



Mapping of SPiCE 1-2-1 for Automotive SPiCE PAM 4.0

Rule-Checker IDs to Blau-Gold-Band Rule-IDs

referring to Tool SW-Version 3.3.31 and Automotive SPiCE Guidelines, 2nd edition, November 2023

Note: The rule-checker can identify & check automatically those rules, which a) don't need any further contextual information or b) are already satisfied or c) are not applicable.

m: 258/0 (Sum:258) - Automatically can be identified as 'satisfied': 25 tool checkable: 257 check if met (25 full auto check) at Level 1/2/3: 185/30/43									
ID	Typ	Dom	RuleTextEN	Page BlueGold	checkable	comment	Precon. CLmin	Scope	
[TAC.RL.1]	rule		If traceability is distinctly established between reasonable clusters of information instead of individual atomic elements, then the 'consistency and traceability' BP shall not be downrated.	51	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.2 SYS.3 SYS.4 SYS.5 SWE.1 SWE.2 SWE.3 SWE.4 SWE.5 SWE.6 HWE.1 HWE.2 HWE.3 HWE.4 MLE.1 MLE.2 MLE.3 MLE.4	
[TAC.RL.2]	rule		If an automated tool-based approach for traceability is not used in favor of a manual approach with snapshot-based checks, then the 'consistency and traceability' BP shall not be downrated.	52	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.2 SYS.3 SYS.4 SYS.5 SWE.1 SWE.2 SWE.3 SWE.4 SWE.5 SWE.6 HWE.1 HWE.2 HWE.3 HWE.4 MLE.1 MLE.2 MLE.3 MLE.4	
[TAC.RL.3]	rule		If there is no explicitly documented review record or analysis record providing evidence of consistency between related information in favor of approaches such as performing pair working or group work, peer spot checks, explaining entries in revision histories in documents, or providing change commenting (via e.g., meta-information) of database or repository entries, then the 'consistency and traceability' BP shall not be downrated.	52	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.2 SYS.3 SYS.4 SYS.5 SWE.1 SWE.2 SWE.3 SWE.4 SWE.5 SWE.6 HWE.1 HWE.2 HWE.3 HWE.4 MLE.1 MLE.2 MLE.3 MLE.4	
[COM.RL.1]	rule		If effective communication of agreed information at capability level 1 is not done based on baselines or by explicitly documented communication or review records then BP 'Communicate' shall not be downrated.	53	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.2 SYS.3 SWE.1 SWE.2 SWE.3 HWE.1 HWE.2 MLE.1 MLE.2 MLE.3	

ID	Typ	Dom	RuleTextEN	Page BlueGold	checkable	comment	Precon. CLmin	Scope
[MBD.RL.1]	rule	MBD	If the syntax and semantics of the model notation are not defined or not appropriate for the use case, the corresponding indicator shall be downrated.	62	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.2 SYS.3 SYS.3 SWE.1 SWE.2 SWE.2 SWE.3 SWE.3 SWE.3
[MBD.RL.2]	rule	MBD	If the additional description is missing or insufficient, the corresponding indicator shall be downrated.	62	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.2 SYS.3 SYS.3 SWE.1 SWE.2 SWE.2 SWE.3 SWE.3 SWE.3
[MBD.RL.3]	rule	MBD	If the additional description is documented in extra documents but associated with the model, the corresponding indicator shall not be downrated.	62	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.2 SYS.3 SYS.3 SWE.1 SWE.2 SWE.2 SWE.3 SWE.3 SWE.3
[MBD.RL.4]	rule	MBD	If the additional description for the model is not considered in downstream processes, the corresponding indicator shall be downrated.	63	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.2 SYS.3 SYS.3 SWE.1 SWE.2 SWE.2 SWE.3 SWE.3 SWE.3
[MBD.RL.5]	rule	MBD	If there is no or insufficient evidence for compliance of the auto-generated code with the detailed design, then SWE.3.BP4 shall not be rated higher than P.	63	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.3
[MBD.RL.6]	rule	MBD	If there is no static verification and unit testing performed on code automatically generated from the model by a qualified tool chain (and without any modification after generation), then SWE.4.BP3 shall not be downrated.	63	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.4
[MBD.RL.7]	rule	MBD	If there is no static verification and unit testing performed on code automatically generated from the model by a qualified tool chain (but has been modified after the generation), then SWE.4.BP3 shall be downrated.	64	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.4
[AGE.RL.1]	rule	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, then the indicators MAN.3.BP4, MAN.3.BP9, and SPL.2.BP1 shall be downrated.	65	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3 MAN.3 SPL.2
[AGE.RL.2]	rule	AGE	If remaining effort for features, which are to be delivered in the current or next release, is not estimated then MAN.3.BP5 shall be downrated.	65	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3
[AGE.RL.3]	rule	AGE	If the system architecture is modified incrementally including impact analysis then SYS.3.BP1 shall not be downrated.	67	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.3
[AGE.RL.4]	rule	AGE	If the software architecture is modified incrementally including impact analysis then SWE.2.BP1 shall not be downrated.	67	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.2
[AGE.RL.5]	rule	AGE	If the way pair programming is actually technically performed is not in conflict with code review requirements in terms of formal reviews, inspections, walkthroughs then SUP.1.BP3 and SWE.4.BP3 shall not be downrated.	67	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.1 SWE.4
[DEX.RL.1]	rule	DEX	If the scope of work is not defined for all collaborating entities, then MAN.3.BP1 shall not be rated higher than L.	72	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3

ID	Typ	Dom	RuleTextEN	Page BlueGold	checkable	comment	Precon. CLmin	Scope
[DEX.RL.2]	rule	DEX	If the planning of the overall project and the collaborating entities show inconsistencies and this aspect is significant in the context of MAN.3.BP9, then MAN.3.BP9 shall be downrated.	72	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3
[DID.RL.3]	rule	DEX	If the monitoring of the overall project does not detect deviations in fulfillment of agreed commitments from the collaborating entities and this aspect is significant in the context of MAN.3.BP7, then MAN.3.BP7 shall be downrated.	72	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3
[DEX.RL.4]	rule	DEX	If the information about the properties used for the exchange of configuration items appears to be incompatible, then SUP.8.BP2 shall be downrated.	72	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.8
[DEX.RL.5]	rule	DEX	If preconditions for work products from collaborating entities to be integrated are not fulfilled and no appropriate reaction has been started to resolve the issue, then SWE.5.BP4 or SYS.4.BP3 shall be downrated.	72	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.5 SYS.4
[DEX.RL.6]	rule	DEX	If the supplier project does not comply with the agreements and the agreed rules for the software supplied by the customer and this aspect is significant in the context of MAN.3.BP7, then MAN.3.BP7 shall be downrated.	72	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3
[DEX.RL.7]	rule	DEX	If the customer of the assessed organization does not comply with the agreements and the agreed rules for the software supplied by the customer, then MAN.3.BP7 shall not be downrated but the noncompliance of the customer shall be documented in the assessment report.	72	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3
[DEX.RL.8]	rule	DEX	If escalation mechanisms across the sub-projects are not defined and this aspect is significant in the context of MAN.3.BP7 or SUP.1.BP7, then MAN.3.BP7 or SUP.1.BP7, respectively, shall be downrated.	72	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3 SUP.1
[DEX.RL.9]	rule	DEX	If the verification measures for system or software integration, respectively, do not include the verification of elements that were developed by different collaborating entities and this aspect is significant in the context of SWE.5.BP2 or SYS.4.BP1, then SWE.5.BP2 or SYS.4.BP1, respectively, shall be downrated.	73	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.5 SYS.4
[DEX.RL.10]	rule	DEX	If no pass/fail criteria are defined to check the compliance of third party software and this aspect is significant in the context of SWE.5.BP1 or SWE.5.BP2, then SWE.5.BP4 shall be downrated.	73	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.5
[DEX.RL.11]	rule	DEX	If third party software is not checked for compliance with defined criteria that have to be fulfilled and this aspect is significant in the context of SWE.5.BP5 then SWE.5.BP5 shall be downrated.	73	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.5
[DEX.RL.12]	rule	DEX	If the software properties of the software from collaborating entities are not in line with the requirements for the project and this aspect is significant in the context of SWE.2.BP4, the indicator SWE.2.BP4 shall be downrated.	74	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.2
[DEX.RL.13]	rule	DEX	If the interfaces of software from collaborating entities are not part of the software architecture and this aspect is significant in the context of SWE.2.BP1, then SWE.2.BP1 shall be downrated.	74	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.2
[DEX.RL.14]	rule	DEX	If dynamic aspects of software from collaborating entities are not reflected of the software architecture and this aspect is significant in the context of SWE.2.BP2, then SWE.2.BP2 shall be downrated.	74	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.2
[DEX.RL.15]	rule	DEX	If the external interfaces of third party software are not reflected in the software architecture and this aspect is significant in the context of SWE.2.BP1, then SWE.2.BP1 shall be downrated.	74	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.2
[DEX.RL.16]	rule	DEX	If FOSS is not managed according to rules ensuring that the free and open source software license agreement is fulfilled and this aspect is significant in the context of MAN.3.BP3, then MAN.3.BP3 shall be downrated.	75	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3
[APA.RL.1]	rule	APA	If the implemented application parameters and their values in the detailed design are not consistent with configurability requirements, then SYS.3.BP1 and SYS.3.BP2 shall be downrated.	77	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.3 SYS.3
[APA.RL.2]	rule	APA	If the detailed design or the implementation does not include checking for allowed value ranges of application parameters, then SWE.3.BP2 or SWE.3.BP3, respectively, shall be downrated.	77	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.3 SWE.3

ID	Typ	Dom	RuleTextEN	Page BlueGold	checkable	comment	Precon. CLmin	Scope
[APA.RL.3]	rule	APA	If application parameters including all aspects above are not treated as configuration items, then SUP.8.BP1 shall be downrated.	79	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.8
[APA.RL.4]	rule	APA	If application parameters do not receive quality assurance with respect to technical correctness, product variant consistency, then BP2 of SUP.1 shall be downrated.	80	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.1
[APA.RL.5]	rule	APA	If samples that are used to perform verification measures do not reflect the correct application parameter settings, then BPs on 'Verify...' or 'perform verification' in 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
[APA.RL.6]	rule	APA	If application parameter values can be, or are, altered at the product level by any other party than the developers of the product, but responsibilities are not clearly defined, then MAN.3.BP7 shall be downrated.	82	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3
[ACQ.4.RL.1]	rule		If the indicator BP1 is downrated due to incomplete agreements about exchanged information between customer and supplier, the corresponding indicator BP2 shall be downrated.	84	no	Assessor judgement.	1	ACQ.4
[SPL.2.RL.1]	rule		If the scope of the current release is not identified in detail (features and/or functions per release), the indicator BP1 shall be not rated higher than P.	85	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SPL.2
[SPL.2.RL.2]	rule		If the release notes do not describe changes compared to previous releases, BP6 shall be downrated.	85	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SPL.2
[SPL.2.RL.3]	rule		If the content in the release notes is inconsistent with the results from VAL.1, SYS.4, SYS.5, SWE.4, SWE.5, SWE.6, HWE.3, HWE.4 then SPL.2.PA1.1 shall not be rated higher than P.	86	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SPL.2
[SYS.2.RL.1]	rule		If there is no evidence for prioritization but a separate release plan consistently mapping system functionality to future releases then SYS.2.BP2 shall not be downrated.	92	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.2
[SYS.2.RL.2]	rule		If different approaches of documenting requirements are used concurrently (e.g., word processor file, application lifecycle management tool, database) then SYS.2.BP1 shall not be downrated.	92	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.2
[SYS.2.RL.3]	rule		If not all system requirements are derived from, and traced to, the customer requirements but to internal standard requirements or to a product line/platform according to a reuse or application strategy, then SYS.2.BP1 and SYS.2.BP5 shall not be downrated.	92	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.2 SYS.2
[SYS.2.RL.4]	rule		If not all system requirements of the final product are available because of release-driven incremental development, then SYS.2.BP1 and SYS.2.BP2 shall not be downrated.	92	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.2 SYS.2
[SYS.2.RL.5]	rule		If the notions "functional" and "non-functional" are the only requirements structuring, categorization, or classification criterion, then SYS.2.BP2 shall be rated as N.	93	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.2
[SYS.2.RL.6]	rule		If the notions "functional" and "non-functional" are not used as a structuring, categorization, or classification criterion, then SYS.2.BP2 shall not be downrated.	93	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.2
[SYS.2.RL.7]	rule		If analysis results of requirements are not demonstrated by means of separate analysis reports or review records but by means of e.g., tool-supported attributes or tool-supported commenting, then SYS.2.BP3 shall not be downrated.	94	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.2
[SYS.2.RL.8]	rule		If analysis of system requirements regarding technical feasibility is covered by effective risk management, then SYS.2.BP3 shall not be downrated.	94	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.2
[SYS.2.RL.9]	rule		If analysis results of system requirements regarding impact on estimates is not consistently used by project management (MAN.3), then SYS.2.BP3 shall not be downrated.	94	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.2

ID	Typ	Dom	RuleTextEN	Page BlueGold	checkable	comment	Precon. CLmin	Scope
[SYS.2.RL.10]	rule		If a system requirement is no longer consistent with stakeholder requirements because of a meaningful adaptation, but the stakeholder does not adapt his respective requirement correspondingly and evidence of the agreement is available, then SYS.2.BP5 shall not be downrated.	94	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.2
[SYS.3.RL.1]	rule		If non-quantitative analysis approaches or techniques are used and adequate but no quantitative ones, then SYS.3.BP2 shall not be downrated.	97	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.3
[SYS.4.RL.1]	rule		If entry/exit criteria are reasonably specified for a set of verification measures instead of each individual verification measure, then SYS.4.BP1 shall not be downrated.	99	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.4
[SYS.4.RL.2]	rule		If a verification measure is automated and the correctness, completeness, and consistency of the corresponding scripts and programs are not addressed in the verification measure definition, then SYS.4.BP1 shall be downrated.	99	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.4
[SYS.4.RL.3]	rule		If verification measures represent explorative tests, which, by definition, cannot be traced to the system architectural design, then SYS.4.BP4 shall not be downrated.	99	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.4
[SYS.4.RL.4]	rule		If selection of verification measures is properly done but based on an inadequate or incomplete release plan, then SYS.4.BP2 shall not be downrated.	100	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.4
[SYS.5.RL.1]	rule		If entry/exit criteria are reasonably specified for a set of verification measures instead of each individual verification measure, then SYS.5.BP1 shall not be downrated.	100	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.5
[SYS.5.RL.2]	rule		If a verification measure is automated and the correctness, completeness, and consistency of the corresponding scripts and programs are not addressed in the verification measure definition, then SYS.5.BP1 shall be downrated.	101	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.5
[SYS.5.RL.3]	rule		If for those verification measures which represent exploratory tests, no traceability to the system requirements is available, then SYS.4.BP4 shall not be downrated.	101	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.5
[SYS.5.RL.4]	rule		If selection of verification measures is properly done but based on an inadequate or incomplete release plan, then SYS.5.BP2 shall not be downrated.	100	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SYS.5
[SWE.1.RL.1]	rule		In the case of software development only, if the traceability and consistency from software requirements to stakeholder requirements are established then SWE.1.BP5 shall not be downrated.	103	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.1
[SWE.1.RL.2]	rule		If some software requirements are not derived from system requirements but from platform or product line requirements and are not in contradiction to other requirements, then SWE.1.BP1 shall not be downrated.	103	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.1
[SWE.1.RL.3]	rule		If software requirements are not derived from system requirements but from stakeholder requirements which do not affect system requirements or the system architecture and this is agreed with software and system representatives, then SWE.1.BP1 shall not be downrated.	103	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.1
[SWE.1.RL.4]	rule		If "functional" and "non-functional" are the only requirements categorization or classification criterion, then SWE.1.BP2 shall be rated as N.	103	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.1
[SWE.1.RL.5]	rule		If there is no evidence for prioritization but a separate release plan consistently mapping software requirements to future releases then SWE.1.BP2 shall not be downrated.	104	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.1
[SWE.1.RL.6]	rule		If the software requirements that are mapped to a particular release do not match with the system requirements mapped to the same release then SWE.1.BP2 shall be downrated.	104	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.1
[SWE.1.RL.7]	rule		If analysis results of requirements are not demonstrated by means of separate analysis reports or review records but by means of e.g., tool-supported attributes or tool-supported commenting, then SWE.1.BP3 shall not be downrated.	105	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.1
[SWE.1.RL.8]	rule		If analysis of software requirements regarding technical feasibility is covered by effective risk management, then SWE.1.BP3 shall not be downrated.	105	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.1
[SWE.1.RL.9]	rule		If analysis results of software requirements regarding impact on estimates is not consistently used by project management (MAN.3), then SWE.1.BP3 shall not be downrated.	105	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.1

ID	Type	Dom	RuleTextEN	Page BlueGold	checkable	comment	Precon. CLmin	Scope
[SWE.1.RL.10]	rule		If traceability is established for one path only but not for the other redundant path, SWE.1.BP5 shall not be downrated.	106	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.1
[SWE.2.RL.1]	rule		If non-quantitative analysis approaches or techniques are used and adequate but no quantitative ones, then SWE.2.BP2 shall not be downrated.	106	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.2
[SWE.3.RL.1]	rule		If a software unit in the detailed design is represented in the code by a cluster of programming language (sub-)routines but not by single atomic (sub-)routines then SWE.3.BP1 and SWE.3.BP3 shall not be downrated.	116	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.3 SWE.3
[SWE.3.RL.2]	rule		If code metric targets for a programming language (sub-)routine are formally violated but there are reasonable context-specific arguments why the size and boundary of that routine are acceptable, then SWE.3.BP1 shall not be downrated.	118	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.3
[SWE.3.RL.3]	rule		If a software unit is of such a low complexity from the technical application domain knowledge perspective that its dynamic behavior can be adequately described in text without use of a graphical notation, and only such a textual explanation is available, then SWE.3.BP2 shall not be downrated.	119	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.3
[SWE.4.RL.1]	rule		If it is made reasonably plausible based on context-specific arguments that a particular verification measure is not necessary, then SWE.4.BP1 shall not be downrated.	121	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.4
[SWE.4.RL.2]	rule		If a verification measure is automated and the correctness, completeness, and consistency of the corresponding scripts and programs are not addressed in the verification measure definition, then SWE.4.BP1 shall be downrated.	122	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.4
[SWE.4.RL.3]	rule		If verification measures representing explorative tests, which, by definition, cannot be traced to the detailed design, have no such traceability then SWE.4.BP4 shall not be downrated.	122	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.4
[SWE.4.RL.4]	rule		If selection of verification measures is properly done but based on an inadequate or incomplete release content, then SWE.4.BP2 shall not be downrated.	123	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.4
[SWE.5.RL.1]	rule		If entry/exit criteria are reasonably specified for a set of verification measures instead of each individual verification measure, then SWE.5.BP1 and SWE.5.BP2 shall not be downrated.	123	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.5 SWE.5
[SWE.5.RL.2]	rule		If a verification measure is automated and the correctness, completeness, and consistency of the corresponding scripts and programs are not addressed in the verification measure definition, then SWE.5.BP1 or SWE.5.BP2, respectively, shall be downrated.	124	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.5 SWE.5
[SWE.5.RL.3]	rule		If verification measures representing explorative tests, which, by definition, cannot be traced to the architectural design, have no such traceability then SWE.5.BP6 shall not be downrated.	124	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.5
[SWE.5.RL.4]	rule		If selection of verification measures is properly done but based on an inadequate or incomplete release plan, then SWE.5.BP3 shall not be downrated.	124	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.5
[SWE.6.RL.1]	rule		If entry/exit criteria are reasonably specified for a set of verification measures instead of each individual verification measure, then SWE.6.BP1 shall not be downrated.	125	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.6
[SWE.6.RL.2]	rule		If a verification measure is automated and the correctness, completeness, and consistency of the corresponding scripts and programs are not addressed in the verification measure definition, then SWE.6.BP1 shall be downrated.	125	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.6
[SWE.6.RL.3]	rule		If verification measures representing explorative tests, which, by definition, cannot be traced to the software requirements, have no such traceability then SWE.6.BP4 shall not be downrated.	126	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.6
[SWE.6.RL.4]	rule		If selection of verification measures is properly done but based on an inadequate or incomplete release plan, then SWE.6.BP2 shall not be downrated.	126	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SWE.6
[VAL.1.RL.1]	rule		If entry/exit criteria are reasonably specified for a set of validation measures instead of each individual validation measure, then VAL.1.BP1 shall not be downrated.	128	no	Assessor judgement.	1	VAL.1

ID	Typ	Dom	RuleTextEN	Page BlueGold	checkable	comment	Precon. CLmin	Scope
[VAL.1.RL.2]	rule		If validation measures representing explorative tests, which, by definition, cannot be traced to the requirements, have no such traceability then VAL.1.BP4 shall not be downrated.	128	no	Assessor judgement.	1	VAL.1
[VAL.1.RL.3]	rule		If selection of validation measures is properly done but based on an inadequate or incomplete release plan, then VAL.1.BP2 shall not be downrated.	126	no	Assessor judgement.	1	VAL.1
[MLE.1.RL.1]	rule		If data characteristics or non-functional requirements of the ML data requirements are not addressed then MLE.1.BP1 shall not be rated higher than P.	130	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MLE.1
[MLE.2.RL.1]	rule		If the ML architecture does not consider elements necessary to train, deploy, and test the ML model then MLE.2.BP1 shall not be rated higher than P.	131	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MLE.2
[MLE.3.RL.1]	rule		If the ML training and validation approach does not cover any of the first three aspects then MLE.3.BP1 shall not be rated higher than P.	133	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MLE.3
[MLE.3.RL.2]	rule		If the ML training and validation approach uses validation techniques which do not require separated ML training and validation data sets at ML training start then MLE.3.BP1 shall not be downrated.	133	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MLE.3
[MLE.4.RL.1]	rule		If the ML test approach does not cover any of the first four aspects then MLE.4.BP1 shall not be rated higher than P.	135	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MLE.4
[MLE.4.RL.2]	rule		If the ML test data set is used to perform major changes/optimization of the ML model then MLE.4.BP1 shall not be rated higher than P.	135	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MLE.4
[HWE.1.RL.1]	rule		In the case of hardware development only, if the traceability and consistency from hardware requirements to stakeholder requirements is established then HWE.1.BP5 shall not be downrated.	136	no	Assessor judgement.	1	HWE.1
[HWE.1.RL.2]	rule		If hardware requirements are not derived from system requirements but from platform requirements, then HWE.1.BP1 shall not be downrated.	137	no	Assessor judgement.	1	HWE.1
[HWE.1.RL.3]	rule		If "functional" and "non-functional" are the only requirements categorization or classification criterion, then HWE.1.BP2 shall be rated as N.	137	no	Assessor judgement.	1	HWE.1
[HWE.1.RL.4]	rule		If there is no evidence for prioritization other than a release planning mapping the functionality to future releases, then HWE.1.BP2 shall not be downrated.	137	no	Assessor judgement.	1	HWE.1
[HWE.1.RL.5]	rule		If there is no evidence for prioritization but a separate release plan consistently mapping hardware functionality to future releases then HWE.1.BP2 shall not be downrated.	137	no	Assessor judgement.	1	HWE.1
[HWE.1.RL.6]	rule		If the hardware requirements that are mapped to a particular release do not match with the system requirements mapped to the same release then HWE.1.BP2 shall be downrated.	137	no	Assessor judgement.	1	HWE.1
[HWE.1.RL.7]	rule		If requirements are prioritized by means of a separate project release plan assigned hardware requirements to releases, HWE.1.BP2 shall not be downrated.	137	no	Assessor judgement.	1	HWE.1
[HWE.1.RL.8]	rule		If analysis results of requirements are not demonstrated by means of separate analysis reports or review records but by means of e.g., tool-supported attributes or tool-supported commenting, then HWE.1.BP3 shall not be downrated.	139	no	Assessor judgement.	1	HWE.1
[HWE.1.RL.9]	rule		If the analysis of requirements is not evidenced by separate review records then HWE.1.BP3 shall not be downrated.	139	no	Assessor judgement.	1	HWE.1
[HWE.1.RL.10]	rule		If analysis of hardware requirements regarding technical feasibility is covered by effective risk management, then HWE.1.BP3 shall not be downrated.	139	no	Assessor judgement.	1	HWE.1

ID	Typ	Dom	RuleTextEN	Page BlueGold	checkable	comment	Precon. CLmin	Scope
[HWE.1.RL.11]	rule		If analysis results of hardware requirements regarding impact on estimates is not consistently used by project management (MAN.3), then HWE.1.BP3 shall not be downrated.	139	no	Assessor judgement.	1	HWE.1
[HWE.3.RL.1]	rule		If entry/exit criteria are reasonably specified for a set of verification measures instead of each individual verification measure, then HWE.3.BP1 shall not be downrated.	146	no	Assessor judgement.	1	HWE.3
[HWE.3.RL.2]	rule		If a verification measure is automated and the correctness, completeness, and consistency of the corresponding scripts and programs are not addressed in the verification measure definition, then HWE.3.BP1 shall be downrated.	147	no	Assessor judgement.	1	HWE.3
[HWE.3.RL.3]	rule		If verification measures representing explorative tests, which, by definition, cannot be traced to the hardware design, have no such traceability then HWE.3.BP4 shall not be downrated.	147	no	Assessor judgement.	1	HWE.3
[HWE.3.RL.4]	rule		If selection of verification measures is properly done but based on an inadequate or incomplete release plan, then HWE.3.BP3 shall not be downrated.	147	no	Assessor judgement.	1	HWE.3
[HWE.4.RL.1]	rule		If entry/exit criteria are reasonably specified for a set of verification measures instead of each individual verification measure, then HWE.4.BP1 shall not be downrated.	150	no	Assessor judgement.	1	HWE.4
[HWE.4.RL.2]	rule		If a verification measure is automated and the correctness, completeness, and consistency of the corresponding scripts and programs are not addressed in the verification measure definition, then HWE.4.BP1 shall be downrated.	150	no	Assessor judgement.	1	HWE.4
[HWE.4.RL.3]	rule		If verification measures representing explorative tests, which, by definition, cannot be traced to the hardware requirements, have no such traceability then HWE.4.BP5 shall not be downrated.	150	no	Assessor judgement.	1	HWE.4
[HWE.4.RL.4]	rule		If selection of verification measures is properly done but based on an inadequate or incomplete release plan, then HWE.4.BP3 shall not be downrated.	151	no	Assessor judgement.	1	HWE.4
[SUP.1.RL.1]	rule		If activities for work product quality assurance do not make use of any type of review-oriented method, then BP3 shall be downrated.	153	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.1
[SUP.1.RL.2]	rule		If quality assurance of work products checks for pure existence of work products only without considering any criteria for content correctness and structure, then BP3 shall not be rated higher than P.	153	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.1
[SUP.1.RL.3]	rule		If quality assurance of work products (BP3) is rated N or P, then PA 1.1 shall not be rated higher than L.	153	yes	Precondition: BP3 rating < L RaiseErr if PA 1.1 rating = F	1	SUP.1
[SUP.1.RL.4]	rule		If quality assurance of process activities is based on performing process assessments (either by a customer or internally) only, the indicator BP4 shall be downrated.	153	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.1
[SUP.1.RL.5]	rule		If quality assurance of process activities (BP4) is rated N or P, then PA 1.1 shall not be rated higher than L.	153	yes	Precondition: BP4 rating < L RaiseErr if PA 1.1 rating = F	1	SUP.1
[SUP.1.RL.6]	rule		If non-conformances related to work products are neither identified nor documented, then BP3 shall be downrated.	154	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.1
[SUP.1.RL.7]	rule		If non-conformances related to process activities are neither identified nor documented, then BP4 shall be downrated.	154	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.1
[SUP.1.RL.8]	rule		If escalations are not followed up on by effective corrective actions, then BP7 shall not be rated higher than P.	155	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.1
[SUP.8.RL.1]	rule		If the configuration items identification fails to include stakeholder needs related to the product(s) to be controlled, the indicator BP1 shall not be rated higher than P.	156	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.8

ID	Typ	Dom	RuleTextEN	Page BlueGold	checkable	comment	Precon. CLmin	Scope
[SUP.8.RL.2]	rule		If the identification of configuration items does not sufficiently cover the relevant work products (BP1), and this results in relevant work products not being controlled, baselined and reported, the indicators BP4, BP5 and BP6, respectively, shall be downrated.	156	yes	implemented as 3 rules: Precondition: BP1 rating < F RaiseWarning if BP4 rating = F; or RaiseWarning if BP5 rating = F; or RaiseWarning if BP6 rating = F; or	1	SUP.8
[SUP.8.RL.3]	rule		If there is no dedicated configuration management tool in place, but the established procedure is adequate for the complexity of the product to be developed, then BP3 shall not be downrated.	158	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.8
[SUP.8.RL.4]	rule		If the established mechanisms for configuration management are not able to support the complexity related to the product, the indicator BP3 shall be downrated.	158	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.8
[SUP.8.RL.5]	rule		If baselines for different disciplines or processes are not consistent, or if overall baselines do not exist, the indicator BP7 shall be downrated.	159	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.8
[SUP.8.RL.6]	rule		If establishing baselines (BP5) is downrated, the indicator BP7 shall be downrated.	159	yes	Precondition: BP5 rating < F RaiseErr if BP7 rating = F	1	SUP.8
[SUP.9.RL.1]	rule		If the identification and recording of problems (BP1) is rated P or N due to an imprecise description, then BP2 shall be downrated.	161	yes	Precondition: BP1 rating < L RaiseErr if BP2 rating = F	1	SUP.9
[SUP.9.RL.2]	rule		If rules for urgent problem resolution are defined, but urgent resolution has not been necessary so far, then BP3 shall not be downrated.	162	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.9
[SUP.9.RL.3]	rule		If the status of a problem is set to resolved while associated work items (such as change requests or development tasks etc.) are not yet completed, then SUP.9.BP6 shall be downrated.	164	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.9
[SUP.10.RL.1]	rule		If the analysis omits to address potential side effects, the indicator BP2 shall not be rated F.	166	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.10
[SUP.10.RL.2]	rule		If the identification and recording of changes (BP1) is rated P or N due to insufficient content, then BP2 shall be downrated.	166	yes	Precondition: BP1 rating < L RaiseErr if BP2 rating = F	1	SUP.10
[SUP.10.RL.3]	rule		If not all relevant disciplines or stakeholders are represented in the approval authority the indicator BP3 shall not be rated F.	166	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.10
[SUP.10.RL.4]	rule		If it is apparent that approval decisions are not taken or not taken in time without justification, the indicator BP3 shall be downrated.	166	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.10
[SUP.10.RL.5]	rule		If the analysis of the change request (BP2) is rated P or N, the indicator BP3 shall not be rated higher.	166	yes	Precondition: BP2 rating < L RaiseError if BP3 rating > BP2 rating	1	SUP.10
[SUP.10.RL.6]	rule		If the rating of establishing bidirectional traceability (BP4) is downrated due to missing dependencies between change requests and affected work products, the indicator BP2 shall be downrated.	167	yes	Precondition: BP4 rating < F RaiseErr if BP2 rating = F	1	SUP.10
[SUP.10.RL.7]	rule		If the confirmation of implemented changes misses that relevant processes are not applied, the indicator BP5 shall be downrated.	167	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.10
[SUP.10.RL.8]	rule		If the confirmation of an implemented change request is not including agreed acceptance criteria or policies, the indicator BP5 shall be downrated.	167	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.10
[SUP.10.RL.9]	rule		If the analysis of change requests (BP2) is rated P or N due to missing information regarding their implementation confirmation, the indicator BP5 shall be downrated.	168	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.10
[SUP.10.RL.10]	rule		If the initiator of the change request is not sufficiently authorizing the closure of the change and this is substantial in regard to the project, the indicator BP6 shall be downrated accordingly.	168	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.10

ID	Typ	Dom	RuleTextEN	Page BlueGold	checkable	comment	Precon. CLmin	Scope
[SUP.10.RL.11]	rule		If the initial recording of change requests (BP1) is rated P or N due to missing information about the initiator or reason, the indicator BP6 shall be downrated.	168	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.10
[SUP.11.RL.12]	rule		If required ML data management activities are not supported by the ML data management system then SUP.11.BP1 shall be downrated.	170	no	Assessor judgement.	1	SUP.11
[MAN.3.RL.1]	rule		If the scope of work (BP1) is a product description only, the indicator BP1 shall not be rated higher than L.	171	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3
[MAN.3.RL.2]	rule		If the scope of work (BP1) is not appropriately documented and updated during project life cycle, the indicator BP9 shall not be rated higher than L.	171	no	Assessor judgement. Precondition: BP1 rating < F RaiseWarning if BP9 rating = F	1	MAN.3
[MAN.3.RL.3]	rule		If the required content of the scope of work (BP1) is distributed over several work products, the indicator BP1 shall not be downrated.	171	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3
[MAN.3.RL.4]	rule		If the dependencies between work packages are not identified, the indicator BP4 shall not be rated higher than L.	173	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3
[MAN.3.RL.5]	rule		If any of the following: - start and end date, - planned effort and actual effort, - correction of effort or end date if work package is not completed on time is missing for work packages, the indicator BP4 shall not be rated higher than P.	173	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3
[MAN.3.RL.6]	rule		If the estimation approach used and the origin of the estimates are not reasonable, the indicator BP5 shall not be rated higher than P.	173	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3
[MAN.3.RL.7]	rule		If the size of work packages is larger than two monitoring cycles of the project and the progress of work packages cannot be measured, the indicator BP4 shall be downrated.	173	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3
[MAN.3.RL.8]	rule		If critical dependencies in the schedule are not determined, the indicator BP8 shall be downrated.	173	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3
[MAN.3.RL.9]	rule		If training for process, project and product specific topic is not provided to project participants the indicator BP6 shall be downrated.	174	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3
[MAN.3.RL.10]	rule		If more than two development partners are involved and agreements and commitments are not documented and signed the indicator BP7 shall be downrated.	174	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3
[MAN.3.RL.11]	rule		If the monitoring cycle is not appropriate to detect deviations of planned versus actual planning items, the respective indicators for monitoring (BP4, BP5, BP6, BP7, BP8) shall not be rated higher than P.	174	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3 MAN.3 MAN.3 MAN.3 MAN.3
[MAN.3.RL.12]	rule		If product release deadlines or milestones are not consistent with the release scope, the indicators BP8 and BP9 shall be downrated.	175	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3
[MAN.3.RL.13]	rule		If for the current and next release the expected activities are defined and monitored completely, the indicators BP4 and BP8 shall not be downrated.	175	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3
[MAN.3.RL.14]	rule		If links between different types of planning information are not supported by tools, this shall not be used to downrate the indicator BP9.	175	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3
[MAN.3.RL.15]	rule		If planning information of sub-projects is not consistent with the overall planning the indicator BP9 shall be downrated.	176	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3
[MAN.3.RL.16]	rule		If the definition of work packages, effort and resources, and the definition of schedule(s) do not sufficiently reflect change requests, risk treatment activities, problems, quality issues and defect removals, the indicators BP2, BP8 and BP5 shall be downrated.	176	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3 MAN.3 MAN.3
[MAN.3.RL.17]	rule		If the definition of risk treatment activities (MAN.5.BP5) is downrated due to incomplete definition of risk treatment activities then the indicator BP4 shall be downrated.	176	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3

ID	Typ	Dom	RuleTextEN	Page BlueGold	checkable	comment	Precon. CLmin	Scope
[MAN.3.RL.18]	rule		If the definition of risk treatment activities (MAN.5.BP5) is downrated due to insufficient identification of required project resources for risk treatment activities, then the indicator BP5 shall not be rated higher than L.	176	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3
[MAN.3.RL.19]	rule		If one of the related BPs in the requirement processes for system (SYS.2.BP3), hardware (HWE.1.BP3), software (SWE.1.BP3) or machine learning (MLE.1.BP3) is downrated due to a missing or incomplete analysis regarding technical feasibility, the indicator BP3 shall be downrated.	177	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.3 MAN.3 MAN.3 MAN.3
[MAN.3.RL.20]	rule		If one of the related BPs regarding status of configuration items (SUP.8.BP6) or regarding the status of problems (SUP.9.BP7) is downrated due to a missing or incomplete report, the indicator BP10 shall be downrated.	177	yes	Implemented as several rules Precondition: BPx rating < F RaiseErr if BPy rating = F	1	MAN.3 MAN.3
[MAN.3.RL.21]	rule		If one of the related BPs regarding tracking of problems (SUP.9.BP6) or regarding tracking of change requests (SUP.10.BP6) is downrated due to a missing or incomplete status tracking, the indicator BP4 shall be downrated.	177	yes	Implemented as several rules Precondition: BPx rating < F RaiseErr if BPy rating = F	1	MAN.3 MAN.3
[MAN.5.RL.1]	rule		If risk management does not consider process-related undesirable events, the indicator BP1 shall be downrated.	179	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.5
[MAN.5.RL.2]	rule		If risk management does not consider product-related undesirable events, the indicator BP1 shall be downrated.	179	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.5
[MAN.5.RL.3]	rule		If undesirable events and sources of risks are not updated on a regular basis the indicators BP1 shall not be rated higher than P.	179	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.5
[MAN.5.RL.4]	rule		If risks are not monitored and updated regularly, the indicator BP6 shall be downrated.	179	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.5
[MAN.5.RL.5]	rule		If aspects of reused development results are not considered in the identification of undesirable events, MAN.5.BP2 shall be downrated.	179	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.5
[MAN.5.RL.6]	rule		If severity of impact and probability of occurrence of undesirable events are not evaluated in a reproducible way the indicator BP3 shall be downrated.	179	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.5
[MAN.5.RL.7]	rule		If the definition of risk treatment activities is not suitable to evaluate the progress and effectiveness of risk treatment activities, then BP5 shall not be rated higher than P.	180	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.5
[MAN.5.RL.8]	rule		If monitoring of risk and progress of the mitigation activities is not performed regularly (e.g., synchronized with project monitoring cycle), then BP6 shall not be rated higher than L.	180	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.5
[MAN.5.RL.9]	rule		If BP4 is downrated due to missing risk treatment options, the indicator BP5 shall be downrated.	181	yes	Precondition: BP4 rating < F RaiseErr if BP5 rating = F	1	MAN.5
[MAN.6.RL.1]	rule		If the metric specification is completely documented in terms of the topics listed above, BP2 shall be not be downrated.	182	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.6
[MAN.6.RL.2]	rule		If BP1 is downrated because there is no involvement of the decision makers, the indicators BP5 and BP6 shall be downrated.	183	yes	Implemented as several rules Precondition: BPx rating < F RaiseErr if BPy rating = F	1	MAN.6 MAN.6
[MAN.6.RL.3]	rule		If the analysis and the interpretation of the metrics are not reviewed before decision making, BP4 and BP6 shall be downrated.	183	no	Assessor judgement.	1	MAN.6
[PIM.3.RL.1]	rule		If there is no commitment regarding the improvements, BP1 shall not be rated higher than P.	184	no	Assessor judgement.	1	PIM.3
[PIM.3.RL.2]	rule		The rating of BP5 shall be in line to the rating of BP2.	184	yes	RaiseWarning if PIM.3.BP5 !~ PIM.3.BP2 rating	1	PIM.3

ID	Typ	Dom	RuleTextEN	Page BlueGold	checkable	comment	Precon. CLmin	Scope
[PIM.3.RL.3]	rule		If the indicator BP5 is downrated due to incomplete planning and performance of process improvement activities within scope of a project, then MAN.3.BP4 shall be downrated.	185	yes	Precondition: PIM.3.BP5 rating < F RaiseErr if MAN.3.BP4 rating = F	1	PIM.3
[PIM.3.RL.4]	rule		If the identification of process improvement measures does not consider aspects of improvements identified in SUP.1.BP6, PIM.3.BP2 shall be downrated.	185	no	Assessor judgement.	1	PIM.3
[REU.2.RL.1]	rule		If the analysis of the reuse capability of the product does not consider constraints of the target architecture, BP2 shall not be rated higher than P.	186	no	Assessor judgement.	1	REU.2
[REU.2.RL.2]	rule		If the constraints and defined qualification for the reused product is not based on the analysis (BP2), then BP3 and BP4 shall be downrated.	186	yes	Implemented as several rules Precondition: BPx rating < F RaiseErr if BPy rating = F	1	REU.2 REU.2
[REU.2.RL.3]	rule		If MAN.5.BP1 is downrated due to not considering reuse products in defining risk sources then REU.2.BP4 shall be downrated.	187	no	Precondition: MAN.5.BP1 rating < F RaiseErr if REU.2.BP4 rating = F	1	REU.2
[PA2.1.RL.1]	rule		If a standard process does not include standard or generic objectives, but process performance objectives have been defined, then GP 2.1.1 shall not be downrated.	191	no	Assessor judgement.	2	*
[PA2.1.RL.2]	rule		If a standard process including a standard or generic strategy does not exist, but a strategy is effectively adhered to, then GP 2.1.1 shall not be downrated.	193	no	Assessor judgement.	2	*
[PA2.1.RL.3]	rule		If a strategy is not documented in a specific document, but there is evidence of the strategy adhered to by all relevant parties, then GP 2.1.1 shall not be downrated.	193	no	Assessor judgement.	2	*
[PA2.1.RL.4]	rule		If the strategy is not described in a single process-specific document, but strategies of different processes are combined in one document, then GP 2.1.1 shall not be downrated.	193	no	Assessor judgement.	2	*
[PA2.1.RL.5]	rule		If a documented process performance strategy does not exist, but there is evidence that an effective strategy is followed, then PA 1.1 shall not be downrated.	193	no	Assessor judgement.	2	*
[PA2.1.RL.6]	rule		If no process description is available, but all expected planning information based on the performance objectives exists, then GP 2.1.2 shall not be downrated.	194	no	Assessor judgement.	2	*
[PA2.1.RL.7]	rule		If the determination of critical dependencies of activities and work packages is not considered in the process performance planning, then GP 2.1.2 shall be downrated.	194	no	Assessor judgement.	2	*
[PA2.1.RL.8]	rule		If supporting activities are not planned as explicit activities but are planned as percentage or absolute number of hours over a certain period of time, then GP 2.1.2 shall not be downrated.	195	no	Assessor judgement.	2	*
[PA2.1.RL.9]	rule		If the objectives or the strategy for the performance of the process (GP 2.1.1) is downrated due to missing suitability to achieve the process outcomes, then GP 2.1.2 shall be downrated.	195	yes	PreCondition: GP 2.1.1 < F RaiseError if GP 2.1.2 = F	2	*
[PA2.1.RL.10]	rule		If planning and monitoring only includes the activities for capability level 1, but not the reviewing of work products according to GP 2.2.4, then GP 2.1.2 shall be downrated.	195	no	Assessor judgement.	2	*
[PA2.1.RL.11]	rule		If the determination of resource needs only relates to human resources, but does not include relevant and necessary physical or material resources, then GP 2.1.3 shall not be rated higher than P.	195	no	Assessor judgement.	2	*
[PA2.1.RL.12]	rule		If resource needs are adequately covered but role definitions provided by a standard process are not available, then GP 2.1.3 shall not be downrated.	196	no	Assessor judgement.	2	*
[PA2.1.RL.13]	rule		If the planning of the process performance (GP 2.1.2) is downrated because of not covering the process outcomes or the reviewing of process-specific work products (PA 2.2), then GP 2.1.3 shall be downrated.	196	yes	RaiseError if GP 2.1.3 > GP 2.1.2	2	*
[PA2.1.RL.14]	rule		If the identification and provision of resources relates to individuals only (while also physical or material resources need to be considered), then GP 2.1.4 shall not be rated higher than P.	196	no	Assessor judgement.	2	*

ID	Type	Dom	RuleTextEN	Page BlueGold	checkable	comment	Precon. CLmin	Scope
[PA2.1.RL.15]	rule		If the indicator for determination of resource needs (GP 2.1.3) is downrated due to inadequately or incompletely defined resource needs, then GP 2.1.4 shall be downrated.	197	yes	RaiseError if GP 2.1.4 > GP 2.1.3	2	*
[PA2.1.RL.16]	rule		If the levels of granularity of planning and monitoring do not match in absence of a consistent mapping in between, then GP 2.1.5 shall be downrated.	197	no	Assessor judgement.	2	*
[PA2.1.RL.17]	rule		If the chosen frequency of monitoring activities is not capable of identifying deviations versus plan in time (e.g., not very early before the closure of the activity), then GP 2.1.5 shall be downrated.	198	no	Assessor judgement.	2	*
[PA2.1.RL.18]	rule		If the indicator for planning the performance of the process (GP 2.1.2) is downrated due to incomplete planning of activities and work packages or missing determination of resource needs, then GP 2.1.5 shall be downrated	198	yes	RaiseError if GP 2.1.5 > GP 2.1.2	2	*
[PA2.2.RL.1]	rule		If templates or checklists do not exist for the work product, but content, structure, review and approval and quality criteria are adequately covered and documented, then GP 2.2.1 shall not be downrated.	201	no	Assessor judgement.	2	*
[PA2.2.RL.2]	rule		If standard work product templates provided by a standard process are available, but there is a defined specific solution that is effective although deviating from the standard process, then GP 2.2.1 shall not be downrated	201	no	Assessor judgement.	2	*
[PA2.2.RL.3]	rule		If standard work product templates provided by a standard process are available and used by the process, but do not fit the purpose of the process, then GP 2.2.1 shall be downrated.	201	no	Assessor judgement.	2	*
[PA2.2.RL.4]	rule		If the requirements for storage and control do not cover the minimal required aspects, the indicator GP 2.2.2 shall be downrated.	203	no	Assessor judgement.	2	*
[PA2.2.RL.5]	rule		If the requirements for storing and controlling work products do not cover versioning and storage requirements, then GP 2.2.2 shall not be rated higher than P.	203	no	Assessor judgement.	2	*
[PA2.2.RL.6]	rule		If the definition of a status model for work products with a trivial status definition lacks definitions of workflow, criteria for status changes, stakeholder and their authorization, then GP 2.2.2 shall not be downrated.	203	no	Assessor judgement.	2	*
[PA2.2.RL.7]	rule		If the indicator for defining requirements for storage and control of the work products (GP 2.2.2) is downrated, then GP 2.2.3 shall not be rated higher than that.	203	yes	PreCondition: GP 2.2.2 < F RaiseError if GP 2.2.3 > GP 2.2.2	2	*
[PA2.2.RL.8]	rule		If the proof of work product reviews does not cover all of the required aspects to be demonstrated, then GP 2.2.4 shall be downrated.	204	no	Assessor judgement.	2	*
[PA2.2.RL.9]	rule		If the proof of work product reviews for relevant capability level 1 related work products does not cover the name and version of the work product under review, review findings (unless immediately solved), and the used review and, if applicable, approval criteria, then GP 2.2.4 shall not be rated higher than P.	204	no	Assessor judgement.	2	*
[PA2.2.RL.10]	rule		If for relevant capability level 1 related work products the review findings are not resolved, then GP 2.2.4 shall not be rated higher than P.	204	no	Assessor judgement.	2	*
[PA2.2.RL.11]	rule		If work product reviews can be demonstrated according to all aspects above but are not explicitly documented in a formal review record, then GP 2.2.4 shall not be downrated.	204	no	Assessor judgement.	2	*
[PA2.2.RL.12]	rule		If the indicator for defining requirements for the work products (GP 2.2.1) is downrated due to inappropriate review and, where applicable, approval criteria, then GP 2.2.4 shall be downrated.	204	yes	Assessor judgement.	2	*
[PA3.1.RL.1]	rule		If scope, purpose and intended use are missing in the standard process definition, then GP 3.1.1 shall not be rated F.	209	no	Assessor judgement.	3	*

ID	Typ	Dom	RuleTextEN	Page BlueGold	checkable	comment	Precon. CLmin	Scope
[PA3.1.RL.2]	rule		If process activities including descriptions are missing in the standard process definition, then GP 3.1.1 shall not be rated higher than P.	209	no	Assessor judgement.	3	*
[PA3.1.RL.3]	rule		If required inputs or expected outputs of process activities are missing in the standard process definition, then GP 3.1.1 shall not be rated higher than P.	209	no	Assessor judgement.	3	*
[PA3.1.RL.4]	rule		If the sequence and interactions of process activities within the process or to other processes is not identifiable, then GP 3.1.1 shall not be rated higher than P.	209	no	Assessor judgement.	3	*
[PA3.1.RL.5]	rule		If the sequence and interactions of process activities within the process or to other processes is not explicitly documented as such, but is identifiable (e.g., by work product status and entry/exit criteria), then GP 3.1.1 shall not be downrated.	209	no	Assessor judgement.	3	*
[PA3.1.RL.6]	rule		If explicit templates for the expected outputs are not provided, but corresponding detailed requirements regarding the expected content are existing, then GP 3.1.1 shall not be downrated.	210	no	Assessor judgement.	3	*
[PA3.1.RL.7]	rule		If process performance roles are not identified and assigned to standard process activities, then GP 3.1.1 shall not be rated higher than P.	210	no	Assessor judgement.	3	*
[PA3.1.RL.8]	rule		If the type of involvement of the process roles in the process activities is not defined, then GP 3.1.1 shall be downrated.	210	no	Assessor judgement.	3	*
[PA3.1.RL.9]	rule		If role definition details like competencies, skills, experience, or qualification methods are missing, then GP 3.1.1 shall not be downrated.	210	no	Assessor judgement.	3	*
[PA3.1.RL.10]	rule		If the standard process does not have a unique version identifier, then GP 3.1.1 shall not be rated F.	210	no	Assessor judgement.	3	*
[PA3.1.RL.11]	rule		If changes between standard process versions are not documented and identifiable, then GP 3.1.1 shall be downrated.	211	no	Assessor judgement.	3	*
[PA3.1.RL.12]	rule		If it is unclear when a new version of the standard process becomes mandatory for new projects, or by when running projects will have to switch to the new standard process, then GP 3.1.1 shall be downrated.	211	no	Assessor judgement.	3	*
[PA3.1.RL.13]	rule		If a project uses a former standard process version, the documentation of which is no longer available, then GP 3.1.1. shall be downrated.	211	no	Assessor judgement.	3	*
[PA3.1.RL.14]	rule		If the tailoring guidelines do not include the responsibility for tailoring and corresponding approval, then GP 3.1.1 shall be downrated.	211	no	Assessor judgement.	3	*
[PA3.1.RL.15]	rule		If the same or similar deviations from the standard process are regularly approved (e.g., by waivers) without updating the standard process and/or tailoring guideline, then GP 3.1.1 shall be downrated.	211	no	Assessor judgement.	3	*
[PA3.1.RL.16]	rule		If the type of involvement of the process roles regarding responsibilities, or authorities in standard process activities is not defined, then GP 3.1.2 shall not be downrated.	212	no	Assessor judgement.	3	*
[PA3.1.RL.17]	rule		If required competencies or required skills are missing for the defined process roles, then GP 3.1.2 shall not be rated higher than P.	212	no	Assessor judgement.	3	*
[PA3.1.RL.18]	rule		If qualification methods for human resources are either not determined, or not maintained, or not available for the defined roles, then GP 3.1.2 shall not be rated higher than P.	212	no	Assessor judgement.	3	*
[PA3.1.RL.19]	rule		If requirements for human resources are not determined, then GP 3.1.3 shall not be downrated.	212	no	Assessor judgement.	3	*
[PA3.1.RL.20]	rule		If required tools are not defined, then GP 3.1.3 shall not be rated higher than P.	213	no	Assessor judgement.	3	*
[PA3.1.RL.21]	rule		If the selected methods for monitoring the adequacy of the standard process comply only with internal provisions and do not reflect relevant industry standards or comparable methods capable of achieving capability level 1, then GP 3.1.4 shall be downrated.	213	no	Assessor judgement.	3	*

ID	Typ	Dom	RuleTextEN	Page BlueGold	checkable	comment	Precon. CLmin	Scope
[PA3.1.RL.22]	rule		If continual effectiveness and adequacy monitoring is performed, but no need for process improvements is reasonably identified, then GP 3.1.4 shall not be downrated.	213	no	Assessor judgement.	3	*
[PA3.1.RL.23]	rule		If the standard process does not follow an international standard in terms of naming and structuring of work products, templates, activities, and roles then GP 3.1.1, GP 3.1.2, GP 3.1.3, and GP 3.1.4 shall not be downrated.	214	no	Assessor judgement.	3	*
[PA3.1.RL.24]	rule		If the determined standard process monitoring methods are only of qualitative nature, but still appropriate regarding effectiveness and adequacy, then GP 3.1.4 shall not be downrated.	214	no	Assessor judgement.	3	*
[PA3.2.RL.1]	rule		If the defined process is not selected, documented, and verified according to the tailoring guidelines, then GP 3.2.1 shall be downrated.	215	no	Assessor judgement.	3	*
[PA3.2.RL.2]	rule		If deviations from the standard process are independently approved based on reasonable arguments (e.g., by a waiver), but not reflected in the tailoring guideline, then GP 3.2.1 shall not be downrated.	215	no	Assessor judgement.	3	*
[PA3.2.RL.3]	rule		If no evidence that the assigned persons have the required qualification is available, then GP 3.2.2 shall not be rated higher than P.	216	no	Assessor judgement.	3	*
[PA3.2.RL.4]	rule		If the necessary skills and competencies are not available in time, then GP 3.2.2 shall not be rated F.	216	no	Assessor judgement.	3	*
[PA3.2.RL.5]	rule		If the availability and usage of the human resources is not monitored, then GP 3.2.2 shall not be rated F.	216	no	Assessor judgement.	3	*
[PA3.2.RL.6]	rule		If the availability and usage of the human resources for process improvement is not measured and monitored, then GP 3.2.2 shall not be downrated.	216	no	Assessor judgement.	3	*
[PA3.2.RL.7]	rule		If the organizational support is not adequate to effectively manage and maintain the resources, then GP 3.2.3 shall not be rated F.	217	no	Assessor judgement.	3	*
[PA3.2.RL.8]	rule		If the availability and usage of the resources is not monitored, then GP 3.2.3 shall not be rated F.	217	no	Assessor judgement.	3	*
[PA3.2.RL.9]	rule		If the evaluation of the effectiveness and adequacy of the defined process is not made available to all affected parties, then GP 3.2.4 shall not be rated F.	217	no	Assessor judgement.	3	*
[PA3.1.RL.25]	rule		If the indicator 3.2.4 is downrated due to missing or inadequate information from monitoring the performance of the process, then GP 3.1.1 shall not be rated F.	219	yes	PreCondition: GP 3.2.4 < F RaiseError if GP 3.1.1 = F	3	*
[PA3.2.RL.10]	rule		If the indicator GP 3.1.1 is downrated due to missing or inadequate definition of the standard process, the indicator GP 3.2.1 shall be downrated.	219	no	PreCondition: GP 3.1.1 < F RaiseError if GP 3.2.1 = F	3	*
[PA3.2.RL.11]	rule		If the indicator GP 3.1.1 is downrated due to missing or inadequate definitions of roles, responsibilities and authorities, the indicator GP 3.2.2 shall be downrated.	219	no	PreCondition: GP 3.1.1 < F RaiseError if GP 3.2.2 = F	3	*
[PA3.2.RL.12]	rule		If the indicator GP 3.1.2 is downrated due to missing or inadequate definitions of competencies, skills or experience, the indicator GP 3.2.2 shall be downrated.	219	yes	PreCondition: GP 3.1.2 < F RaiseError if GP 3.2.2 = F	3	*
[PA3.2.RL.13]	rule		If the indicator GP 3.1.3 is downrated due to missing or inadequate definitions of resources, the indicator GP 3.2.3 shall be downrated.	219	yes	PreCondition: GP 3.1.3 < F RaiseError if GP 3.2.3 = F	3	*

ID	Type	Dom	RuleTextEN	Page BlueGold	checkable	comment	Precon. CLmin	Scope
[PA3.2.RL.14]	rule		If collecting and analyzing the required information is not performed according to the defined methods and activities (GP 3.1.4), the indicator GP 3.2.4 shall be downrated.	219	no	Possible PreCondition: GP 3.1.4 < F Possibly RaiseError if GP 3.2.4 = F	3	*
[PA3.2.RL.15]	rule		If GP 2.1.3 is downrated due to missing or inadequate determination of responsibilities, authorities, knowledge or skills the indicator GP 3.2.2 shall be downrated.	220	yes	PreCondition: GP 2.1.3 < F RaiseError if GP 3.2.2 = F	3	*
[PA3.2.RL.16]	rule		If the identification, allocation and availability of resources (GP 2.1.4) is downrated due to human resources issues, the indicator GP 3.2.2 shall be downrated.	221	no	PreCondition: GP 2.1.4 < F Possibly RaiseError if GP 3.2.2 = F	3	*
[PA3.2.RL.17]	rule		If GP 2.1.4 is downrated due to missing or inadequate qualification of individuals, then GP 3.2.2 shall be downrated.	221	no	PreCondition: GP 2.1.4 < F Possibly RaiseError if GP 3.2.2 = F	3	*
[PA3.2.RL.18]	rule		If the identification, allocation and availability of resources (GP 2.1.4) is downrated due to physical or material resource issues, then GP 3.2.3 shall be downrated.	221	no	PreCondition: GP 2.1.4 < F Possibly RaiseError if GP 3.2.3 = F	3	*