspects above, the indicator BP1 must not be rated F.	174	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.8
[SUP.8.RL.2]	rule		If there is no dedicated configuration management system defined in the strategy but the procedure is adequate for the complexity of the product to be developed this must not be used to downrate the indicator BP1.	174	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.8
[SUP.8.RL.3]	rule		If major configuration management aspects (according to d) or e)) are missing in the strategy the indicator BP1 must not be rated higher than P.	174	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.8
[SUP.8.RL.4]	rule		If major baselining aspects (according to g)) are missing in the strategy the indicator BP1 must not be rated higher than P.	174	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.8

ID	Typ	Dom	RuleTextEN	Page BlueGold	checkable	comment	Precon. CLmin	Scope
[SUP.8.RL.5]	rule		If major branching and merging aspects (according to h)) are missing in the strategy the indicator BP1 must not be rated higher than P.	174	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.8
[SUP.8.RC.1]	recom		If there is only an adequate generic strategy but no project specific implementation, the indicator BP1 should not be downrated.	175	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.8
[SUP.8.RL.6]	rule		If it is not defined for each kind of baseline which configuration items are to be controlled, the indicator BP6 must not be rated higher than P	175	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.8
[SUP.8.RL.6a]	rule		If required baselines do not exist for events defined in the strategy, the indicator BP6 shall be downrated.	175	no	Assessor judgement. Should get new ID RL.7!	1	SUP.8
[SUP.8.RL.7]	rule		If established baselines for different disciplines, sites, processes etc. (according to c) are not consistent or if overall baselines do not exist, the indicator BP6 shall be downrated.	175	no	Assessor judgement. Should get new ID RL.8!	1	SUP.8
[SUP.8.RL.8]	rule		If content of a baseline is not verified (by e.g., a baseline or configuration management audit), the indicator BP8 shall be downrated.	175	no	Assessor judgement. Should get new ID RL.9!	1	SUP.8
[SUP.8.RC.2]	recom		If the defined naming convention for baselines is not used, the indicator BP6 should be downrated.	176	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.8
[SUP.8.RL.9]	rule		If branches are not created according to the strategy, the indicator BP4 shall be downrated.	176	no	Assessor judgement. Should get new ID RL.10!	1	SUP.8
[SUP.8.RL.10]	rule		If consistency and completeness of merged items or sets of items is not ensured, the indicator BP8 must not be rated F.	176	no	Assessor judgement. Should get new ID RL.11!	1	SUP.8
[SUP.8.RL.11]	rule		If the established infrastructure is not able to support the procedures (according to a)) or the complexity (according to b)), the indicator BP3 shall be downrated.	177	no	Assessor judgement. Should get new ID RL.12!	1	SUP.8
[SUP.8.RL.12]	rule		If there is no dedicated configuration management system in place but the established procedure is adequate for the complexity of the product to be developed this must not be used to downrate the indicator BP3.	177	no	Assessor judgement. Should get new ID RL.13!	1	SUP.8
[SUP.8.RL.13]	rule		If properties of used IT services are not known, or known but in case of deviations from project requirements no corrective actions are established, the indicator BP9 shall be downrated.	177	no	Assessor judgement. Should get new ID RL.14!	1	SUP.8
[SUP.8.RL.14]	rule		If the strategy-related activities are not performed according to the defined strategy (BP1), the indicators BP2, BP3, BP4, BP5, and BP6 shall be downrated, respectively .	179	no	Assessor judgement. Should get new ID RL.15!	1	SUP.8 SUP.8 SUP.8 SUP.8

ID	Typ	Dom	RuleTextEN	Page BlueGold	checkable	comment	Precon. CLmin	Scope
[SUP.8.RC.3]	recom		If the identification of configuration items is not properly done (BP2), the indicators BP5, BP7, BP8, and BP9 should be downrated.	179	yes	implemented as 4 rules: Precondition: BP2 rating < F RaiseWarning if BP5 rating = F; or RaiseWarning if BP7 rating = F; or RaiseWarning if BP8 rating = F; or RaiseWarning if BP9 rating = F	1	SUP.8
[SUP.8.RC.4]	recom		If establishing baselines (BP6) is downrated, the verification of configuration items and their baselines BP8 should be downrated.	179	yes	Precondition: BP6 rating < F RaiseErr if BP8 rating = F	1	SUP.8
[SUP.8.RC.5]	recom		If establishing a configuration management system (BP3) is downrated, the management of storage of items and baselines BP9 should be downrated.	179	yes	Precondition: BP3 rating < F RaiseErr if BP9 rating = F	1	SUP.8
[SUP.8.RC.6]	recom		If establishing baselines (BP6) is downrated, the management of storage of baselines BP9 should be downrated.	179	yes	Precondition: BP6 rating < F RaiseErr if BP9 rating = F	1	SUP.8
[SUP.8.RC.7]	recom		If the indicator BP1 is downrated due to improper naming conventions for baselining, this should be in line with the rating of establishing a product release classification and numbering scheme (SPL.2.BP3).	180	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.8
[SUP.8.RC.8]	recom		If the indicator BP6 is downrated, this should be in line with the rating of delivering releases to the customer (SPL.2.BP13)	180	yes	PreCondition: SPL.2 in scope and SPL.2.BP13 rated RaiseWarning if SPL.2.BP13 rating > SUP.8.BP6	1	SUP.8
[SUP.8.RC.9]	recom		If the rating of reporting configuration status (BP7) is downrated, this should be in line with the rating of reviewing and reporting progress of the project (MAN.3.BP10).	180	yes	PreCondition: MAN.3 in scope and MAN.3.BP10 rated RaiseWarning if MAN.3.BP10 rating > SUP.8.BP7	1	SUP.8
[SUP.9.RL.1]	rule		If the strategy does not include the aspects above, the indicator BP1 must not be rated F.	182	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.9
[SUP.9.RL.2]	rule		If the strategy does not address interfaces between multisite organizations/projects, subprojects, and/or groups in case of correspondingly complex projects, the indicator BP1 must not be rated higher than P.	182	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.9
[SUP.9.RL.3]	rule		If the impact analysis does not adequately address potential side effects due to insufficient involvement of relevant stakeholders, the indicator BP4 must not be rated F.	183	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.9
[SUP.9.RL.4]	rule		If the impact analysis is incomplete due to missing consideration of similar problems in the same application or potential effects on other systems, the indicator BP4 must not be rated F.	183	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.9
[SUP.9.RL.5]	rule		If affected work products are not identified by the impact analysis, the indicator BP4 must not be rated F.	183	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.9
[SUP.9.RL.6]	rule		If there is no evidence for required alert notifications due to missing consideration of potential effects on clones, variants or other systems, the indicator BP6 shall be downrated.	183	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.9
[SUP.9.RL.7]	rule		If the strategy does not include the definition of a status model, workflow, criteria for status changes, stakeholder and their authorization, the indicator BP1 shall be downrated.	184	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.9

ID	Typ	Dom	RuleTextEN	Page BlueGold	checkable	comment	Precon. CLmin	Scope
[SUP.9.RL.8]	rule		If the status model and workflow does not fit to the actual way of working or is not applied correspondingly, the indicator BP3 must not be rated higher than P.	184	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.9
[SUP.9.RC.1]	recom		If the initiator of the problem is not also authorizing the closure of the problem, the indicator BP8 should be downrated.	184	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.9
[SUP.9.RL.9]	rule		If the strategy-related activities are not performed according to the defined strategy (BP1), the indicators BP3, BP5, BP6, BP7, and BP9 shall be downrated, <i>respectively</i> .	186	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.9 SUP.9 SUP.9 SUP.9 SUP.9
[SUP.9.RC.2]	recom		If the degree of problem identification (BP2) is downrated, the problem status recording (BP3) should not be rated higher.	186	yes	RaiseErr if BP3 rating > BP2 rating	1	SUP.9
[SUP.9.RC.3]	recom		If the recording of problems (BP2) is rated P or N due to insufficient content, the indicator BP4 should be downrated.	186	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.9
[SUP.9.RL.10]	rule		If the analysis of the problem (BP4) is rated P or N, the indicator BP5 must not be rated higher.	186	yes	Precondition: BP4 rating < L RaiseErr if BP5 rating > BP4 rating	1	SUP.9
[SUP.9.RC.4]	recom		If the analysis of the problem (BP4) is rated P or N, the indicator BP6 should be downrated.	186	yes	Precondition: BP4 rating < L RaiseErr if BP6 rating = F	1	SUP.9
[SUP.9.RC.5]	recom		If the analysis of the problem (BP4) is rated P or N, the indicator BP7 should be downrated.	186	yes	Precondition: BP4 rating < L RaiseErr if BP7 rating = F	1	SUP.9
[SUP.9.RL.11]	rule		If problem status recording (BP3) is rated P or N, the indicator BP8 shall be downrated.	186	yes	Precondition: BP3 rating < L RaiseErr if BP8 rating = F	1	SUP.9
[SUP.9.RC.6]	recom		If the rating of the indicator BP7 is downrated due to improper initiation of change requests, this should be in line with the rating of the identification and recording of change requests (SUP.10.BP2)	187	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.9
[SUP.9.RC.7]	recom		If the rating of the indicator BP8 is downrated, this should be in line with the rating of tracking change requests to closure (SUP.10.BP7)	187	yes	PreCondition: SUP.10 in scope and SUP.10.BP7 rated RaiseWarning if SUP.10.BP7 rating > SUP.9.BP8	1	SUP.9
[SUP.10.RL.1]	rule		If the strategy does not include the aspects above, the indicator BP1 must not be rated F.	189	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.10
[SUP.10.RL.2]	rule		If the strategy does not address interfaces between multisite organizations/projects, subprojects, and/or groups in case of correspondingly complex projects, the indicator BP1 must not be rated higher than P.	189	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.10

ID	Typ	Dom	RuleTextEN	Page BlueGold	checkable	comment	Precon. CLmin	Scope
[SUP.10.RC.1]	recom		If the strategy does not include goals according to e) above, the indicator BP1 should be downrated.	189	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.10
[SUP.10.RC.2]	recom		If change request handling is actually different over project life cycle phases but not consistent to the defined strategy, the indicator BP1 should be downrated.	189	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.10
[SUP.10.RC.3]	recom		If the use of a strategy is obvious by the implementation in a tool but not explicitly documented this should not be used to downrate the indicator BP1 to N or P.	189	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.10
[SUP.10.RL.3]	recom		If not all relevant disciplines or stakeholders are represented in the actual CCB the indicator BP5 must not be rated F.	190	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.10
[SUP.10.RC.4]	recom		If it is visible that decisions are not taken or not taken in time by the CCB without reasoning, the indicator BP5 should be downrated.	190	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.10
[SUP.10.RL.4]	rule		If the analysis does not adequately address potential side effects due to specific risks and complexity of the potential changes the indicator BP4 must not be rated F.	191	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.10
[SUP.10.RC.5]	recom		If the technical content of the change request or in case of alternatives the decision for one alternative is not properly documented the indicator BP4 should be downrated.	191	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.10
[SUP.10.RL.5]	rule		If the review of implemented changes fails to detect that relevant processes are not applied, the indicator BP6 shall be downrated.	191	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.10
[SUP.10.RC.6]	recom		If the confirmation of a successful implementation of change requests is not based on documented criteria the indicator BP6 should be downrated.	191	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.10
[SUP.10.RL.6]	rule		If the strategy does not include the definition of a status model, workflow, criteria for status changes, stakeholder and their authorization, the indicator BP1 shall be downrated.	192	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.10

ID	Typ	Dom	RuleTextEN	Page BlueGold	checkable	comment	Precon. CLmin	Scope
[SUP.10.RL.7]	rule		If the status model and workflow does not fit to the actual way of working or is not applied correspondingly, the indicator BP3 must not be rated higher than P.	192	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.10
[SUP.10.RC.7]	recom		If closed CRs do not reflect a final state according to d) above, the indicator BP7 should be downrated.	192	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.10
[SUP.10.RL.8]	rule		If the strategy-related activities are not performed according to the defined strategy (BP1), the indicators BP2, BP3, BP4, and BP5 shall be downrated, respectively .	194	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.10 SUP.10 SUP.10 SUP.10
[SUP.10.RC.8]	recom		If the strategy (BP1) is downrated due to not reflecting the complexity of the organization or project in the status flow, BP3 should be downrated.	194	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.10
[SUP.10.RC.9]	recom		If the degree of CR identification (BP2) is downrated, the indicator BP3 should not be rated higher.	194	yes	RaiseWarning if BP3 rating > BP2 rating	1	SUP.10
[SUP.10.RC.10]	recom		If the review of the implementation of the CRs (BP6) is downrated, it should have no influence on the rating BP3.	194	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.10
[SUP.10.RC.11]	recom		If the recording of CRs (BP3) is rated P or N due to insufficient content, the indicator BP4 should be downrated.	194	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.10
[SUP.10.RC.12]	recom		If the rating of establishing bidirectional traceability (BP8) is downrated due to missing dependencies between CRs and affected work products, the indicator BP4 should be downrated.	194	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.10
[SUP.10.RL.9]	rule		If the analysis of the change request (BP4) is rated P or N, the indicator BP5 must not be rated higher.	194	yes	Precondition: BP4 rating < L RaiseErr if BP5 rating > BP4 rating	1	SUP.10
[SUP.10.RC.13]	recom		If the analysis of CRs (BP4) is rated P or N due to missing confirmation criteria, the indicator BP6 shall be downrated.	194	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.10
[SUP.10.RL.10]	rule		If CR status recording (BP3) is rated P or N, the indicator BP7 shall be downrated.	195	yes	Precondition: BP3 rating < L RaiseErr if BP7 rating = F	1	SUP.10
[SUP.10.RL.11]	rule		If the initial recording of CRs (BP2) is rated P or N due to missing information about origin and/or reason, the indicator BP8 shall be downrated.	195	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.10
[SUP.10.RC.14]	recom		If the indicator BP4 is downrated due to missing analysis of dependencies to affected work products, this should be in line with the rating of PA 1.1 of the processes relevant to the maintenance of work products affected by the CR.	195	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.10
[SUP.10.RC.15]	recom		If the indicator BP6 is downrated due to not properly applying relevant processes during CR implementation, this should be in line with the rating of PA 1.1 of the processes, relevant to the maintenance of work products affected by the CR.	195	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.10

ID	Typ	Dom	RuleTextEN	Page BlueGold	checkable	comment	Precon. CLmin	Scope
[SUP.10.RC.16]	recom		If the indicator BP8 is downrated due to missing dependencies between CRs and corresponding problem reports, this should be in line with the rating of the initiation of problem resolution activities (SUP.9.BP7).	195	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.10
[SUP.10.RC.17]	recom		If the indicator BP8 is downrated due to missing traceability between CRs and affected work products, this should be in line with the rating of PA 1.1 of the processes relevant to the maintenance of work products affected by the CR.	196	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.10
[SUP.10.RC.18]	recom		If the indicator BP5 is downrated, this should be in line with the rating of the definition of the content of a release (SPL.2.BP1)	196	yes	PreCondition: SPL.2 in scope and SPL.2.BP1 rated RaiseWarning if SPL.2.BP1 rating > SUP.10.BP5	1	SUP.10
[MAN.3.RL.1]	rule		If the scope of work (BP1) is a product description only, the indicator BP1 must not be rated higher than L.	198	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3
[MAN.3.RC.1]	recom		If the scope of work (BP1) does not address the responsibilities of all affected parties regarding the project and product, the indicator BP1 should not be rated higher than L.	198	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3
[MAN.3.RL.2]	rule		If the scope of work (BP1) is not appropriately documented at project start, the indicator BP1 must not be rated higher than L.	198	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3
[MAN.3.RC.2]	recom		If the commitment is not fulfilled by delaying the timeline of the project or by cancelling functionality, the indicators BP1 and BP3 should not be rated higher than L.	198	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3 MAN.3
[MAN.3.RL.3]	rule		If the commitment is not fulfilled by delaying the timeline of the project or by cancelling functionality etc., the indicator BP5 and BP8 must not be rated higher than L.	198	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3 MAN.3
[MAN.3.RC.3]	recom		If the activities are not described with input and output artefacts, the indicator BP4 should not be rated higher than P.	199	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3
[MAN.3.RC.4]	recom		If the dependencies between activities are not identified, the indicator BP4 should not be rated higher than L.	199	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3
[MAN.3.RC.5]	recom		If the work packages are too big (longer than the update cycle for the schedule), the indicator BP8 should be downrated.	199	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3
[MAN.3.RC.6]	recom		If the estimation method used is not comprehensible, the indicator BP5 should not be rated higher than P.	200	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3
[MAN.3.RC.7]	recom		If the estimates are too high level, e.g. based on high level packages rather than on actual activities, the indicator BP5 should not be rated higher than P.	200	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3
[MAN.3.RC.8]	recom		If there are not sufficient resources to cover the estimated effort, the indicator BP5 should not be rated higher than P.	200	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3
[MAN.3.RC.9]	recom		If the resources are sufficient to cover the estimates but a monitoring of actual effort versus the estimates is missing, the indicator BP5 should not be rated higher than L.	200	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3
[MAN.3.RC.10]	recom		If the rationale for the estimates is missing, the indicator BP5 should not be rated higher than L.	200	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3
[MAN.3.RC.11]	recom		If the definition of activities, effort and resource estimation, and the preparation of schedule(s) do not sufficiently reflect expectable change requests and problem resolution, the indicators BP4, BP5 and BP8 should be downrated.	201	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3 MAN.3 MAN.3
[MAN.3.RC.12]	recom		If the project lifecycle does not contain phases that allow for addressing change requests and problem resolution, the indicator BP2 should be downrated.	201	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3
[MAN.3.RC.13]	recom		If action items or corrective actions are not properly tracked to closure, the corresponding indicators BP4, BP5, BP7, BP8 and/or BP10 should be downrated.	201	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3 MAN.3 MAN.3 MAN.3
[MAN.3.RL.4]	rule		If the schedule is not based on the defined activities (BP4) and estimations (BP5), the indicators BP8 and BP9 must not be rated higher than P.	201	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3 MAN.3
[MAN.3.RL.5]	rule		If the schedule does not contain all of the following -a start and end date, -duration, -effort, -degree of fulfillment (for monitoring), -resources, -dependencies the indicator BP8 must not be rated higher than L.	202	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3
[MAN.3.RL.6]	rule		If any of the following: -start and end date, -effort, -degree of fulfillment is missing, the indicator BP8 must not be rated higher than P.	202	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3

ID	Typ	Dom	RuleTextEN	Page BlueGold	checkable	comment	Precon. CLmin	Scope
[MAN.3.RL.7]	rule		If the schedule is changed without adocumented reason, or the change is not documented, the indicator BP8 shall be downrated.	202	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3
[MAN.3.RL.8]	rule		If the degree of fulfillment tracked in the schedule is not up to date (at least biweekly depending on the project scope and release plan), the indicator BP8 shall be downrated.	202	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3
[MAN.3.RL.9]	rule		If the critical path is not determined, the indicator BP8 shall be downrated.	202	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3
[MAN.3.RL.10]	rule		If monitoring does not assess the correlation of actual consumption of resources, meeting of deadlines and fulfillment of activities (i.e. progress of content), the indicator BP10 must not be rated higher than P.	203	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3
[MAN.3.RL.11]	rule		If product release recipients are not considered as stakeholders, the indicator BP7 must not be rated higher than P.	204	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3
[MAN.3.RL.12]	rule		If product release deadlines or milestones are not reflected in schedules (consider also consistency across different schedules), the indicator BP8 must not be rated higher than P.	204	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3
[MAN.3.RL.13]	rule		If the scope of the current and next release is not identified in detail (features and/or functions per release), the indicators BP7 and BP8 must not be rated higher than P.	204	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3 MAN.3
[MAN.3.RL.14]	rule		If the mid and long term planning of the releases does not at least cover a latest release/milestone for features and/or functions, the indicators BP7 and BP8 must not be rated higher than L.	204	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3 MAN.3
[MAN.3.RL.15]	rule		If for the current and next release not all the expected activities are planned and tracked (without a good reason), the indicators BP4, BP7 and BP8 shall not be rated higher than L. If less than 50% of the expected activities are planned, BP4, BP7, BP8 must not be rated higher than P.	204	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3 MAN.3 MAN.3
[MAN.3.RC.14]	recom		If links between different types of planning information are not supported by tools, this should not be used to downrate the indicator BP9.	205	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3
[MAN.3.RL.16]	rule		If the correlation between different plans or between estimates and plans is too high level or weak, the indicator BP9 shall be downrated.	205	no	Assessor judgement. Error in GelbBlau: there it says rule 15 instead of 16!	1	MAN.3
[MAN.3.RC.15]	recom		If risks regarding feasibility are not considered, the indicator BP3 should be downrated.	206	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3
[MAN.3.RC.16]	recom		If risks regarding estimates or resources are not considered, the indicator BP5 should be downrated.	206	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3
[MAN.3.RC.17]	recom		If risks regarding skills or knowledge are not considered, the indicator BP6 should be downrated.	206	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3
[MAN.3.RC.18]	recom		If the definition of the scope of work (BP1) is downrated, then the indicator BP2 should be downrated.	208	yes	Precondition: BP1 rating < F RaiseWarning if BP2 rating = F	1	MAN.3
[MAN.3.RC.19]	recom		If the definition of the scope of work (BP1) is downrated, then the indicator BP3 should be downrated.	208	yes	Precondition: BP1 rating < F RaiseWarning if BP3 rating = F	1	MAN.3
[MAN.3.RC.20]	recom		If the project lifecycle (BP2) is downrated, the indicator BP4 should be downrated.	208	yes	Precondition: BP2 rating < F RaiseWarning if BP4 rating = F	1	MAN.3
[MAN.3.RC.21]	recom		If the definition of the scope of work (BP1) is downrated, then the indicator BP5 should be downrated.	208	yes	Precondition: BP1 rating < F RaiseWarning if BP5 rating = F	1	MAN.3
[MAN.3.RC.22]	recom		If the feasibility of the project (BP3) is not evaluated, the indicator BP5 should be downrated.	208	yes	PreCondition: BP3 rating < F RaiseWarning if BP5 rating = F	1	MAN.3
[MAN.3.RC.23]	recom		If the activities defined as a result of BP4 are not mapped to the estimates, the indicator BP5 should be downrated.	208	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3
[MAN.3.RC.24]	recom		If the estimates are not correlated with the available skills of the project (BP6), the indicator BP5 should be downrated.	208	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3

ID	Typ	Dom	RuleTextEN	Page BlueGold	checkable	comment	Precon. CLmin	Scope
[MAN.3.RL.17]	rule		If the estimates are not developed systematically (BP5), the indicator BP8 shall be downrated.	208	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3
[MAN.3.RC.25]	recom		If the definition of work packages is weak, dependencies between work packages are not captured or the activities of the project are not properly broken down and documented (BP4), the indicator BP8 should be downrated.	208	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3
[MAN.3.RC.26]	recom		If the activities of the project are not properly broken down and documented (BP4), the indicator BP10 should be downrated.	209	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3
[MAN.3.RC.27]	recom		If the estimates are not properly documented (BP5), the indicator BP10 should be downrated.	209	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3
[MAN.3.RC.28]	recom		If Risk Management (MAN.5 PA 1.1) is downrated then the indicator BP5 (control of estimates and resources) should not be rated higher than L.	209	yes	PreCondition: MAN.5 in scope and MAN.5.PA 1.1 rated < F RaiseWarning if MAN.3.BP5 rating = F	1	MAN.5
[MAN.3.RC.29]	recom		If the relevant BP of the engineering processes regarding communication (last BP of all engineering processes) is downrated, this should be in line with the rating of the indicator BP7.	209	yes	Needs to be implemented as several separate rules: one for each engineering process e.g.: RaiseWarning if: SYS.1.BP8 !~ MAN.3.BP7; or ...	1	SYS.2 SYS.3 SYS.4 SYS.5 SWE.1 SWE.2 SWE.3 SWE.4 SWE.5 SWE.6
[MAN.3.RC.30]	recom		If the relevant BP of the requirement processes on system level (SYS.2.BP3) or software level (SWE.1.BP3) is downrated because of a missing or weak analysis regarding technical feasibility, this should be in line with the rating of the indicator BP3.	210	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3 MAN.3
[MAN.3.RC.31]	recom		If the relevant BP regarding status of quality assurance (SUP.1.BP4), status of configuration items (SUP.8.BP7), status of problems (SUP.9.BP8) and status of change requests (SUP.10.BP7) is downrated because of a missing or weak report, this should be in line with the rating of the indicator BP10.	210	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3 MAN.3 MAN.3 MAN.3
[CL2.RC.1]	recom		At least one of the ratings of PA 2.1 or PA 2.2 should not be greater than the rating of PA 1.1.	212	yes	Precondition: PA 2.1 rating > PA 1.1 rating RaiseWarning if PA 2.2 rating > PA 1.1 rating	2	*

ID	Type	Dom	RuleTextEN	Page BlueGold	checkable	comment	Precon. CLmin	Scope
[CL2.RL.1]	rule		If process performance objectives do not cover aspect a) above, the indicator GP 2.1.1 must not be rated higher than P.	215	no	Assessor judgement.	2	*
[CL2.RL.2]	rule		If process performance objectives do not cover aspect b) and c) above, the indicator GP 2.1.1 shall be downrated.	215	no	Assessor judgement.	2	*
[CL2.RL.3]	rule		If process performance objectives do not include KPIs but consider aspect a) above, the indicator GP 2.1.1 must not be downrated.	215	no	Assessor judgement.	2	*

ID	Type	Dom	RuleTextEN	Page BlueGold	checkable	comment	Precon. CLmin	Scope
[CL2.RL.4]	rule		If a standard process is not existing, but the aspects above are fulfilled, the indicator GP 2.1.1 must not be downrated.	215	no	Assessor judgement.	2	*
[CL2.RL.5]	rule		If the planning of the performance of the process does not cover all aspects above, the indicator GP 2.1.2 shall be downrated.	216	no	Assessor judgement.	2	*
[CL2.RL.6]	rule		If the planning of the performance of the process does not cover the aspects d) and e) above, the indicator GP 2.1.2 must not be rated higher than P.	216	no	Assessor judgement.	2	*

ID	Type	Dom	RuleTextEN	Page BlueGold	checkable	comment	Precon. CLmin	Scope
[CL2.RL.7]	rule		If required activities of the process are not separately planned, but cover aspects e) and g) above, the indicator GP 2.1.2 must not be downrated.	216	no	Assessor judgement.	2	*
[CL2.RL.8]	rule		If supporting activities as mentioned in e.2) above are not planned as explicit activities, but are planned as percentage or absolute number of hours over a certain period of time, the indicator GP 2.1.2 must not be downrated.	216	no	Assessor judgement.	2	*
[CL2.RL.9]	rule		If no process description including required activities and tasks is available, but the aspects above are covered, the indicator GP 2.1.2 must not be downrated.	216	no	Assessor judgement.	2	*

ID	Typ	Dom	RuleTextEN	Page BlueGold	checkable	comment	Precon. CLmin	Scope
[CL2.RL.10]	rule		If the monitoring of the process does not cover all aspects above, the indicator GP 2.1.3 shall be downrated.	217	no	Assessor judgement.	2	*
[CL2.RL.11]	rule		If the level of detail of planned and actual values does not fit together (or if there is no mapping available) (aspect d), the indicator GP 2.1.3 shall be downrated.	217	no	Assessor judgement.	2	*
[CL2.RL.12]	rule		If the frequency of monitoring activities does not fit to the project duration (aspect d), the indicator GP 2.1.3 shall be downrated.	217	no	Assessor judgement.	2	*
[CL2.RL.13]	rule		If adjusting the performance of the process does not cover aspect a), the indicator GP 2.1.4 shall be downrated.	218	no	Assessor judgement.	2	*
[CL2.RL.14]	rule		If adjusting the performance of the process does not cover aspect b), the indicator GP 2.1.4 must not be rated higher than P.	218	no	Assessor judgement.	2	*
[CL2.RL.15]	rule		If the definitions do not cover all aspects above, the indicator GP 2.1.5 shall be downrated.	219	no	Assessor judgement.	2	*

ID	Typ	Dom	RuleTextEN	Page BlueGold	checkable	comment	Precon. CLmin	Scope
[CL2.RL.16]	rule		If the definition of the responsibilities does not cover aspect a), the indicator GP 2.1.5 must not be rated higher than P.	219	no	Assessor judgement.	2	*
[CL2.RL.17]	rule		If the aspects above are adequately covered, without considering the role definition in a standard process, the indicator GP 2.1.5 must not be downrated.	219	no	Assessor judgement.	2	*
[CL2.RL.18]	rule		If identification, preparation, and availability of resources do not cover all aspects above, the indicator GP 2.1.6 shall be downrated.	220	no	Assessor judgement.	2	*
[CL2.RL.19]	rule		If identification, preparation, and availability of resources do not cover aspects a) and b), the indicator GP 2.1.6 must not be rated higher than P.	220	no	Assessor judgement.	2	*
[CL2.RL.20]	rule		If managing the interfaces between involved parties does not cover all aspects above, the indicator GP 2.1.7 shall be downrated.	221	no	Assessor judgement.	2	*

ID	Typ	Dom	RuleTextEN	Page BlueGold	checkable	comment	Precon. CLmin	Scope
[CL2.RL.21]	rule		If communication between involved parties is not assured and effective (aspect c) above), the indicator GP 2.1.7 must not be rated higher than P.	221	no	Assessor judgement.	2	*
[CL2.RL.22]	rule		If the indicator for identifying the objectives for the performance of the process (GP 2.1.1) is downrated, the indicator GP 2.1.2 shall be downrated.	223	yes	PreCondition: GP 2.1.1 < F RaiseError if GP 2.1.2 = F	2	*
[CL2.RL.23]	rule		If the indicator for planning the performance of the process (GP 2.1.2) is downrated, the indicator GP 2.1.3 must not be rated higher.	223	yes	RaiseError if GP 2.1.3 > GP 2.1.2	2	*
[CL2.RL.24]	rule		If the indicator for identifying the objectives of the process (GP 2.1.1) is downrated, the indicator GP 2.1.4 shall be downrated.	223	yes	PreCondition: GP 2.1.1 < F RaiseError if GP 2.1.4 = F	2	*
[CL2.RL.25]	rule		If the indicator for planning the performance of the process (GP 2.1.2) is downrated, the indicator GP 2.1.4 must not be rated higher.	223	yes	RaiseError if GP 2.1.4 > GP 2.1.2	2	*
[CL2.RL.26]	rule		If the indicator for monitoring the performance of the process (GP 2.1.3) is downrated, the indicator GP 2.1.4 must not be rated higher.	223	yes	RaiseError if GP 2.1.4 > GP 2.1.3	2	*
[CL2.RL.27]	rule		If the indicator for planning the performance of the process (GP 2.1.2) is downrated, the indicator GP 2.1.6 must not be rated higher.	224	yes	RaiseError if GP 2.1.6 > GP 2.1.2	2	*
[CL2.RL.28]	rule		If the indicator for defining responsibilities and authorities (GP 2.1.5) is downrated due to non-adequately defined responsibilities, the indicator GP 2.1.6 shall be downrated.	224	yes	PreCondition: GP 2.1.5 < F RaiseWarning if GP 2.1.6 = F	2	*
[CL2.RC.3]	recom		If the indicator for defining responsibilities and authorities (GP 2.1.5) is downrated due to non-adequately defined responsibilities, this should be in line with the rating of the indicator GP 2.1.7.	224	yes	PreCondition: GP 2.1.5 < F RaiseWarning if GP 2.1.5 !~ GP 2.1.7	2	*
[CL2.RC.4]	recom		The rating of the indicator GP 2.1.2 of all processes should be in line with the ratings of the indicators MAN.3.BP4, MAN.3.BP5 and MAN.3.BP8, respectively.	224	yes	RaiseWarning if GP 2.1.2 !~ MAN.3.BP4 or GP 2.1.2 !~ MAN.3.BP5 or GP 2.1.2 !~ MAN.3.BP8	2	* * *
[CL2.RC.5]	recom		The rating of the indicator GP 2.1.3 of all processes should be in line with the ratings of the indicators MAN.3.BP4, MAN.3.BP5 and MAN.3.BP8, respectively.	224	yes	RaiseWarning if GP 2.1.3 !~ MAN.3.BP4 or GP 2.1.3 !~ MAN.3.BP5 or GP 2.1.3 !~ MAN.3.BP8	2	* * *
[CL2.RC.6]	recom		The rating of the indicator GP 2.1.4 of all processes should be in line with the ratings of the indicators MAN.3.BP4, MAN.3.BP5 and MAN.3.BP8, respectively.	224	yes	RaiseWarning if GP 2.1.4 !~ MAN.3.BP4 or GP 2.1.4 !~ MAN.3.BP5 or GP 2.1.4 !~ MAN.3.BP8	2	* * *
[CL2.RC.7]	recom		The rating of the indicator GP 2.1.6 of all processes should be in line with the rating of the indicator MAN.3.BP6.	225	yes	RaiseWarning if GP 2.1.6 !~ MAN.3.BP6	2	*
[CL2.RC.8]	recom		The rating of the indicator GP 2.1.7 of all processes should be in line with the rating of the indicator MAN.3.BP7	225	yes	RaiseWarning if GP 2.1.7 !~ MAN.3.BP7	2	*

ID	Typ	Dom	RuleTextEN	Page BlueGold	checkable	comment	Precon. CLmin	Scope
[CL2.RC.9]	recom		The rating of the indicator GP 2.1.7 of the considered process should be in line with the rating of its indicator for "Communicate Agreed..." (SYS.2.BP8, SYS.3.BP8, SWE.1.BP8, SWE.2.BP9, SWE.3.BP7).	225	yes	RaiseWarning if GP 2.1.7 !~ SYS.2.BP8 or GP 2.1.7 !~ SYS.3.BP8 or GP 2.1.7 !~ SWE.1.BP8 or GP 2.1.7 !~ SWE.2.BP9 or GP 2.1.7 !~ SWE.3.BP7	2	SYS.2 SYS.3 SWE.1 SWE.2 SWE.3
[CL2.RC.10]	recom		The rating of the indicator GP 2.1.7 of the considered process should be in line with the rating of its indicator for "Summarize and Communicate" (SYS.4.BP9, SYS.5.BP7, SWE.4.BP7, SWE.5.BP9, SWE.6.BP7).	225	yes	RaiseWarning if GP 2.1.7 !~ SYS.4.BP9 or GP 2.1.7 !~ SYS.5.BP7 or GP 2.1.7 !~ SWE.4.BP7 or GP 2.1.7 !~ SWE.5.BP9 or GP 2.1.7 !~ SWE.6.BP7	2	SYS.4 SYS.5 SWE.4 SWE.5 SWE.6
[CL2.RL.29]	rule		If work product requirements do not include all aspects above, the indicator GP 2.2.1 shall be downrated.	227	no	Assessor judgement.	2	*
[CL2.RL.30]	rule		If no template or checklist is existing for the work product, but the aspects above are adequately documented, the indicator GP 2.2.1 must not be downrated.	227	no	Assessor judgement.	2	*
[CL2.RL.31]	rule		If standard work product templates provided by a standard process are available, but the project has defined a project-specific solution that is actually effective, the indicator GP 2.2.1 must not be downrated.	227	no	Assessor judgement.	2	*
[CL2.RL.32]	rule		If standard work product templates provided by a standard process are available and used by the project, but do not fit for the purpose of the project, the indicator GP 2.2.1 shall be downrated.	227	no	Assessor judgement.	2	*
[CL2.RL.33]	rule		If the requirements for documentation and control do not cover all aspects above, the indicator GP 2.2.2 shall be downrated.	228	no	Assessor judgement.	2	*

ID	Typ	Dom	RuleTextEN	Page BlueGold	checkable	comment	Precon. CLmin	Scope
[CL2.RL.34]	rule		If the requirements for documenting and controlling work products do not cover versioning and storage requirements (aspects f) and g) above), the indicator GP 2.2.2 must not be rated higher than P.	228	no	Assessor judgement.	2	*
[CL2.RL.35]	rule		If the proof of work product reviews does not cover all aspects above, the indicator GP 2.2.4 shall be downrated.	229	no	Assessor judgement.	2	*
[CL2.RL.36]	rule		If the proof of work product reviews does not cover aspects a.1), a.4), and a.6) for the most relevant work products, the indicator GP 2.2.4 must not be rated higher than P.	229	no	Assessor judgement.	2	*
[CL2.RL.37]	rule		If work product review findings are not resolved, the indicator GP 2.2.4 must not be rated higher than P.	229	no	Assessor judgement.	2	*
[CL2.RL.38]	rule		If the quality of work products was not established in time (i.e. not according to the planning in the context of PA 2.1), the indicator GP 2.2.4 shall be downrated.	230	no	Assessor judgement.	2	*
[CL2.RL.39]	rule		If work product reviews are demonstrable according to all aspects above, but are not explicitly documented in a formal review record, the indicator GP 2.2.4 must not be downrated.	230	no	Assessor judgement.	2	*
[CL2.RL.40]	rule		If the indicator for defining requirements for documentation and control of the work products (GP 2.2.2) is downrated, the indicator GP 2.2.3 must not be rated higher.	232	yes	PreCondition: GP 2.2.2 < F RaiseError if GP 2.2.3 > GP 2.2.2	2	*
[CL2.RL.41]	rule		If the indicator for defining requirements for the work products (GP 2.2.1) is downrated due to non-appropriate review and approval criteria, the indicator GP 2.2.4 shall be downrated.	232	no	Assessor judgement.	2	*
[CL2.RC.12]	recom		The rating of the indicator GP 2.2.1 of all processes should be in line with the rating of the indicator SUP.1.BP1.	232	yes	RaiseWarning if GP 2.2.1 !~ SUP.1.BP1	2	*

ID	Typ	Dom	RuleTextEN	Page BlueGold	checkable	comment	Precon. CLmin	Scope
[CL2.RC.13]	recom		The rating of the indicator GP 2.2.2 of all processes should be in line with the rating of indicator SUP.8.BP1 and the indicator SUP.8.BP2. The rationale for the recommendation is that the definition of the work product life cycle including status model is related to the identification, documentation and control of work products.	232	yes	RaiseWarning if GP 2.2.2 !~ SUP.8.BP1 or GP 2.2.2 !~ SUP.8.BP2	2	*
[CL2.RC.14]	recom		The rating of the indicator GP 2.2.2 of all processes should be in line with the rating of indicator SUP.10.BP1. The rationale for the recommendation is that the change request management strategy covers also the status model of the change requests, which is related to the identification, documentation and control of work products.	233	yes	RaiseWarning if GP 2.2.2 !~ SUP.10.BP1	2	*
[CL2.RC.15]	recom		The rating of the indicator GP 2.2.3 of all processes should be in line with the ratings of the indicators SUP.8.BP3, SUP.8.BP5, and SUP.8.BP6, respectively.	233	yes	RaiseWarning if GP 2.2.3 !~ SUP.8.BP3 or GP 2.2.3 !~ SUP.8.BP5 or GP 2.2.3 !~ SUP.8.BP6	2	*
[CL2.RC.16]	recom		The rating of the indicator GP 2.2.3 of all processes should be in line with the ratings of the indicators SUP.10.BP2, SUP.10.BP3, and SUP.10.BP7, respectively.	233	yes	RaiseWarning if GP 2.2.3 !~ SUP.10.BP2 or GP 2.2.3 !~ SUP.10.BP3 or GP 2.2.3 !~ SUP.10.BP7	2	*
[CL2.RC.17]	recom		The rating of the indicator GP 2.2.4 of all processes should be in line with the rating of the indicator SUP.1.BP2.	233	yes	RaiseWarning if GP 2.2.4 !~ SUP.1.BP2	2	*
[CL2.RC.18]	recom		The rating of the indicator GP 2.2.4 should be in line with the rating of the indicator of the corresponding process for ensuring consistency of work products (SYS.2.BP7, SYS.3.BP7, SYS.4.BP8, SYS.5.BP6, SWE.1.BP7, SWE.2.BP8, SWE.3.BP6, SWE.4.BP6, SWE.5.BP8, SWE.6.BP6, SUP.8.BP8).	233	yes	RaiseWarning if GP 2.2.4 !~ SYS.2.BP7 or GP 2.2.4 !~ SYS.3.BP7 or GP 2.2.4 !~ SYS.4.BP8 or GP 2.2.4 !~ SYS.5.BP6 or GP 2.2.4 !~ SWE.1.BP7 or GP 2.2.4 !~ SWE.2.BP8 or GP 2.2.4 !~ SWE.3.BP6 or GP 2.2.4 !~ SWE.4.BP6 or GP 2.2.4 !~ SWE.5.BP8 or GP 2.2.4 !~ SWE.6.BP6 or GP 2.2.4 !~ SUP.8.BP8	2	SYS.2 SYS.3 SYS.4 SYS.5 SWE.1 SWE.2 SWE.3 SWE.4 SWE.5 SWE.6 SUP.8
[CL3.RL.1]	rule		If the definition of the standard process does not cover all aspects above, the indicator GP 3.1.1 must not be rated F.	235	no	Assessor judgement.	3	*
[CL3.RL.2]	rule		If one of the aspects b) or c) is missing in the defined standard process, the indicator GP 3.1.1 must not be rated higher than P.	235	no	Assessor judgement.	3	*
[CL3.RL.3]	rule		If maintaining the standard process does not cover all aspects above, the indicator GP 3.1.1 shall be downrated.	236	no	Assessor judgement.	3	*
[CL3.RL.4]	rule		If the tailoring guideline does not cover all aspects above, the indicator GP 3.1.1 shall be downrated. If there is no tailoring defined, the following aspects need to be checked -The standard process is unmodified used in the project but is not Appropriate (see PA 3.2) -The standard process cannot be effectively applied by the project -The standard process is not suitable for the project	236	no	Assessor judgement.	3	*

ID	Typ	Dom	RuleTextEN	Page BlueGold	checkable	comment	Precon. CLmin	Scope
[CL3.RL.5]	rule		If there is no tailoring defined despite the aspects above, the indicator GP 3.1.1 shall be downrated.	237	no	Assessor judgement.	3	*
[CL3.RL.6]	rule		If the sequence and interaction mentioned above are not defined, the indicator GP 3.1.2 must not be rated higher than P.	237	no	Assessor judgement.	3	*
[CL3.RL.7]	rule		If the criteria mentioned above are not defined, the indicator GP 3.1.3 must not be rated higher than P.	237	no	Assessor judgement.	3	*
[CL3.RL.8]	rule		If the criteria mentioned above are not defined, the indicator GP 3.1.4 must not be rated higher than P.	238	no	Assessor judgement.	3	*
[CL3.RL.9]	rule		If only the feedback methods c) and d) are determined, the indicator GP 3.1.5 shall be downrated.	238	no	Assessor judgement.	3	*
[CL3.RL.10]	rule		If the defined process is not documented and verified according the criteria above, the indicator GP 3.2.1 shall be downrated.	239	no	Assessor judgement.	3	*
[CL3.RL.11]	rule		If the assignment does not cover all aspects above, the indicator GP 3.2.2 must not be rated F.	239	no	Assessor judgement.	3	*
[CL3.RC.1]	recom		If roles, responsibilities and authorities are assigned and the assignment is available for all project members but there is no evidence for an active communication of the assignment, the indicator GP 3.2.2 should not be downrated.	240	no	Assessor judgement.	3	*
[CL3.RL.12]	rule		If no evidence that the assigned persons have the required qualification is available, the indicator GP 3.2.3 must not be rated higher than P.	240	no	Assessor judgement.	3	*
[CL3.RL.13]	rule		If the necessary competencies are not available in time, the indicator GP 3.2.3 must not be rated F.	240	no	Assessor judgement.	3	*

ID	Typ	Dom	RuleTextEN	Page BlueGold	checkable	comment	Precon. CLmin	Scope
[CL3.RL.14]	rule		If the provided resources and information do not cover all aspects above, the indicator GP 3.2.4 must not be rated F.	241	no	Assessor judgement.	3	*
[CL3.RL.15]	rule		If the organizational support does not cover all aspect above, the indicator GP 3.2.5 must not be rated F.	241	no	Assessor judgement.	3	*
[CL3.RL.16]	rule		If the defined process does not ensure all aspects above, the indicator GP 3.2.6 must not be rated F.	242	no	Assessor judgement.	3	*
[CL3.RC.2]	recom		If the collected and analyzed data are only qualitative, this should not be used to downrate the indicator GP 3.2.6.	242	no	Assessor judgement.	3	*
[CL3.RC.3]	recom		If the defining and maintaining of the standard process (GP 3.1.1) is downrated due to an inadequate definition of the standard process, this should be in line with the rating of the indicator GP 3.1.2, GP 3.1.3 and GP 3.1.4, respectively.	244	no	RaiseWarning if GP 3.1.1 !~ GP 3.1.2 or GP 3.1.1 !~ GP 3.1.3 or GP 3.1.1 !~ GP 3.1.4	3	* * *
[CL3.RC.4]	recom		The rating of the indicator GP 3.1.5 should be in line with the ratings of the standard process related GP (GP 3.1.1, GP 3.1.2, GP 3.1.3, GP 3.1.4)	244	yes	RaiseWarning if GP 3.1.5 !~ GP 3.1.1 or GP 3.1.5 !~ GP 3.1.2 or GP 3.1.5 !~ GP 3.1.3 or GP 3.1.5 !~ GP 3.1.4	3	* * * *
[CL3.RC.5]	recom		The rating of the indicator GP 3.2.1 should be in line with the ratings of the standard process related GP (GP 3.1.1, GP 3.1.2, GP 3.1.3, GP 3.1.4)	244	yes	RaiseWarning if GP 3.2.1 !~ GP 3.1.1 or GP 3.2.1 !~ GP 3.1.2 or GP 3.2.1 !~ GP 3.1.3 or GP 3.2.1 !~ GP 3.1.4	3	* * * *
[CL3.RL.17]	rule		If the indicator for identify the roles and competencies, responsibilities, and authorities (GP 3.1.3) is downrated due to missing or non-adequate definitions of roles, responsibilities and authorities, the indicator (GP 3.2.2) shall be downrated.	244	no	Assessor judgement.	3	*
[CL3.RL.18]	rule		If the indicator for identify the roles and competencies, responsibilities, and authorities (GP 3.1.3) is downrated due to missing or non-adequate definitions of competencies, the indicator (GP 3.2.3) shall be downrated.	244	no	Assessor judgement.	3	*

ID	Typ	Dom	RuleTextEN	Page BlueGold	checkable	comment	Precon. CLmin	Scope
[CL3.RL.19]	rule		If the indicator for identify the roles and competencies, responsibilities, and authorities (GP 3.1.3) is downrated due to missing or non-adequate definitions of roles, responsibilities and authorities, the indicator (GP 3.2.4) shall be downrated.	245	no	Assessor judgement.	3	*
[CL3.RL.20]	rule		If the indicator for Identify the required infrastructure and work environment (GP 3.1.4) is downrated, the indicator (GP 3.2.5) shall be downrated.	245	yes	PreCondition: GP 3.1.4 < F RaiseError if GP 3.2.5 = F	3	*
[CL3.RL.21]	rule		If collecting and analyzing the defined data is not performed according to the defined methods and measures (GP 3.1.5), the indicator (GP 3.2.6) shall be downrated.	245	no	Assessor judgement.	3	*
[CL3.RL.22]	rule		If the definition of responsibilities and authorities (GP 2.1.5) is downrated, the indicator GP 3.2.2 shall be downrated.	246	yes	PreCondition: GP 2.1.5 < F RaiseError if GP 3.2.2 = F	3	*
[CL3.RC.6]	recom		If the identification, preparation and availability of resources (GP 2.1.6) is downrated, due to human resources issues, this should be in line with the rating of GP 3.2.4.	246	no	Assessor judgement.	3	*
[CL3.RC.7]	recom		If the identification, preparation and availability of resources (GP 2.1.6) is downrated due to infrastructure issues, this should be in line with the rating of GP 3.2.5.	247	no	Assessor judgement.	3	*