



ISO/IEC JTC1/SC7
Software Engineering
Secretariat: CANADA (SCC)

ISO/IEC JTC1/SC7 N1593

1996-11-13

Doc. Type	Comment Disposition Report
Title	Comment Disposition Report on the PDTR registration ballot of ISO/IEC15504-2: Information Technology - Software Process Assessment Part 2 - A Reference Model For Processes And Process Capability.
Source	WG10
Project	07.29.02
Status	Final
Reference	N1406
Action ID	FYI or ACT
Due Date	
Mailing Date	1996-11-13
Distribution	Electronic: SC7_AG; Disk: P, O and L
Medium	E-Mail - uuencoded Word ; Diskette - Word
No. of Pages	28
Disk	14
Note	

ISO/IEC JTC1/SC7 WG10 N102

TITLE: COMMENTS DISPOSITION REPORT

PDTR Registration Ballot
Software Process Assessment Part 2

SOURCE: WG10

WORK ITEM: 07.29

REFERENCES: SC7 N1472

ACTION: Information

DATE: 30 September 1996

The table below provides the comment dispositions from the PDTR Registration ballot for Part 2 of the Software Process Assessment set of documents. The table contains all of the comments that remained applicable to the Part 2 document after the restructuring of the document set as outlined in ISO/IEC JTC1/SC7 WG10 N088 titled "Restructuring of Parts 2, 3, 4 and 5". A large number of the comments received were no longer applicable to Part 2 and were passed on to the editors of Part 5 for disposition.

The columns in the table can be defined as follows:

No	Indicates the specific comment number in the format XXX-## where XXX = Country abbreviation ## = sequential comment number
Comment Type	This indicates the type of comment(technical, editorial or clarity). If not used it is blank
Priority	Relative priority of the comment (High, Medium and Low) . If not used it is blank
Text Reference	Section reference to the old Part 2 document or General/Global comment that applies to the entire document
New Part	Should always be 2 which indicates that the comment still applies to Part 2
Comment	The verbatim text of the comment
Action	N = Noted A = Accepted & incorporated into document or used as basis for revised text O = Overtaken by events - changes to documents made comment irrelevant W = Withdrawn (by agreement with national body representative) R = Rejected G = Covered in disposition of general comments

No	Comment Type	Priority	Text Reference	New Part	Comment	Action
AUS-2				2	"practices fundamental to good software engineering" - delete "good"; this implies a normative element which is not intended. WORDING WAS PART OF THE REQUIREMENTS DOCUMENT - N944R.	N
AUS-3				2	"which can be is used by the other parts of this International Standard".	N
AUS-4				2	"The model contained in this document" <u>This document defines a model which</u> describes processes that an organization may perform" WORDING CHANGED	A
AUS-12				2	"The Engineering process category consists of processes that directly specify, implement, or maintain a system and software product and its user associated documentation" THIS IS MEANT TO SPECIFY THAT THE USER DOC IS PART OF THE PRODUCT. GENERAL ASSOCIATED DOCUMENTATION(ie.Design, Test, etc.) IS HANDLED IN SUP.1.	R
AUS-18				2	The descriptions of Capability Levels should be summarised only in this section. The detailed analyses of CLs should be in Section 5. For this Section: "Level 0; Not-Performed: There is general failure to perform the base practices in the process. Level 1; Performed-Informally: Base practices of the process are generally performed. Level 2; Planned-and-Tracked: Performance of the base practices in the process is planned and tracked. Level 3; Well-Defined: Base practices are performed according to a well-defined process using approved, tailored versions of standard, documented processes. Level 4; Quantitatively-Controlled: Detailed measures of performance are collected and analyzed. This leads to a quantitative understanding of process capability and an improved ability to predict performance. Level 5; Continuously-Improving: Continuous process improvement is enabled by quantitative feedback from performing the defined processes and from piloting innovative ideas and technologies." MOVED TO SECTION 4 - Structure of the reference model.	A
AUS-25			Scope	2	This is not really a Scope statement; it requires substantial work to make it so. SCOPE REWRITTEN	A

No	Comment Type	Priority	Text Reference	New Part	Comment	Action
AUS-26				2	Para 1: - "The model defines, at a high level, the fundamental activities (practices) that are essential to good software engineering" WORDING WAS PART OF THE REQUIREMENTS DOCUMENT - N944R.	N
AUS-29				2	Para 5 should come ahead of Para 4 (see comment above regarding the need for consistency in ordering BPs and GPs). SCOPE REWRITTEN	A
AUS-38				2	The detailed descriptions of the Capability Levels should be in this Section. MOVED TO SECTION 4 - Structure of the reference model.	N
AUS-70				2	Confusion between software and system WORDING FOR CUS.1 DOES NOT USE THE WORD SYSTEM	A
AUS-71			Note	2	Meaning of "external" SEE ESI-8 - REFERENCE TO BE REWORDED	N
AUS-98				2	No evidence of tracking req's in the Base Practices (in this Process) CUSOMER REQUIREMENTS TRACKING INCLUDED IN CUS.2	A
AUS-159			Global-Vocab	2	Is there a common agreement on meaning of "system" - USE ISO 12207 P5 3.31 DEF	N
AUS-281				2	Needs to be referenced to 9126. ADD AS A NOTE	N
AUS-384			SUP 4	2	Detle "and removed" - replace with "and resolved". WORDING CHANGED TO INCLUDE RESOLUTION IN SUP.8	A
AUS-414				2	There needs to be specific identification of the Process Owner.	R
AUS-480			General	2	Australia strongly supports the strategy for developing this document agreed at the recent WG10 meeting at Kwa Maritaine and embodied in the papers defined at that meeting. If this strategy is followed, many of the detailed Australian comments lodged earlier will be addressed as part of the envisaged restructuring. Others - relating to wording and style - may provide useful input into the forthcoming work. THE RESTRUCTURING OF THE DOCUMENTS AND CHANGES TO PART2 TAKE THIS COMMENT INTO ACCOUNT.	A
ESI-8	Clarity		6.1 CUS	2	Clarify interpretation of CUS processes for different customer situations (2 party, internal, product development sub-contract) - REFER AUS-71	N
ESI-16	Technical		6.2 ENG 7	2	Review content of ENG 7 for consistency and overlap with other ENG and CUS processes which deal with the same topics. ENG.7 CHANGED WITH POINTERS(NOTES) TO CUS AND SUP.	A
ITA-1				2	Implement the proposal for changes in the architecture described in the document WG10/N080 taking into account the concerns expressed by the Italian delegation during the South African meeting which are : THE RESTRUCTURING OF THE DOCUMENTS AND CHANGES TO PART2 TAKE THIS COMMENT INTO ACCOUNT.	A

No	Comment Type	Priority	Text Reference	New Part	Comment	Action
ITA-2				2	Nomenclature: change from capability to ability We feel there is no need to change the term capability to ability. THE TERM CAPABILITY HAS BEEN RETAINED	A
ITA-3				2	Functional dimension contains primary and supporting processes. It should also cover organisational processes. THE ORG CATEGORY REMAINS IN THE FUNCTIONAL DIMENSION	A
MEX-1				2	Mexico strongly supports the "Proposal for Changes to the Architecture" [WG10/N080] given that: a) it reflects thoroughly the "Diaz Proposal" made on behalf the Mexican delegation during the South Africa meeting; b) we contributed through our direct involvement in the small team tasked by WG10 for this purpose; c) it was unanimously approved by all participating countries to proceed in that direction after an intense working week; d) it will be further refined through the "Other Working Group" and contribute to ensure that all other part become consistent and coherent with this restructuring of the architecture. The Mexican comments & concerns to WG10/N080 have been forwarded to the OWG and are the following: THE RESTRUCTURING OF THE DOCUMENTS AND CHANGES TO PART2 TAKE THIS COMMENT INTO ACCOUNT.	A
UK-4	Editorial	Low	Introduction, Table 1	2	This would be more useful in the Scope. Under 'Why' include 'Enable organisation to assess its current capability' to emphasise the use of SPICE in self-assessment. REFER AUS-25 USAGE TABLE MODIFIED TO INCLUDE THIS "WHY".	A
UK-5	Editorial	Low	Scope	2	This is not a scope, but a summary of the Part. The scope ought to contain a list of benefits and details of intended users of the document and their required skills. The scope should also describe what the document is intended to be used for, not 'applied to'. No incentive is given to use this document. REFER AUS-25 SCOPE STATEMENT REWRITTEN.	A

No	Comment Type	Priority	Text Reference	New Part	Comment	Action
UK-8	Technical	High	5, Tables 2-6	2	<p>There is inconsistent granularity in the capability levels, common features and generic practices. The organisation of generic practices and common features into capability levels is not entirely logical. The relationship between generic practices and the processes that implement them is also confusing and the application of capability levels to such processes is often problematic. There is inconsistency in the stringency in the requirements of the base practices across the processes. The model needs to be revised to address these issues. In particular common features should be better organised to enable rating at the common feature level (rather than the generic practice level) to be meaningful and sufficient (to reduce the number of ratings and be consistent with rating processes at the process level).. The revision of the model needs to satisfy the following requirements:</p> <p>There must be a definition of what the <i>capabilities</i> are that <u>any</u> process can attain. i.e. <i>Capabilities</i> should apply to all processes.</p> <p>There must be a definition of what purpose the <i>capability</i> fulfils i.e. what it delivers.</p> <p>There must be a definition of how <i>capabilities</i> are attained.</p> <p>There must be a definition of what aspects of these <i>capabilities</i> are associated with instantiations of the process within projects and across the organisation. i.e. Some <i>capabilities</i> can be said to be capabilities of the project (or process instance) while some are <i>capabilities</i> of the organisation.</p> <p>The process measures must be readily comprehensible, clearly defined and directly related to the <i>capabilities</i>.</p> <p>The process measures must have a consistent meaning for every instance of every process.</p> <p>All process measures must be applied consistently - i.e. there should be consistent use of supporting information (e.g. base practice ratings).</p> <p>Each process measure must make sense on a per process basis. i.e. No fundamental process measure should be 'not applicable' for certain processes.</p> <p>Process measures must be capable of being summarised.</p> <p>ADDRESSED BY CAPABILITY DIMENSION</p>	A
UK-18	Technical	Medium	6	2	<p>There is no process dealing with causal analysis, corrective and preventative action. Such a process should include practices such as 'establish cause of defect', 'identify preventative action' and 'implement preventative action to eliminate cause of future defects'.</p> <p>REVISIONS MADE TO ORG.3 AND SUP.8 BUT DIRECT REFERENCE TO A METHOD A "HOW" (CAUSAL ANALYSIS) NOT INCLUDED.</p>	A
UK-20	Technical	Medium	6	2	<p>There is an overlap between processes, for example: software maintenance: ENG.7 and CUS and other ENG processes</p> <p>NOTES EXPANDED TO POINT TO CUS & SUP.</p>	A

No	Comment Type	Priority	Text Reference	New Part	Comment	Action
UK-40	Technical	Low	6.2, ENG.3, para 1	2	Replace 'effectively accommodates the software requirements' by 'implements the software requirements'. WORDING CHANGED	A
UK-67	Editorial	Medium	C	2	This entire section should be re-worked in line with revised model and make consistent and clearer throughout. THIS ANNEX HAS INTEGRATED INTO THE DOCUMENT IN SECTION 4 Structure of the reference model.	A
UK-69	Editorial	Medium	D	2	Revise the example in line with the revised model. AN EXAMPLE HAS NOT BEEN INCLUDED IN PART 2.	R
UK-71	Editorial	Low	F	2	More guidance could be given in this annex.. For example, control of quality records only identifies common features 2.3 and 2.4, whereas base practice ORG.2 - define the process - features an explicit reference to the need for quality records; statistical techniques identifies common features 4.1 and 4.2, whereas ORG.3 improve the process is directly relevant . Many organisations with ISO9001 based quality systems will be looking to this section. THIS ANNEX HAS BEEN ELIMINATED IN FAVOR OF DIRECT POINTERS TO 12207 IN THE BODY OF THE DOCUMENT.	N
USA-1				2	This paper supplements the initial comments on Parts 2, 5 dated 10/18/95. They include discussions that occurred at the WG10 meeting the week of Nov. 13-17, 1995. The accompanying paper N080 is result of discussions involving ideas raised by the US delegation at the recent WG10 meeting. In principle the concepts contained in the paper address the majority of the US concerns on results of project 7.29, Software Process Assessment. When the concepts of N080 are implemented the results of project 7.29 should be close to the intent of the project 7.29 tempered by the realities of trials process. WG10/N080: WG10 Meeting Kwa Maritane THE RESTRUCTURING OF THE DOCUMENTS AND CHANGES TO PART2 TAKE THIS COMMENT INTO ACCOUNT.	A

No	Comment Type	Priority	Text Reference	New Part	Comment	Action
AUS-8				2	"The model categorizes <u>classifies</u> processes into five process categories INTRODUCTION WORDING CHANGED.	A
AUS-9				2	Indent definitions of process categories INTRODUCTION WORDING CHANGED.	A
AUS-21			Table 1	2	"As a reference guide to highlight process and practices considerations considerations of processes and practices." WORDING CHANGED TO INCLUDE PROCESS & CAPABILITY CONSIDERATIONS.	A
AUS-22				2	Replace "practice checklist" with "checklist of practices" (ambiguous) WORDING CHANGED TO INCLUDE BOTH PROCESS AND CAPABILITY CONSIDERATIONS.	A
AUS-23				2	"Prior to before an assessment" (occurs twice)	R
AUS-56			Global	2	Confusion in terminology - "customer" "acquirer" "supplier" REFERENCES TO ACQUIRER AND SUPPLIER HAVE BEEN REDUCED AND EXPLAINED WHERE USED.	A
AUS-57			Global	2	Inconsistent style with colons ahead of bulleted lists	A
157			Global	2	Mixed level of cross-referencing, and some inconsistency	A
224			Eng 7	2	Cross-references are incorrect CROSS REFERENCES HAVE BEEN CORRECTED.	A
283			General	2	Use of the terms 'SLC' and 'projects, products and activities' is not consistent through the document as a whole. REFERENCE TO 12207 LIFE CYCLE'S WHENEVER POSSIBLE AND CONSISTENCY HAS BEEN IMPROVED.	A
432			ORG.3	2	"in line with the business need" - sentence is poorly constructed.	R
IRE-15		Low	2 Norm-ative	2	"of" instead of "og" WORDING OF THIS SECTION HAS CHANGED.	A
IRE-16		Low	6 Base practices	2	Double period at end of first paragraph THIS SECTION HAS BEEN ELIMINATED FROM PART 2.	A
UK-1	Editorial	High	General	2	The clause numbers in this document are unusual. Is this acceptable for a Technical Report? It is not for a standard. This Technical Report is very complicated and the explanations in the early sections, whilst enthusiastic, are pitched at someone with a considerable knowledge of IT, quality and process improvement. THE DETAILED EXPLANATIONS IN PART 2 HAVE BEEN SIMPLIFIED GREATLY AND THE SHEER COMPLEXITY OF THE REFERENCE MODEL HAS BEEN SIMPLIFIED AS WELL. THE CLAUSE NUMBERING IT WILL REMAIN THE SAME.	A

No	Comment Type	Priority	Text Reference	New Part	Comment	Action
UK-3	Editorial	Low	Forward	2	What is the purpose of this section? Is it intended to leave it in the final version? THE FORWARD IS A STANDARD SECTION IN ALL DOCUMENTS AND WILL BE ELIMINTAED IN THE FINAL VERSION.	N
UK-68	Editorial	Medium	C.3, Figure 2	2	What does a line connecting two boxes mean? It is hard to give this diagram any interpretation without either knowing what lines mean or annotating each with its meaning. This picture is absolutely central to the SPICE scheme and it's a pity it does not get given the status (detail and position) it deserves. THIS FIGURE SEEMED TO CAUSE MORE CONFUSION AND THUS WAS ELIMINATED. IN ADDITION THE PRACTICES PART OF THE DIAGRAM HAVE BEEN MOVED TO PART 5.	R
UK-72	Editorial	Low	F, Table 10	2	For user convenience the processes in the table should be labelled with clause numbers from this Part as well as ISO 9001. THIS ANNEX HAS BEEN ELIMINATED IN FAVOR OF DIRECT POINTERS TO 12207 IN THE BODY OF THE DOCUMENT.	N

No	Comment Type	Priority	Text Reference	New Part	Comment	Action
AUS-1			Introduction	2	The Introduction contains much material that is not appropriate to this function. It should be a much smaller section, providing a real introduction to the document. Much of the current section, together with a substantial amount of material from Annex C, should form a new Section 4 with a title such as "Description of the Model". THE INTRODUCTION SECTION HAS BEEN GREATLY REDUCED AND SECTION 4 NOW CONTAINS A DESCRIPTION OF THE STRUCTURE OF THE REFERENCE MODEL.	A
AUS-11				2	"The Customer-Supplier process category consists of processes that directly impact the customer, support development and transition transfer of the software to the customer, and provide support for its correct operation and use" WORDING HAS REMAINED THE SAME.	R
146			CUS.7	2	"acceptable" level of service? - inconsistencies with previous style e.g. (correct and) effective THE WORD ACCEPTABLE HAS BEEN RETAINED BUT ONE OF THE GOALS OF THIS PROCESS IS TO DEFINE AND REFINE THE LEVEL OF SERVICE.	A
188			ENG.2	2	No prioritising of requirements MODIFY CUS.2 THE PRIORITIZATION OF REQUIREMENTS HAS NOW BEEN INCLUDED.	A
189			ENG.2	2	No establishment of traceability TRACEABILITY TO REQUIREMENTS HAS BEEN INCLUDED IN ENG.3.	A
214			Eng 6	2	The meaning of "integrate" seems to be different from Eng 5. Refer also comment #5. THE TERM INTEGRATE IS USED IN BOTH ENG.5 AND ENG.6 BUT AN CLEAR EXPLANATION DESCRIBING WHAT TO INTEGRATE IS INCLUDED.	R
215			Eng 5	2	The model in Eng 5 implies two levels of aggregation/integration; however, the difference between the two levels is not clear. 9 & 10 reflect this lack of clarity. THE TERM INTEGRATE IS USED IN BOTH ENG.5 AND ENG.6 BUT AN CLEAR EXPLANATION DESCRIBING WHAT TO INTEGRATE IS INCLUDED.	R
216			Eng 6	2	Definition of "system" needs to be clarified (same comment last time).	N
218				2	Very difficult to define the difference between Eng 5 and Eng 6 EXPLANATION HAS BEEN PROVIDED.	A
219				2	There is a need for a BP in Eng 6 analogous to Eng 5 CONSENSUS DECISION MADE TO KEEP BOTH ENG.5 & ENG.6 AS IS.	N
220				2	Should Eng 5 and Eng 6 be removed and combined into a new SUP Process "Validate software and system"? CONSENSUS DECISION MADE TO KEEP BOTH ENG.5 & ENG.6 AS IS.	N
230			6.3	2	There are significant problems with the PRO category. It maps poorly to 12207, and contains processes that do not fit together cleanly. THE PRO CATEGORY HAS BEEN CHANGED TO THE MAN CATEGORY WITH A REDUCED SET OF PROCESSES AND ALIGNED TO 12207.	A

No	Comment Type	Priority	Text Reference	New Part	Comment	Action
231			6.3	2	The category should contain specifically only those processes relating to the establishment and management of projects. THE PRO CATEGORY HAS BEEN CHANGED TO THE MAN CATEGORY WITH A REDUCED SET OF PROCESSES AND ALIGNED TO 12207.	A
254			PRO.3	2	More ORG than PRO AGREED, THE ESENCE OF THIS HAS BEEN INCLUDED IN ORG.4.	A
255				2	Maintenance of project team is an issue that needs to be addressed. AGREED, THE TEAM MAINTENANCE ASPECT HAS BEEN ELIMINATED.	A
269			PRO.4	2	More needs to be made of the relationship with ENG.1 and 2. AGREED, OLD PRO.4 HAS BEEN ELIMINATED AND NOW PART OF ENG.	A
271				2	The question of requirements elicitation, management and analysis needs to be examined in more depths and the assignment of functions to CUS,ENG and PRO clarified. AGREED, OLD PRO.4 HAS BEEN ELIMINATED AND ALL MANAGEMENT OF REQUIREMENTS ARE NOW PART OF ENG. AND CUS WITH EXPLANATION.	A
279				2	A process with this description should be treated at the ORG level. CONSENSUS DECISION WAS TO LEAVE THIS IN THE MAN CATEGORY.	R
280				2	Management of (product) quality is really part of managing requirements. CONSENSUS DECISION WAS TO LEAVE THE MANAGEMNT OF PRODUCT QUALITY IN THE MAN CATEGORY.	R
282				2	Insufficient focus on process quality. PROCESS QUALITY IS A MAJOR PART OF THE CAPABILITY DIMENSION.	R
291				2	This should be an ORG process - there should then be a req to apply it at the project level CONSENSUS DECISION WAS TO LEAVE RISK MANAGEMENT IN THE MAN CATEGORY.	R
318				2	Expect more "mirroring" of CUS processes - 12207 achieves this better! MORE ALIGNMENT AND REFERNCE TO 12207 HAS BEEN INCLUDED.	A
319				2	There should be a more generic process related to "suppliers" in ORG CONSENSUS DECISION TO LEAVE THE MANAGEMENT OF SUBCONTRACTORS/SUPPLIERS IN MAN (OLD PRO).	R
404			ORG	2	Establishment of a QMS at the organisational level is not easily evaluated within this framework. THE CURRENT SHOULD NOT PRECLUDE THE CREATION OF A QMS.	N
413				2	Split ORG 2 into two processes: "Establish Quality Management System" and "Define the Process". AUS TO TRY TO RUN TRIAL ON THIS	W

No	Comment Type	Priority	Text Reference	New Part	Comment	Action
ESI-1	Technical		6.5 ORG	2	All of the ORG Process Category would appear to describe a high capability level. The integration of this with the other process categories and the rating system should be reviewed for consistency. For example, a Level 1 Org Rating is clearly more advanced than a Level 1 ENG Rating. THIS MAY BE TRUE DUE TO THE FACT THAT DIFFERENT PROCESSES AND PROCESS CATEGORIES WILL MATURE AT DIFFERENT SPEEDS. PART 2 DOES NOT TRY TO INDICTAE WHICH ONE'S TO MATURE FIRST.	N
ESI-3	Technical		6.5 ORG	2	Further guidance should be given to explain how this process category is positioned in the model and its relationship with the others and the generic practices as the assessment of its processes was very difficult. THERE HAS BEEN NO POISITIONING OF ANY OF THE CATEGORIES IN THE MODEL. THE SCOPE OF ORG HAS CHANGED TO ACCOMODATE SOME OF THE OLD PROCESS(IE. CREATE PROJECT TEAMS) AND FOR CLARITY 2 OLD ORG PROCESSES(6 & 7) HAVE BEEN COMBINED INTO ORG.5.	N
ESI-9	Clarity		6.1 CUS	2	Clarify impact of customer input on assessed capability. For example, use of customer mandated standards; joint customer-supplier developments; actual capability of the customer - could it affect the supplier assessment if the customer capability is low e.g. will not take part in joint reviews and audits etc. AGREED, THE CAPABILITY OF THE CUSTOMER WRT JOINT REVIEWS MAY HAVE AN IMPACT ON THE SUPLIERS CAPABILITY. FOR THE USE OF CUSTOMER MANDATED STANDARDS, ETC. , THIS SHOULD BE CAPTURED IN THE MANAGEMENT OF CUSTOMER REQUIREMENTS.	N
ESI-13	Technical		6.2 ENG 4 & 5	2	Processes ENG 4&5 should be reviewed to make these processes more consistent with standard lifecycle models. Consideration should be given to three processes Code- Integrate and Test - Test. CONSENSUS DECISION WAS TO LEAVE ENG 4 & 5 THE SAME.	N
ESI-18	Clarity		6.3 PRO 5	2	Clarify the relationship between PRO 5 and SUP 3. A clear explanation of Quality Goals would help to make the distinction. The positioning of this as a process with its base practices should also be reviewed as it seems to be suited a Capability Level higher than 1. EXPLANATION HAS BEEN PROVIDED FOR CLARIFICATION	A
ESI-38	Clarity		AnnexC	2	Provide better description of the model by : Highlighting the major threads between each Capability Level; Explicitly defining the links between GPs, Processes, Practices and Capability Levels including the existence of them at different levels; ANNEX C HAS BEEN ELIMINATED.	N
ESI-39	Clarity		Annex D	2	Review all of annex D and the Example used to more clearly express the meaning of the GPs and how to assess their adequacy. ANNEX D & E HAVE BEEN ELIMINATED FROM PART 2. PART 5 SHOULD PROVIDE THE DETAIL REQUIRED.	N

No	Comment Type	Priority	Text Reference	New Part	Comment	Action
ESI-40	Technical		General	2	Ensure that the words 'audit' and 'verify' are used are consistent with ISO Definition. e.g GP 2.3.2 Audit work products - unclear whether this means audit or verify. THE TERM ADUIT HAS BEEN ELIMINATED FROM THE CAPABILITY DIMENSION.	A
IRE-1		High	5	2	<p>The dual architecture of Process Category and Capability Level should be scrapped. The Process Categories should remain as a concept, with a simple and easily understood set of Common Features which might be incorporated as base practices in each process, where they are not already. Recommend something that looks like: Process Category A</p> <p>Process 1 Capability level 1 Base practice 1 Base practice 2 Capability level 2 Base practice 3 Base practice 4 Base practice 5 Capability level 3 Base practice 6 Process 2 etc. Process Category B etc.</p> <p>Rationale: the assessment is no better than our ability to gather and convey results and recommendations in understandable and timely fashion to the client; this is so complicated, I don't see how to do that.</p> <p>THE PROBLEM HIGHLIGHTED HERE IS THE COMPLEXITY OF THE OLD MODEL. THE CURRENT MODEL HAS BEEN GREATLY SIMPLIFIED IN ORDER TO PROVIDE AN SIMPLIER MANNER TO COLLECT DATA IN AN ASSESSMENT.</p>	A
IRE-2		High	6.1	2	<p>Comment: This category implies a specific customer exists but it may not. Developers of general software products may have distributors, for example who do not specify requirements, but merely sell the product. I assume this process category would not be assessed the same for product developers as for developers of bespoke software, for example. REFER AUS-71 & ESI-8.</p> <p>THIS CATEGORY DOES ASSUME A CUSTOMER OR A REPRESENTATIVE OF A CUSTOMER SEGMENT IS PART OF THE PROCESS. DURING THE PLANNING OF AN ASSESSMENT ONE, THE INCLUSION OR EXCLUSION OF THIS CATEGORY WILL BE REVIEWED.</p>	N

No	Comment Type	Priority	Text Reference	New Part	Comment	Action
IRE-3		High	6.3	2	Comment: not all software activities are performed as part of a project. I assume that maintenance environments without development projects would not be assessed under this process category. THE ANSWER TO THE QUESTION IS YES. THIS WAS THE MAIN REASON THAT THE OLD PRO CATEGORY WAS RENAMED TO MAN.	A
IRE-11		Medium	ENG.4.2	2	Remove references to unit test. Rationale: some organisations have eliminated unit testing in favour of reviews and other verification procedures; not appropriate for a standard. AGREED, THE USE OF THE TERM VERIFY (RATHER THEN TEST)THE UNITS HAS BEEN USED.	A
ITA-4				2	Project/organisational view needs more explanation to ensure that it does not mean CMM. THE PRO CATEGORY HAS BEEN ELIMINATED IN FAVOR OF THE MAN CATEGORY IN AN ATTEMPT TO CLARIFY THIS.	A
ITA-5				2	Migration/Alignment of current methods The original idea was to put together the best features of existing methods in a common framework to which each method would eventually align. The current proposal seems to accept the idea that some methods have fundamental elements which the method providers are not willing to abandon (because they are considered fundamentally good features). If this is so, this means that in WG10 we do not agree on what are the best features of an assessment method and we admit that different methods will continue to exist which are fundamentally different. A SEPARATE SECTION TITLED SECTION 7 Compatibility with the reference model HAS BEEN INCLUDED IN PART 2 TO ADDRESS THIS ISSUE.	A
MEX-2				3	Clarification of the project/organisational link or interpretation. Up to now the SPICE architecture and measurement framework are based on the aggregation of project instances to derive a "process capability profile". Given that within the process model there are "organisational type" categories and/or processes, such as organisaional & support categories, clarification or guidance should be made on the inferences that could, and will probably be done, to induce/present it as an "organisational capability profile".	W
SA-2			ORG 1	2	Cannot be rated 'fully adequate' in the generic practices Comments : A limitation of the model WHY NOT? CLARIFICATION REQUIRED	N

No	Comment Type	Priority	Text Reference	New Part	Comment	Action
UK-17	Technical	High	5, 6.3 - 6.5	2	There is an overlap between generic practices and base practices of ORG, PRO and SUP, which although probably intentional makes the model overly complex and assessment difficult. For example: planning: generic practice 2.1.6 and PRO.2; tracking: generic practice 2.4.1 and PRO.7.2; audit work products: generic practice 2.3.2 and SUP.3.3; peer reviews: generic practice between 3.2.2 and SUP.5; configuration management: generic practice 2.2.2 and SUP.2. In addressing comment #1, this issue of complexity must also be addressed. THIS IS AN INTENDED DESIGN FEATURE IN THE NEW ARCHITECTURE, WHICH HAS BEEN CONSIDERABLY SIMPLIFIED WITH THE INCLUSION OF CROSS REFERENCES BETWEEN THE PROCESSES. INTRODUCTION TO 'CAPABILITY DIMENSION' HAS BEEN EXPANDED	A
UK-45	Technical	Low	6.2, ENG.6	2	This section makes no mention of the testing of user aspects of the system at all. Reference should be made to the new Usability Process proposed above and based on ISO 13407. REFER UK-31 The tests described in ENG.6 appear not to have a defined context of measurement. THE ENG.6 EXPLANATION HAS BEEN EXPANDED TO INCLUDE THIS ASPECT.	A
UK-61	Technical	Medium	6.5, ORG.1	2	This is very dangerous territory and should not be included in this standard. CONSENSUS DECISION TO LEAVE THIS IN THE REFERENCE MODEL.	R
UK-66	Editorial	Low	A.1	2	Replace existing heading with 'Requirements for extended processes_ and variant models'. Reword this whole paragraph to make its meaning clear and unambiguous. THIS ANNEX HAS BEEN REPLACED BY THE PROCESS STYLE GUIDE.	A

No	Comment Type	Priority	Text Reference	New Part	Comment	Action
IRE-5		High	CUS.8	2	Delete all of Assess customer satisfaction. Rationale: this is a business requirement, but not necessarily a candidate for inclusion in a standard. CONSENSUS DECISION WAS TO LEAVE THIS AS PART OF DOCUMENT. ALTHOUGH THE TITLE OF THE PROCESS HAS BEEN CHANGED TO PROVIDE CUSTOMER SERVICE OF WHICH A GOAL IS TO ASSESS THE LEVEL OF SATISFACTION.	R
IRE-8		Medium	CUS.3.2	2	Delete Understand customer expectations. Rationale: this is beyond what should be required of a standard. THE WORD EXPECTATIONS HAS BEEN ELIMINATED.	A
IRE-13		Medium	ORG.3	2	Delete Improve the process. Rationale: we have guidelines for doing this; whether or not an organisation elects to improve any or all of its processes should not be mandated by a standard. DISAGREE, THIS IS A MAJOR PART OF INCREASING ORGANIZATION MATURITY.	R
IRE-14		Medium	ORG.7	2	Delete Provide work facilities. Rationale: this doesn't belong in a software process assessment standard. DISAGREE, OUR REQUIREMENTS HAVE ASKED US TO INCLUDE THIS ASPECT.	R
UK-9	Technical	Medium	5, Tables 2-6	2	The model should recognise improvement activities (e.g. project level improvements) in capability levels below level 5. THE HAS BEEN A CLOSER ALGNMENT TO 12207 IN THIS AREA OF IMPROVEMENT.	N
UK-16	Technical	Medium	5, Table 6	2	Level 5 must be considered largely speculative. In particular, the use of the thresholds, trends and capability (as defined in 95/644394) implies a degree of stability in the development milieu that is unrealistic except for a handful of unrepresentative development groups. The notions of <i>special and common causes</i> are technical notions from statistical process control and more work is required (in the industry) to give useful meaning to them in the people-central design situation which is software development. Levels 4 and 5 should, for now, be made informative rather than normative across the entire document set. Moreover, within the industry there is sufficient real and empirically based understanding of real process measure (other than time and cost which can only tell you something somewhere is wrong (e.g. your estimates) to base an international standard on their use for statistically driven process improvement. These issues need to be addressed within the revision of the model and architecture. SOME OF WHAT WAS ASKED HAS BEEN IMPLEMENTED. LEVELS 4 & 5 HAVE BEEN SIMPLIFIED SO AS NOT TO PRESCRIBE A CERTAIN METHOD. HOWEVER WE CAN NOT AGREE THAT LEVELS 4 & 5 SHOULD BE INFORMATIVE.	R

No	Comment Type	Priority	Text Reference	New Part	Comment	Action
UK-46	Technical	Medium	6.2, ENG.7	2	This processes is an instantiation of parts of other ENG and CUS processes and should not be defined in its own right. IN ORDER TO OBTAIN ALIGNMENT TO ISO 12207 THIS PROCESS HAS BEEN RETAINED.	R

No	Comment Type	Priority	Text Reference	New Part	Comment	Action
AUS-5				2	The essential dimensions of the Model are not “two types of practices”, but rather the distinction between function (processes and process categories) on the one hand and performance (capability levels) on the other. This distinction is not made clear. THE EXPLANATION OF THE MODEL HAS BEEN REWRITTEN.	A
AUS-6				2	“The architecture distinguishes between: – base practices, which are the essential activities of a specific process, grouped into processes and process categories by the type of activity they address; – generic practices, applicable to any process, which represent the activities necessary to manage a process and improve its capability to perform.” THE EXPLANATION OF THE MODEL HAS BEEN REWRITTEN.	A
AUS-7				2	In this Section, and elsewhere in the document, the model is discussed by treating first with the Processes and BPs, and then with the Capability Levels and GPs. This pattern should be followed consistently throughout the WD; primarily, this would mean reversing the order of Sections 5 & 6. CHANGES HAVE BEEN MADE TO REFLECT THIS COMMENT.	A
AUS-10				2	Process Categories should be more strongly aligned to the Processes in ISO 12207 AGREE, THIS VERSION OF PART 2 IS MUCH MORE CLOSELY ALIGNED TO 12207.	A
AUS-13				2	The Project process category consists of processes which that establish the a project, and co-ordinate and manage its resources <u>throughout its duration</u> , to produce a product or provide a service which satisfies the customer . INTRO TO THE MAN CATEGORY HAS BEEN CHANGED.	A
AUS-14				2	The Support process category consists of processes which enable and support the performance of the other processes on a project . INTRO TO THE MAN CATEGORY HAS BEEN CHANGED TO ACCOMODATE THIS COMMENT.	A
AUS-15				2	The Organization process category consists of processes which establish the business goals of for the organization and develop process, product, and resource assets which will help the organization achieve its business goals .	W

No	Comment Type	Priority	Text Reference	New Part	Comment	Action
AUS-16				2	Process categories, processes, and base practices provide a grouping by type of activity. Each process in the model is described in terms of base practices, which are its <u>unique the essential</u> software engineering or management activities <u>of the process</u> . <u>The base practices are intended to represent a necessary and sufficient set of practices to achieve the purpose of the process</u> . These processes and activities characterize performance of a process, even if that performance is not systematic. Performance of the base practices may be ad hoc, unpredictable, inconsistent, poorly planned, and/or result in poor quality products, but those work products are at least marginally usable in achieving the purpose of the process. Implementing only the base practices of a process may be of minimal value and represents only the first step in building process capability.; but <u>The base practices represent the unique, essential</u> functional activities of the process when instantiated in a particular environment. THIS SECTION HAS BEEN REWRITTEN	O
AUS-17				2	A capability level is a set of common features (sets of activities) <u>practices</u> that work together to provide a major enhancement in the capability to perform a process. This paragraph should be structured in a similar manner to the earlier paragraph on process categories and base practices. THIS HAS BEEN REWRITTEN.	O
AUS-19				2	"A common feature in the model is a set of generic practices that address the same aspect of process implementation or institutionalization. A generic practice is an implementation or institutionalization practice (activity) that enhances the capability to perform any process. The generic practices characterize good process management that results in an increasing process capability for any process. A planned, well-defined, measured, and continuously improving process is consistently performed as the generic practices are implemented for a process. This process capability is built on the foundation of the base practices that describe the <u>unique essential</u> functional activities of the process.	O
AUS-20			Introduction - ahead of Table 1	2	A sub-heading "Audience and Usage" (or similar) is suggested.	W
AUS-24			General	2	Annex H should be located closer to Annex A within the structure of the WD.	O
AUS-27				2	Use "practices" consistently instead of "activities".	A
AUS-28				2	The second paragraph is clumsy and potentially ambiguous. THE SCOPE STATEMENT HAS BEEN REWRITTEN	A
AUS-30			Normative references	2	"There are no normative references in this part of <u>of</u> the International Standard"	A
AUS-31			Nomenclature	2	"Nomenclature" is not the right word. Suggest that the correct title for the Section is "Referencing Model Elements".	O

No	Comment Type	Priority	Text Reference	New Part	Comment	Action
AUS-32				2	This section should come after the detailed practice definitions, as Section 7.	O
AUS-33				2	"identification" in the second sentence is not the right word.	O
AUS-34				2	"The nomenclature shall also be used in constructing extended processes and variant models" - is this normative implication intended? It would be better if the requirement were placed in the normative annex.	O
AUS-35				2	Each practice is assigned an identifier consisting of a three-character <u>part</u> alphanumeric code.	O
AUS-36				2	The last two paragraphs (the examples) are clumsily worded.	O
AUS-37			Generic Practices	2	This Section should be Section 6, following <u>after</u> the description of the processes and base practices.	A
AUS-39				2	The Title of the Section should be "Capability Levels". IT HAS BEEN RENAMED THE CAPABILITY DIMENSION.	A
AUS-40				2	"The generic practices, defined in the following tables, <u>shall</u> apply to all processes defined within this part of the International Standard." - "shall" should not be used - it implies a normative requirement and can be taken as ambiguous. THE WORD SHALL HAS BEEN ELIMIINATED	A
AUS-41				2	Tables should not be used to contain the definitions.	O
AUS-51				2	L 5 - There shoud be more cross-references to process ORG-3 in this part.	W
AUS-52				2	The issue of managing change in standard and defined Processes is not addressed adequately. THIS IS INCLUDED IN THE ORG.3 PROCESS	A
AUS-55			Global	2	Cross-referencing is incorrect.	O
AUS-58			Global	2	Initial phrase of Process Purpose definition	O
AUS-59			S6 Par 1	2	Requirements should not be in Part 2	A
AUS-60			S6 Par 2	2	as for (5)	A
AUS-61			Par 4	2	List of process categories is redundant INCLUDED FOR READER CLARITY	R
AUS-62			S6 Par 7	2	First sentence is poorly structured THIS SECTION HAS BEEN REWRITTEN.	A
AUS-63				2	"Clause 4" - reference is unclear THIS SECTION HAS BEEN REWRITTEN.	A
AUS-64				2	Last sentence is poorly structured THIS SECTION HAS BEEN REWRITTEN.	A
AUS-65				2	Use diagram to give meaning of paragraph	N
AUS-66			6.1 P1	2	"Development"	W
AUS-67				2	"Transition"	W
AUS-68				2	"Impact"	W

No	Comment Type	Priority	Text Reference	New Part	Comment	Action
AUS-69				2	"Supporting"	W
AUS-72				2	Placement of CUS.4	O
AUS-73			CUS.1 P1	2	Paragraph needs restructuring	O
AUS-74				2	Inconsistency in referring to "software product and/or service"	O
AUS-75			CUS.1 Note	2	Note is not needed	A
AUS-86			CUS.2	2	"clearly"	O
AUS-87				2	Is this process intended to reside with the <u>supplier</u> ?	O
AUS-95			CUS.3	2	Language is very clumsy THE INTRODUCTION FOR THIS PROCESS HAS BEEN REWRITTEN.	A
AUS-96				2	Distinction between "needs" , "requirements" and "request" THE INTRODUCTION FOR THIS PROCESS HAS BEEN REWRITTEN.	A
AUS-97				2	Delete "instead"	O
108			CUS.4	2	"objectives of the contract" - should be terms on requirements.	O
109			CUS.4	2	CUS.2 does <u>not deal</u> with contract reviews - it refs CUS.4	O
121			CUS.5	2	Problem with incorporation of "install" in this process	N
122				2	Use of "critical" - value judgement	O
132			CUS.6	2	"correct"	N
133				2	Change to "Install and Operate" Remove support issues to CUS.7	N
134				2	Stope at CUS.5 in 2nd para	O
135				2	Delte para 4	O
136				2	Wording of note is clumsy Inclusion of definitions	O
151			CUS.8	2	Not a CUS process, more ORG STILL INCLUDE IN CUS BUT UNDER A DIFFERENT PROCESS NAME "PROVIDE CUSTOMER SERVICE"	R
152				2	Wording starts	O
153				2	Use term "software products" <u>defined</u> to mean system or software products and/or services	O
158			6.2 Para 2	2	Use of "system" is incorrect	O
160			6.2 P3	2	Delete reference to "waterfall"	O
161			P4	2	Should there be reference to "inputs" for <u>each</u> process category? (None for CUS).	N
162			P5	2	Why is there no reference to outputs?	N
163			Eng. 1	2	Note: either replace "typically" with "may", or delete the note (2 reasons)	O
169			Eng. 1	2, 5	There should be some form of traceability (e.g. to CUS.3) in this process	N
170			Eng.2	2	Is "analyze" needed? - delete	N

No	Comment Type	Priority	Text Reference	New Part	Comment	Action
187			Eng 2	2	No reference in this Process to customer "sign-off" (But would this be appropriate? Should be in CUS) BASELINING OF CUSTOMER REQUIREMENTS IS INCLUDED IN CUS.3	A
190			Eng 3	2	Top-level - rogue hyphen "coded, complied" - replace with "constructed" or "built" - or <u>delete</u> the last phrase	O
198			Eng 4	2	Specific reference to "code" is not appropriate. Remove "executable and" & "code"	N
203			Eng 4	2	This process can be disposed of; 4.1 can go into Eng 3, 4.2 and 4.3 can go into Eng 5. The current breakup of processes is based on a code-centred view of software development.	N
204			Eng 5 Notes	2	Remove notes - they imply a requirement/recommendation	O
217			Notes	2	Notes should be deleted.	O
225				2	Processes should <u>not</u> be mapped to base practices	O
226				2	Eng 7 does not map well to the Maintenance Process in ISO 12207 MAPPING TO 12207 HAS BEEN INCLUDED.	A
229			Sect 6.3 (PRO)	2	Typography in last sentence/para is not consistent	O
232			PRO1	2	Purpose statement and title should be "establish the project" - review purpose statement accordingly.	O
233				2	This process description is anomalous in that it specifically references input and output. Either <u>all</u> processes should, or <u>none</u> should.	O
241			PRO 2	2	There is a problem with meaning of Work Breakdown Structure.	O
242			PRO 2	2	Delete reasonable. Delete "for performing.....basis" Delete "model" from last sentence	O
256				2	Use of "project teams" is misleading esp in terms of 3rd bullet point.	O
257				2	Delete last sentence ("A likely input")	O
268			PRO.3	2, 5	Some reference is needed to confidentiality issues - poss in 3.3.	O
270				2	The term "software work" is ambiguous, there is no need for "software" (as an adjective) and "work" is redundant.	O
278			PRO 5	2	References to inputs and outputs are not consistent between processes.	O
289			PRO 6	2	CUS 6.2 is <u>not</u> "Plan against future"	O
290				2	Second para - "Identify risks..."	O
292				2, 5	These practices should mirror Manage Quality	N
293				2	Last para should be deleted.	O
303			PRO 7	2	Poor grammar and expression	O
304				2	Tautologous and redundant expression	O
305				2	Structure should mirror more closely that of PRO 6, especially with respect to use of metrics	O

No	Comment Type	Priority	Text Reference	New Part	Comment	Action
317			PRO 8	2	Second para needs restructuring	O
332			SUP.1 para 1	2	delete "needed by managers, engineers, users, or customers of the system or software."	O
333			SUP.1 note	2	delete "such as plans", delete "such as design rationale", delete "such as peer review procedure", delete "which describes the intended use of the system and software to a user."	O
336			SUP.1	2	Add a new process "Determine what documents will be required." THIS HAS BEEN INCLUDED IN SUP.1	A
352			SUP 2 para 1	2	delete "of the software project throughout the project's software life cycle."	O
353			SUP 2 & note	2	Inconsistent style - document has started referring to specific generic practices	O
372			SUP 3	2	Para 2, "and" sentence is redundant.	O
373				2	There is confusion esp in para 2 and 3 about how this process maps to 12207. This process appears to combine the QA and Audit processes from 12207, they should be kept separate. MAPPING TO 12207 HAS BEEN INCLUDED.	A
380			SUP 3	2	The relationship between SUP 3, PRO 5, and Quality Audit (12207) is very unclear. MAPPING TO 12207 HAS BEEN INCLUDED.	N
381			SUP 3	2	ISO9001 now explicitly references "Quality Plan". This is not mentioned in this framework.	N
385			SUP 4	2	Is the last sentence necessary?	O
396			SUP 5	2	Most of this is unnecessary and irrelevant. Delete at least Para 2.	O
409			ORG 1	2, 5	ORG 1.4, 1.5 and 1.6 do not really belong here. ORG.1 HAS BEEN CHANGED TO REFLECT THIS COMMENT.	A
410			ORG 1	2, 5	There needs to be additional practice (o) about "Define and Implement the Business Plan" (and also about "Review Strategic Vision").	N
412			ORG 2	2	Delete last sentence.	O
430			ORG.3	2	There should be a cross-ref to ORG.2 as well as to 3.1.1	N
433			ORG.3	2	is some ambiguity in the use of "standard" - is it in the context of ORG.2, or by contrast to "extended process"	N
434			ORG.3	2	The note of self-justification in 2nd and 3rd sentences is inconsistent with other processes.	O
442			ORG.4	2	Second para should be a note.	O
443			ORG.4	2	"So" in the NOTE adds ambiguity	O
447			ORG.5	2	There should be a Generic Practice (L4 or L5) referencing/implementing this process	O
448			ORG.5	2	The process should provide for reuse of entities other than software components - eg process models, plans etc.	O
449			ORG.5	2	Last phrase ("leading to...") should be a NOTE	O
459			ORG.6	2	Delete "by the projects"	N

No	Comment Type	Priority	Text Reference	New Part	Comment	Action
470			Annex A - A.1 Para 2	2	The criteria (requirements) should be numbered	O
471			Annex A - A.1 Para 2	2	Should this read "shall <u>be</u> " or 'shall <u>contain</u> '?"	O
472			Annex A - A.1 Para 2	2	"this part" - "Part" should be capitalised	O
473			Para 4	2	2nd sentence should be a NOTE	O
474			Para 6	2	"this part" - "Part" should be capitalised	O
475			Para 7	2	clause 4 - does not exist? Should be "Annex A.2"?	O
476			Annex A	2	Examples should be provided THE EXAMPLES PROCESSES ARE THOSE THAT HAVE ALREADY BEEN WRITTEN IN THE DOCUMENT.	R
477			Annex A.2 Para 3	2	Not grammatical; either use " <u>A</u> new process..." or replace "its" where it occurs	O
478			Annex A.2 Para 3	2	Rule in Para 3 is not consistently applicable to all processes in this part of the draft standard	O
479			Para 7	2	The use of "its" is ungrammatical and ambiguous	O
ESI-2	Technical		6.5 ORG	2	Applying the generic practices at the different capability levels to the ORG processes is difficult. Consideration should be given as to whether the generic processes are applicable to ORG processes. For example can ORG 1,6,7 really be improved from Level 1 through to Level 5. INCREASING THE CAPABILITY OF THE ORG PROCESSES IS APPLICABLE.	R
ESI-14	Technical		6.2 ENG 3	2, 5	Add a base practice to define requirements for the transition from high-level to detailed design which would include steps, controls and criteria for decomposition.	O
ESI-15	Technical		6.2 ENG 5	2, 5	Add a base practice to define the requirements for an Integration Test strategy.	O
ESI-17	Technical		6.3 PRO	2	Processes PRO 1 and PRO 2 should be merged into one Process as they both deal with the same topic of Project Planning. Normally one Software development Plan would contain all of the information required by these two processes. PRO 1 & 2 ARE NOW MAN.1	A
ESI-19	Clarity		6.3 PRO 2	2	Add a bullet to first paragraph to include how tracking will be performed. THE INTENT OF PART 2 IS NOT TO INCLUDE THE "HOW'S".	R
ESI-23	Technical		6.4 SUP 4	2, 5	Add a base practice to SUP 4 to Identify Trends and initiate action.	O

No	Comment Type	Priority	Text Reference	New Part	Comment	Action
ESI-24	Technical		5 Tables5,6	2	It appears to be easier to perform Generic Practices at Level 5 than at Level 4. The definition and allocation of Generic Practices at these levels should be reviewed for suitability and correctness. Revise the allocation of Gps at Levels 4 and 5 to ensure that the Level 4 Gps can be performed before Level 5 Gps and that Level 4 provides an improvement step towards Level 5. THE CAPABILITY LEVELS HAVE BEEN REVIEWED AND REVISED BUT THE ESSENCE OF THEIR DEFINITIONS HAS NOT CHANGED GREATLY.	N
ESI-25	Technical		5 Table 2	2	At Level 1 there appears to be confusion about the relationship of the Generic Practice 1.1.1 and the existence of the Base Practice. There should be some direct relationship between Base Practice Adequacy and Generic Practice -Perform The Process Adequacy.	O
ESI-41	Technical		Table 4	2, 5	Information is required on how to assess the use of Industry Standards or Customer Standards at Level 3 and how they interface with Organisational Standards.	O
UK-2	Editorial	Low	General	2	Reference to the Capability Maturity Model should either be explained or removed. REFERENCE TO THE CMM HAS BEEN REMOVED	A
UK-10	Technical	Medium	5, Tables 2-6	2	The words 'audit' and 'verify' are used in the opposite sense to their normal use and should be reversed.	O
UK-21	Technical	Medium	6	2	There is inconsistent scoping of processes, e.g. in the way that planning and tracking are handled within PRO.2 & PRO.7 and PRO.5. THE LEVEL OF SCOPING HAS BEEN REVIEWED AND CORRCETED.	A
UK-22	Technical	Medium	6	2	There is inconsistent granularity across the processes. Some (e.g. PRO.3) are very detailed, whilst others could be more so, e.g. a base practice could be added to ENG.3 to cover the transition from high-level design to detailed design which identifies steps, controls and criteria for decomposition. In addition, PRO.6 has a base practice, PRO.6.5, for the definition of risk metrics, whereas ENG processes have no practices for defining metrics, e.g. test metrics. THE LEVEL OF SCOPING /GRANULARITY HAS BEEN REVIEWED AND CORRCETED.	A
UK-23	Technical	Medium	6, A.2, para 3	2	There are numerous references in Parts 4 and 8 to the 'process model' but Part 2 is not a process model. It is a model for process management. However, some of the processes in Part 2 Clause 6 have input/output conditions identified (e.g. CUS.6 has an input condition, PRO.1 has inputs and outputs). In addition, Part 2 A.2 talks about inputs and outputs for extended processes.	O
UK-24	Technical	Low	6.1, CUS.1	2	Revise purpose statement for process to give the purpose, not the way by which the purpose is met. PURPOSE STATEMENT HAS BEEN REWRITTEN	A
UK-50	Technical	Low	6.3, PRO.2	2, 5	The project plan should document human resources, roles and responsibilities, organisational interfaces. It is not possible to perform PRO.2.8 and PRO.2.9 until these have been identified.	O

No	Comment Type	Priority	Text Reference	New Part	Comment	Action
UK-54	Editorial	Medium	6.4, SUP.1	2	In review of BS 7649 (Guide to the design and preparation of documentation for users of application software), following points were noted: although the scope of BS 7649 is narrower than that of SUP.1 (in being restricted to user documentation), the BS 7649 process appears to be a general process for document production. As such it is applicable to SUP.1; process steps in BS 7649 are broadly consistent with SUP.1, but former places more emphasis on the early phases and is more detailed; BS 7649 places emphasis on 'integration' into the project lifecycle (§2, §3). This aspect is only a note in SUP.1. PART 2 IS MAPPED TO ISO 12207	A
UK-56	Technical	Low	6.4, SUP.3	2, 5	It is essential that whoever undertakes the function is independent of the activity under evaluation and has delegated authority from senior management.	N
UK-58	Technical	Low	6.4, SUP.4	2, 5	SUP.4 mentions the identification of trends, but no corresponding base practice exists to achieve this.	O
UK-70	Editorial	Low	E, Table 9	2	For user convenience the processes in the table should be labelled with clause numbers from both ISO 12207 and this Part. Add 'Develop system requirements' to the Process column in the third row of the table, 'Development'. MAPPING TO 12207 HAS BEEN ELIMINATED.	O
UK-73	Editorial	Low	F, Table 10	2	Replace 'Perform configuration management' with 'Handle deviations (SUP.3.5) MAPPING TO ISO 9001 HAS BEEN ELIMINATED.	O
UK-74	Editorial	Low	H, table 12	2	Within the 'identifier' entry, replace the whole Guideline entry' with ' To ease external reference, each base practice is given an identifier (see 4.2)' Within the 'Name' entry, replace 1. with 'The name of the base practice should identify, in summary form, what the <u>base practice</u> does.'	O