



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

## ISO/IEC JTC1/SC7 N2542

**2001-09-30**

<b>Doc. Type</b>	Comment Disposition Report
<b>Title</b>	Comment Disposition Report on CD 15504-2 - Software Engineering - Process Assessment - Part 2: Performing An Assessment.
<b>Source</b>	JTC1/SC7/WG10 Editor
<b>Project</b>	07.29.12
<b>Status</b>	Final
<b>References</b>	N2468
<b>Action ID</b>	FYI or ACT
<b>Due Date</b>	
<b>Mailing Date</b>	2001-09-30
<b>Distribution</b>	SC7_AG
<b>Medium</b>	Encoded Acrobat
<b>No. Of Pages</b>	46
<b>Note</b>	

WG10 ID	National Body ID	ID	Category (TH, TL, E, G)	Clause, Sub-clause	Paragraph, Figure, Table	Comment and rationale	Proposed new text	Disposition
222	AT	1	E	Title		is the title really correct	Process Assessment Framework	Overtaken by events: CF Japan 1
223	AT	2	TL	1.1		is 'conformant assessment' defined somewhere? (part 1?) In the (old) part 9 it was not defined		Reject - standard terminology
224	AT	3	E	3		There does not seem to be a good reason to have a few definitions not included in part 1! Merge all definitions into part 1!	move to Part 1	Noted - standing strategy.
225	AT	4	E	3.3		A definition of 'conformant' is needed		reject - defined in iso directives and iso/iec guide 2 1991.
227	AT	6	G	4.1	a)	The description should clearly state that the assessment is based on historical data with the assumption (which might be wrong!) that this extrapolates into the future!	goals; This assessment is based on consideration and evidence of past performed projects and is assumed to be indicative for the future.	Reject - consistency with 12208
228	AT	7	TL	4.1	d)	I do not see the need to require 'reviews' at appropriate intervals. An assessment could be a one-time exercise yielding just one statement about current (more exact past) capability.	delete	Reject
229	AT	8	E	4.1	Fig. 1	The figure should also show the actual process data as inputs!		Overtaken by events
230	AT	9	G	4		For a clear division of aspects, it would be more logical to allocate all information concerning the assessment PROCESS in one part, i.e. Part 3. This would also be of advantage if at some point the measurement framework would become replaceable, as it happened with the reference model		Reject - specified in Design document for 15504.
231	AT	10	E	4.2.2	b) 5)	the user might wonder what an indicator is	... based on the indicators (cf, section 6. 3.4), that ...	Accept
232	AT	11	TH	4.2.2	c	there should also be a provision to consider the DATE of the considered and collected data! This would allow to consider trends of the capability!		Reject

WG10 ID	National Body ID	ID	Category (TH, TL, E, G)	Clause, Sub-clause	Paragraph, Figure, Table	Comment and rationale	Proposed new text	Disposition
233	AT	12	E	4.5.2	a)	isn't the date trivial? We also could require the names of the assessors etc.	delete item a)	Reject
234	AT	13	TL	5	2nd paragraph	... process model ... seems to be too weak	clearly defined reference model.	Accept: with change "...to a process reference model"
235	AT	14	TH	5.2.1		The PA1.1 Process performance attribute should contain another criteria which is elementary for the whole process improvement philosophy: Is the way, how the activity is performed repeatable? If yes, this activity should be considered to be classified as a process and be added to the organisation's set of process assets. If no, this activity can not be seen as a process and thus can not be improved using the process improvement methods.	Add the following: - the activity is identified to be repeatable and shall be treated as a process. There is a common understanding or policy to show the intention to perform this process if it is applicable.	Overtaken by Events
237	AT	15	E	5.3.1	3rd bullet	unclear 'the process of the process'		Accept
236	AT	15	TH	5.3		Especially for beginners in the SPI field, it would be necessary to provide an alternative approach to the existing schema of process attributes which focuses on level 2 activities. It is proposed to divide the existing two attributes into three or four process attributes to enable better measuring on this level. At the same time, process attributes for level 4 and five should be combined and only be represented with one attribute each. It is recommended not to exceed the current number of attributes (nine), cause this would increase the complexity too much. To be able to compare these alternative attribute schema, it is necessary to have at least one attribute per level and to provide a sound mapping which makes the alternative schema comparable to the standard schema.	Example for an alternative attribute schema focusing on level 2 could be: PA1.1 Process performance (stays the same) PA2.1 Process planning (more detailed) PA2.2 Process responsibility and authority (more detailed) PA2.3 Work product management (more detailed) PA2.4 Monitoring and verification (more detailed) PA3.1 Process definition (stays the same) PA3.2 Process resource (stays the same) PA4.1 Measurement and control (reduced) PA5.1 Change and improvement	Referred to OWG

WG10 ID	National Body ID	ID	Category (TH, TL, E, G)	Clause, Sub-clause	Paragraph, Figure, Table	Comment and rationale	Proposed new text	Disposition
							(reduced)	
238	AT	17	TL	5.4.1	3rd bullet	I do not see the need to refer to "historical" performance data.	the behaviour of the defined process and its enactment is fully understood	overtaken by events-see UK 68
239	AT	18	TH	5.4.1	4th bullet	I do not see the need to refer to require 'refinement' at this level. To me this belongs rather to level 5. I think that the information from where the information comes it not of relevance	the process can be tailored depending on the project requirements.	Reject
240	AT	19	E	5.6.2	1st bullet	Here assessment is against the 'specified objectives OF THE PROCESS'. Is this the same as the 'relevant process objectives' in section 5.5.1, 2nd bullet?		Accept - delete specified
241	AT	20	E	5.4.2	3rd bullet		resources are MADE available ...	Accept
242	AT	21	E	5.5	1st sentence	is 'executes' the proper word?	... now performs ...	Accept with change - enacted
243	AT	22	TL	5.5.1	1st paragraph and 1st bullet	business goals is too vague a term. Should be made more precise		Already disposed of. See ZAR 8
244	AT	23	E	5.5.1 ( 5.6, 5.6.1)		sometimes its 'business goals' sometimes its 'business goals of the organisation'. Is there a difference? From the text I gather that business goals can be 'defined' (5.5.1) , 'current and projected' (5.6) and 'relevant' (5.6.1) Is there an intent behind these differences?		Overtaken by events
245	AT	24	TL	5.6.1	2nd bullet	..sources of ... variations	move to 5.5.1 (PA4.1)	Already addressed - See FRA 6.
246	AT	25	TL	5.7		The percentage scale is perfect! Keep it. The rating scale NPLF does not have a good name yet. We propose to call it the 'NPLF-rating'. It is necessary to have a		Reject

WG10 ID	National Body ID	ID	Category (TH, TL, E, G)	Clause, Sub-clause	Paragraph, Figure, Table	Comment and rationale	Proposed new text	Disposition
						name for it to allow easy reference and identification of any assessment evaluation where this schema is used.		
247	AT	26	E	5.7.2	"P"		approach to and SOME achievement...	Accept
248	AT	27	E	5.7.3	NOTE		move the note to the definitions	Reject - not a definition
249	AT	28	TH	5.8		At the moment it is not possible to calculate the capability level for a process when the information for one of the attributes is missing. There should be an exceptional rule where it is possible to reach a certain level if at least one of the attributes (for each level) is rated Fully and the information about the other attribute is not available (at the moment). This rule would enable the performance and evaluation of an assessment even if one of the employees with special knowledge is missing (holiday, illness, etc.). It is almost impossible to have each relevant person available during the short period of performing an assessment.		Reject
250	AT	29	E	5.8.1	NOTE	is this note helpful?	delete it?	Reject
251	AT	30	E	5.8.1	Table 1	for consistency reasons with 5.1 the level 0 should be included	Level 0 - Proc Performance - Not achieved or Partially achieved.	Reject - no attributes in L0
252	AT	31	E	6.1	3rd sentence	Does 'This clause' point to 6.1 or to 6.2?		Noted - refer to directives
253	AT	32	E	6.2.2	1st sentence		15504 (cf. Fig. 1)	Accept
254	AT	33	E	6.2.3	b)		as required by this clause.	Accept
255	AT	34	TH	6.2.3	after e) and 15288	Additional Reference Models may be defined for other relevant domains.		overtaken by events

WG10 ID	National Body ID	ID	Category (TH, TL, E, G)	Clause, Sub-clause	Paragraph, Figure, Table	Comment and rationale	Proposed new text	Disposition
256	AT	35	E	6.2.4	b)	achievement cannot be guaranteed and is not the issue.	... sufficient to JUDGE the achievement of the purpose ...	Reject
257	AT	36	E	6.2.3	2nd bullet	change of state OF WHAT?		Reject
258	AT	37	E	6.3.4	1st paragraph	unclear!		Reject
259	AT	38	E	6.3.4	2nd paragraph	is there a difference between 'detailed elements' and 'elements' (cf. 6.2.3)		Accept -delete detailed
260	AT	39	TL	6.3.4	2nd paragraph	is there a difference between 'work product' and 'artefact' (cf. 6.2.4., 2nd bullet)		Accept - replaced 'artefact' with 'work product' in 6.2.4
118	AUS	1	E	Gen		Organisations vs Organizations	Ensure all consistent spelling.	Accept I31 (reclassified to Editorial by AUS.)
119	AUS	2	E	Introduction	Para 1	The second sentence talks about " ... need to be assured that the requirements have been met." The requirements of what?	"...need to be assured that the requirements of the assessment have been met."	Accept with change - "requirements of this IS"
120	AUS	3	E	Introduction	Para 6	The paragraph beginning "ISO/IEC 15504-3 provides..." goes on talk about a team undertaking an assessment. The last two sentences of the paragraph are out of context and have little value to contribute to the sentence on what ISO/IEC 15504-3 is.	Only retain the first sentence of the paragraph. Remove all others.	Accept in principle - text relocated.
121	AUS	4	E	Introduction	Para 9	The paragraph beginning "An assessment is ...." should be the same as in the Introduction for ISO 15504-3.3: Guidance	Change paragraph to mirror that in the Guidance standard.	Noted - referred to Part 3 Editors for consistency check.

WG10 ID	National Body ID	ID	Category (TH, TL, E, G)	Clause, Sub-clause	Paragraph, Figure, Table	Comment and rationale	Proposed new text	Disposition
						on performing an assessment.		
122	AUS	5	E	Introduction	Para 10	The paragraph beginning "ISO/IEC 15504-5....ISO/IEC 12207." is not the same as the guidance document.	End Paragraph with ISO/IEC 12207 AMD1 as per ISO 15504-3.3 guidance document.	Accept
123	AUS	6	E	1.2		"The requirements form a process" Which requirements?	Either "The process assessment requirements described in this standard form a ....." or "The minimum set of requirements form a..."	Accept
124	AUS	7	E	3.4	1	insert a full stop at the end of the sentence; and a blank line before 3.5	a model describing .....purpose of assessing process capability.	Accept
125	AUS	8	E	3.5		Insert line before start of section 3.5		Accept see aus 7
126	AUS	9	E	4.1	1	Remove the word 'process' after Process Assessment process as it is understood in the context	The purpose of Process Assessment is to determine.....	Accept - consistency with 12207
127	AUS	10	E	4.1	last	remove the redundant word 'process' at the end of the sentence	Figure 1 shows the logical organisation of the elements of a Process Assessment.	Reject
128	AUS	11	E	4.2.2	b) 2)	Grammar and punctuation on sentence	Change to "Correspondence shall be established between the organizational unit's processes, specified in the assessment scope, to the model(s)....."	Accept
129	AUS	12	E	4.2.2	c) 1)	All dot points at the (1) level. Some start with capitals whilst others are lower case. Consistency of use through out the document.	Consistency of capitalisation on dot points throughout the document.	Noted - template issue
130	AUS	13	TH	4.2.2	c) 2)	evidence should be sufficient and representative.	"ensure that the objective evidence is sufficient and representative to cover the scope and purpose of the assessment."	Accept
131	AUS	14	TL	4.2.2	e)	Should evidence of sponsor acceptance of the findings be included as well?		Reject

WG10 ID	National Body ID	ID	Category (TH, TL, E, G)	Clause, Sub-clause	Paragraph, Figure, Table	Comment and rationale	Proposed new text	Disposition
132	AUS	15	E	4.3.1 (and 4.3.2)		Some sentences end in full stops whilst others end in semi colons. Consistency of grammar usage. Item f) has a full stop whilst item g) has a semi colon.	Ensure consistent grammar usage of colons fullstops etc.	Accept
133	AUS	16	TH	4.3.2		Add item h) obtain acceptance signoff of assessment result deliverables.		Accept with change - "g) confirm receipt of the assessment result deliverables by the sponsor."
134	AUS	17	E	4.4.2	c)	end sentence with : vis a ;		Accept
135	AUS	18	E	4.4.2	c) 4)	as should be at.	The context which, at a minimum, included:	Accept
136	AUS	19	E	4.4.2	d) 4)	Capital on The. Consistency of grammar usage		Accept
137	AUS	20	E	4.4.2	e)	Sentence mixes plural and singular grammar usage.		Overtaken by events
138	AUS	21	E	4.5.2	c)	Capital on The. Consistency of grammar usage		Accept
139	AUS	22	TL	4.5.2		Require evidence of sponsor acceptance of output.	Add item h) evidence of sponsor approval/acceptance of assessment input and output.	Reject
140	AUS	23	TH	5		In order to simplify reference and remove ambiguity, all of the bullet points in definitions of process attributes should be numbered.		Accept, also add comment that the numbering does not imply any sequencing or priority, but is for identification only.
141	AUS	24	E	5	Paragraph 2	No fullstop at end of sentence.		Accept
142	AUS	25	TL	5.3.1	3rd item	unclear	the responsibility and authority for performing the process are assigned;	Accept
143	AUS	26	TH	5.3.1	Last item	Compared to the other achievements, this is on a quite difference scale, covering the whole of monitoring and control of performance. The best solution would be to split it into two points.	the performance of the process is monitored using appropriate measures; the performance of the process is controlled to produce work products that meet the defined objectives.	Overtaken by Events

WG10 ID	National Body ID	ID	Category (TH, TL, E, G)	Clause, Sub-clause	Paragraph, Figure, Table	Comment and rationale	Proposed new text	Disposition
144	AUS	27	TH	5.3.2	point four	The reference to "changes will be controlled" causes problems in addressing work products that are not intended to be changed - eg records, minutes etc. The reference to control of change should be modified to specify general control.	work products are appropriately identified, documented and controlled;	Accept
145	AUS	28	TL	5.5.1	heading	be consistent with other headings used in clause 5	5.5.1 PA 4.1 Process measurement attribute	Accept. Check rest of document.
146	AUS	29	TL	5.5.1	beginning of the 1st paragraph	consistency	The process measurement attribute measures ...	Accept - Change title
147	AUS	30	TL	5.7.1	1	replace 'any' attribute with 'a process' attribute	The extent of achievement of a process attribute is measured using .....	Accept
148	AUS	31	TH	6.2.3	e)	The specification does not provide for adequate recognition of status of PRMs, and may result in proliferation; this would represent failure of the goal of the project to "discourage the establishment of other de-facto standards" (SC7 N944R)	e) a process reference model shall have the status of an international or national standard or publicly available specification.	Reject. Israel wishes to note disagreement with this disposition.
149	AUS	32	E	6.3.3	Para 3	Sentence has "...terms of both ..." but goes on to talk about 3 items. Comma's are needed to make the sentence meaning clearer.	A process assessment model shall declare its scope of coverage in the terms of both the selected reference model and the selected processes from the reference model, and the capability levels selected from the measurement framework.	Accept
150	AUS	33	E	6.3.4	Para 1	Grammar usage	Change "...that explicitly address the purposes, ..." to "...that explicitly address the purpose."	reject - subject of sentence is plural
151	BR	1	E	Intro.	Par 3	Restructure paragraphs 3 and 4 because the text does not flow well.	Two changes: (1) Move text starting in "This part of ISO/IEC 15504" and finishing in "d) conformity assessment." to a new paragraph before current paragraph 6 (the one starting with "ISO/IEC 15504-3"); and (2) Combine the two first phrases of paragraph 3 with the phrase at paragraph 4. These three phrases will be the new paragraph 3.	Accept
152	BR	2	E	4.1	Figure 1	The five arrows should have the same size	make the five arrows with the same	Accept

WG10 ID	National Body ID	ID	Category (TH, TL, E, G)	Clause, Sub-clause	Paragraph, Figure, Table	Comment and rationale	Proposed new text	Disposition
						to make the figure better.	size in the Figure 1	
153	BR	3	E	4.1	Figure 1	Align the OUTPUT box in Figure 1 with the list in 4.2.5.	Replace all 3 bullets with only one: "assessment record" and so change the title to "OUTPUT"	Reject
154	BR	4	E	4.2.2		The document uses different forms for bullet lists. For example, in 4.2.2.a) and c) each bullet starts with lower case. In 4.2.2.b) and d) each bullet starts with capital letter. The phrase before the bullet lists sometimes finishes with a "." (for example in 4.2.2.d)) and sometimes with ":" (for example in 4.2.2.c). Sometimes the bullet is numbers (for example in 4.2.2.a)) and sometimes the bullet is letters (for example in 4.3.1).	Verify the editorial rule defined by ISO for bullet lists and apply it in the whole document	Noted - template issue
155	BR	5	E	4.3	title	The item covers roles and responsibilities, as mention in the Figure 1.	Include "Roles and" before the word "Responsibilities" in the title.	Accept
159	BR	6	TL	5.4.1		The word "performs" is used with two meanings: one related with the execution of a process and another related with the data about some criteria of the execution. For example, in 5.4.1 first paragraph it is used with the first meaning and in 5.5.2 last bullet it is used with the second one. In Portuguese, for example, we use two different words: "execução" for the first meaning and "desempenho" for the second.	Verify if in English there is a need for two different terms to avoid possible confusion. If this is the case, two different terms should be used.	Accept - reword to enact
160	BR	7	E	5.7.1	Last Paragraph	Percentage values should be in a frame	Format the percentage values as a table in a frame.	Reject - template issue
156	BR	8	E	4.4.2		Align the list in 4.4.2 with the INPUTS box in Figure 1	Two changes: (1) Include in the box "INPUTS" a bullet "Assessment Model" after the bullet "Constraints"; and a bullet "Additional Information" at the end; and (2) Joint the bullet f) g) and h) as the bullet f) with the text "the assessment team which shall include:" followed by the current 3 bullet as sub items. (The last current bullet should be renamed as g).	Reject (simplicity of the figure)

WG10 ID	National Body ID	ID	Category (TH, TL, E, G)	Clause, Sub-clause	Paragraph, Figure, Table	Comment and rationale	Proposed new text	Disposition
157	BR	9	E	4.5		There is no subsection in 4 to cover the upper three boxes in Figure 1 (There a subsection for each one of the other boxes)	Include a new item, 4.6 to describe the three upper boxes: Process reference models, Measurement Framework and Conformant process / Assessment Model.	Reject - covered in clause 6.
162	BR	10	E	6.2.4	bullet c)	Wrong reference. The measurement framework is the clause 5.	replace "clause 4" with "clause 5"	Accept
158	BR	11	TL	5.4		the meaning of defined and standard process is implicit in the text	explain better the meaning of defined and standard process	Replace standard process with enacted where appropriate. Add note in part 1 re. Defined process.
161	BR	12	E	6.2.3	b	wrong clause reference (6.2.3)	replace "by clause 6.2.3" by "clause 6.2.4"	Accept
163	BR	13	E	7.1 (7.2, 7.3)		missing a space in three references for 15504	include space between "ISO/IEC" and "15504"	Accept
164	BR	14	E	7.2	Par 1	wrong reference	replace "clause 4" with "clause 5"	Overtaken by events
165	BR	15	E	7.3	Par 1	wrong reference	replace "clause 6.2" with "clause 6.3"	Accept
285	CZECH REPUBLIC	1	G			Reasons of the abstention: The definitions in the draft are not clear and not confirm with the text in the draft. For example: 1. What is the difference between "assessor", "competent assessor" "professional assessor"? 2. What is the difference between "assessment model", "process assessment model", "process reference model", "conformant process assessment model"? 3. What is the difference between "assessed process", "documented assessment process"?		Noted - definitions in 15504-9
96	FRA	1	TH	5.2.1	paragraph 1 point 1	Identify who has to understand what is performed and produced		Accept with change - redraft 1.1

WG10 ID	National Body ID	ID	Category (TH, TL, E, G)	Clause, Sub-clause	Paragraph, Figure, Table	Comment and rationale	Proposed new text	Disposition
97	FRA	2	TH	5.2.1	paragraph 1 point 1	Difficulties to prove the understanding when assessing		Accept with change - redraft 1.1
98	FRA	3	E	5.3.1	3rd point	words "of the process" to be removed	the responsibility and authority for performing the process are assigned	Accept with change - CF ZAR5
99	FRA	4	TH	5.5.2	last point	what does "special" mean ? Is it the opposite of "common" like at the end of 5.6.2 ?		Noted - refer to part 3 to provide guidance
100	FRA	5	E	5.6.1	1st and last point	the term "goals" is used instead of "objectives"	process improvement objectives	reject - consistency
101	FRA	6	TH	5.6.1	2nd point	does the term "source" intentionnaly avoid "cause" at the end of 5.5 ? IF NOT = cause, IF YES explain the difference between source and cause		Accept - replace source with cause
102	FRA	7	TL	5.6.2	1st point	"processes" should be worded as standard process and defined process	use "standard process" and "defined process" rather than plural	Accept
103	FRA	8	TL	4.4.2	c) 4) v)	use of example in all cases or none	delete example	Overtaken by Events
104	FRA	9	TH	4.1	1	The purpose of the assessment process is not defined properly : it is NOT to "determine the extend to which the organization's standard processes contribute to the achievement of ITS BUSINESS GOAL", but to measure the process CAPABILITY according to a (standardized) capability scale : an assessment model & an assesment method would never be able to determine a quantitative relation between processes and business goals within an organisation	Rephrase according to the proposal	Accept
105	FRA	10	TH	4.1	a)	"Consistent" is not defined ; criteria to assess processes's consistency are not defined	remove the end of the sentence " ... to produce products and services.....goals"	Accept with change - replace "consistent" with "taking into consideration"
106	FRA	11	TH	4.1	b) and c)	Undefined processes at level 1 may be assessed	remove "standard"	Accept (note: should be bullets b and d)
107	FRA	12	TH	4.1	last §	".. For conformant assessment." precise "conformant" with what ?	"for 15504 conformant assessment"	Accept with change - reword to "an assessment conformant with this international standard"
108	FRA	13	TL	4.1	last phrase and Fig 1	the input / output identified are only the major I/O	"...fig 1 shows the logical organisation of the <i>essential</i> element of the process	Accept - "major"

WG10 ID	National Body ID	ID	Category (TH, TL, E, G)	Clause, Sub-clause	Paragraph, Figure, Table	Comment and rationale	Proposed new text	Disposition
							assessment process"	
109	FRA	14	TH	4.1	Fig 1	The assessment indicators" are the principal new components of an assessment model : they must be mentioned in the figure	Add the wording of "Indicators" in the "Conformant process assessment model"	Accept - add into "conformant Process Assessment model" box.
110	FRA	15	TL	4.2.2	d)2)	"..in the assessment model(s)" : remove (s). When instantiating the assessment process, only one assessment model is used	remove (s)	Accept - '...selected assessment model ...'
111	FRA	16	TL	4.4.2	e) & all along the text	" the identity of the assessment model(s)" : remove (s). When instantiating the assessment process, only 1 assessment model is used	remove (s)	Accept
112	FRA	17	TH	5.2.1		"understood" is not a objective concept	Change with "identified"	Accept with change - redraft 1.1
113	FRA	18	TH	5.3.1	last bullet	this sentence is just a "copy & past" of the 2.1 attribute definition	Remove or change	Overtaken by Events
114	FRA	19	TH	5.3.2	bullet #3	Experience shows that the concept of "work product dependencies" is mainly applicable to processes such as verification, validation, audit, tests, Management ...but not always necessary for all the processes in every organization / environnements : this "best good best practice" should not be included in a generic capability scale.	Remove	Accept with change - replace "the" with "any"

WG10 ID	National Body ID	ID	Category (TH, TL, E, G)	Clause, Sub-clause	Paragraph, Figure, Table	Comment and rationale	Proposed new text	Disposition
115	FRA	20	TL	5.5.1	Note	Other technics may be acceptable	change "can be" by "may be" ; change "and" by "or"	Accept with change: only mention SPC
116	FRA	21	TH	5.5.2	bullet #2	What is an " in-process process measures"... not understandable and translatable in french ==> does not comply with 15504 generic requirement of "cultural independancy" of the standard	Explain and rephrase	Accept - rephrase
117	FRA	22	E	5.7.2	"F"	The wording "...across the defined organizational unit" is confusing because related to defined processes and level 3 (or above) concept	Remove the wording "...across the defined organizational unit" which is not necessary to understand the "Fully" rating	Overtaken by events
286	GER	1	G	Title		The Title of the document should reflect the change in the name of the SC7, i.e.	CD 15504-2 Software and System Engineering - Process Assessment.....	Accept
287	GER	2	G	Gen		There are a lot of links to other new parts. Due the fact that they are not yet available, those references cannot be checked.		Noted. Referred to other project editors for consistency checking.
288	GER	3	G	3		Move §3.x to the relevant paragrap of ISO/IEC 15504-1		Noted
289	GER	4	G	1.2		In the note of paragraph 1.2 it is not clear what is meant by "... contained in the measurement framework ...", maybe an additional reference could help.		Accept - refer to relevent clause
290	GER	5	G	3.2		§3.2 substitute "one or more ..." by "two or more ..."		Reject

WG10 ID	National Body ID	ID	Category (TH, TL, E, G)	Clause, Sub-clause	Paragraph, Figure, Table	Comment and rationale	Proposed new text	Disposition
166	IT	1	TL	4.1	1st	"...the extent to which the organization's standard processes...". Delete the word "standard" since it implies a certain level of process capability or substitute with another qualifier such as "enacted".	"... the extent to which the organization's enacted processes..."	Overtaken by events
167	IT	2	TH	4.4.2	b)	It is not clear whether "alignment with business goals" is mandatory or perhaps in some cases one may perform an assessment independently from business goals. For instance When one is investigating only level one, the organization is only assessing the achievement of process outcome.	Delete "including alignment with business goals".	Accept - NB Part 3 will describe how to link purpose to business goals.
168	IT	3	TL	4.4.2	d) 3)	Seems redundant with respect to the assessment scope c) 2) and c) 3). If one specifies within the scope the processes and the organizational unit to be investigated, it is not necessary to state the OU and processes excluded.	Eliminate 4.4.2 d) 3)	Reject
169	IT	4	E	4.4.2	e)	Wrong reference to chapter 7.	Point to chapter 6.	Overtaken by events
170	IT	5	TL	4.4.2	e)	Eliminate reference to "good engineering practice". It is hard to judge. It is sufficient to meet the requirements defined in section 6.	e) the identity of the assessment model(s) used, which shall meet the requirements defined in section 6.	Overtaken by Events
171	IT	6	TL	4.5.2	d)	Add a reference to the assessment documented process. The approach may be embedded in the documented process.	d) the assessment approach used, including the documented process used.	Overtaken by Events
172	IT	7	TL	4.5.2	f)	Should add a reference to clause 6.3.6.	f) the identification of any additional information.....to support process improvement, process capability determination or translation/conversion of results.	Accept
173	IT	8	TH	5	End of third sentence	Do not use the term "performed process". It may get confused with capability levels. Use instead "enacted".	"The scale represents increasing capability of the enacted process."	Accept

WG10 ID	National Body ID	ID	Category (TH, TL, E, G)	Clause, Sub-clause	Paragraph, Figure, Table	Comment and rationale	Proposed new text	Disposition
174	IT	9	TH	5.3.1	last bullet outcome	The text is a duplicate of part of the purpose.	Delete the last outcome.	Overtaken by Events
175	IT	10	TH	5.5.1 and 5.5.2		There is still a dependency between the two attributes.	??	Accept with change - add note to clause 5 intro to clarify linkage. TR to draft form of words.
176	IT	11	TL	5.7.4	2nd sentence	Not clear what it means. Restate it differently.	??	Accept - delete the sentence
177	IT	12	E	6.2.3	b)	Wrong reference to clause 6.2.3.	Should reference clause 6.2.4	Accept
178	JPN1	1	G	15504 Part2		If the scope and the title is changed, the number of IS should be changed.	Renumber the document.	Reject
179	JPN1	1a	G	title		Software engineering - process assessment - part 2: performing an assessment. ~ Part2 contain not only assessment process but the framework of process assessment such as process reference model, measurement framework and process assessment model. At 1.2 of this document, "the requirements form a process assessment framework", it means this document is "process assessment framework".	Software engineering - process assessment - part 2: process assessment framework	Accept
188	JPN10	10	E	3.4		Assessment models - the title of 6.3 is process assessment models	process assessment model	Accept
189	JPN11	11	TH	4.1		The purpose of the Process Assessment process is to determine the extent to which the organization's standard processes	The purpose of the Process Assessment process is to determine the extent to which the organization's	Accept - cross reference France 106

WG10 ID	National Body ID	ID	Category (TH, TL, E, G)	Clause, Sub-clause	Paragraph, Figure, Table	Comment and rationale	Proposed new text	Disposition
						contribute to the achievement of its business goals and to help the organization focus on the need for continuous process improvement. - the process assessment process is not restricted to organization's standard process.	processes contribute to the achievement of its business goals and to help the organization focus on the need for continuous process improvement.	
190	JPN12	12	TH	4.1		As a result of successful implementation of the process: ~ add the outcome of process improvement in the purpose and renumber the items.	As a result of successful implementation of the process: a) help focus on continuous process improvement	Reject - capability determination is also a valid use.
191	JPN13	13	TH	4.1	b)	the relative strengths and weaknesses of the organization's standard processes are understood; ~ the process assessment process is not restricted to organization's standard process.	b) the relative strengths and weaknesses of the organization's processes are understood;	Accept
192	JPN14	14	TH	4.1		In order to increase the likelihood of repeatable ratings for assessed processes this clause of ISO/IEC 15504-2 sets out the requirements for conformant assessments. ~ Sometime it is confused process attribute rating and capability determination.	In order to increase the likelihood of repeatable attribute ratings for assessed processes this clause of ISO/IEC 15504-2 sets out the requirements for conformant assessments.	Accept
193	JPN15	15	TH	Figure1		Input ~ "data (collected)" is input of the ASSESSMENT PROCESS.	add "data(collected)"	accept with change - change box name to initial input.
194	JPN16	16	TH	Figure1		Roles and responsibilities ~ If the roles and responsibilities describes resources, there are other participants of assessment without assessor.	add "participants of assessment"	Accept with change - add assesseees.
195	JPN17	17	TH	Figure1		Conformant process assessment model ~ other items in figure 1 include more detail items.	add "scope, assessment indicators, mapping, translation" as the item of the process assessment model	Accept

WG10 ID	National Body ID	ID	Category (TH, TL, E, G)	Clause, Sub-clause	Paragraph, Figure, Table	Comment and rationale	Proposed new text	Disposition
196	JPN18	18	TH	Fig. 1 INPUTS		Sponsor ~ "Sponsor" is resources of assessment process which described at Role and responsibility. As all resources appear input and output, so description principle of resources it is only resources.	Delete 'Sponsor'.	Accept with change - sponsor identity
197	JPN19	19	E	4.2.1		The assessment shall be conducted according to a documented process that is capable of meeting the assessment purpose. ~ There are many processes that are assessment process and assessed process. Clarify the process is belong of the two type.	4.2.1 The assessment shall be conducted according to a documented assessment process that is capable of meeting the assessment purpose.	Accept
180	JPN2	2	G			activities of assessment process. ~ relation of definition of activities of assessment process and good engineering practice concerned assessment process should be explained.		overtaken by events: reference to good engineering practice removed
198	JPN20	20	TH	4.2.2		The assessment process shall contain at minimum the following activities: ~ This requirement is need for documented assessment process.	4.2.2 The documented assessment process shall contain at minimum the following activities. It is tailored by the assessment purpose and assessment approach using documented appropriate tailoring guidance.	Accept "documented assessment process", refer the rest of the comment to Part 3.

WG10 ID	National Body ID	ID	Category (TH, TL, E, G)	Clause, Sub-clause	Paragraph, Figure, Table	Comment and rationale	Proposed new text	Disposition
199	JPN21	21	TH	4.2.2	a). 1)	the required inputs defined in this part of ISO/IEC 15504; ~ "Scope and purpose of assessment" is essential information for planning.. 'Scope and purpose of assessment' shall be verified and analyzed on the assessment process. Selection of assessed process is important information at planning.	1) verify and analyze the required assessment input (sponsor, assessment purpose, assessment scope including selection of process assessed, assessment constraints) defined in 4.2.2 of this part of ISO/IEC 15504;	Reject - to be referred to Part 3 for guidance.
200	JPN22	22	TH	4.2.2	a),2)	the activities to be performed in conducting the assessment; ~ It is need for assessment process to tailoring from the documented assessment process.	2) the activities to be performed in conducting the assessment which shall be tailored documented assessment process.	Reject - tailoring implies level; 3 capability
201	JPN23	23	TH	4.2.2	a),4)	the identity and defined responsibilities of the assessors and assessees in the assessment; ~ all participants of the assessment have roles and responsibilities.	4) the identity and defined responsibilities of assessor and the participants in the assessment;	Accept with change - replace assessors and assessees with participants
202	JPN24	24	TH	4.2.2	b)	Data Collection Data required for evaluating the processes within the scope of the assessment [ref 4.4.2 (c)] and additional information [ref 4.4.2 (i)] shall be collected in a systematic and ordered manner, applying at minimum the following: ~ The order of data collection should be changed by the other data.	b) Data Collection Data required for evaluating the processes within the scope of the assessment [ref 4.4.2 (c)] and additional information [ref 4.4.2 (i)] shall be collected in a systematic manner, applying at minimum the following:	Accept
203	JPN25	25	TH	4.2.2	d).1)	The strategy and techniques for the selection, collection, analysis of data and justification of the findings shall be explicitly identified and shall be demonstrable; ~ The	1) The strategy and techniques for the selection, collection, analysis of data and judgement of the attribute ratings shall be explicitly identified and shall	Overtaken by Events

WG10 ID	National Body ID	ID	Category (TH, TL, E, G)	Clause, Sub-clause	Paragraph, Figure, Table	Comment and rationale	Proposed new text	Disposition
						judgement of process attribute rating shall be addressed from business goal, assessment purpose and purpose of the assessed process.	be demonstrable from the business goal, assessment purpose and purpose of the assessed process.	
204	JPN26	26	TH	4.3.1	b)	ensure that resources (both assessors and assessees where necessary) are made available to conduct the assessment. ~ all participants of the assessment is not only assessee.	b) ensure that resources (assessors and other participants of assessment where necessary) are made available to conduct the assessment.	Accept with change - delete text in brackets
205	JPN27	27	TH	4.3.4		If the roles and responsibilities describes resources, there are other participants of assessment without assessor.	add "participants of the assessment" "participants of the assessment shall be assigned by the sponsor."	reject: not always possible in capability determination
206	JPN28	28	TH	4.4.2	b)	the assessment purpose including alignment with business goals, ~ assessment purpose include not only business goals but also process improvement.	b) the assessment purpose including alignment with business goals and process improvement,	Overtaken by Events
207	JPN29	29	TH	4.4.2	e)	the identity of the assessment model(s) used, which shall be model(s) of good engineering practice that meet the requirements defined in section 7; ~ the relation of the activities of process and good engineering practices should be explained or defined.		Accept with change: delete which shall be model(s) of good engineering practice and refer comment to part 3 for guidance re. 6.3.2
181	JPN3	3	E	all		process rating. ~ Sometime it is confused process attribute rating and capability determination. It is used at 4.2.2 d) and others.	process attribute rating	Accept
208	JPN30	30	TL	4.4.2	d) 3)	specific processes or organisational units to be excluded from the assessment, ~ This item should be described in the scope or described at part 3.	Delete	Reject
209	JPN31	31	TH	4.4.2	d) 4)	The quantity and type of objective evidence to be examined in the assessment, ~ It is not clear why this kind of item include for the assessment constraints. It should be described at part 3 with detail description.	Delete	Reject.Refer to Part 3 to provide guidance.

WG10 ID	National Body ID	ID	Category (TH, TL, E, G)	Clause, Sub-clause	Paragraph, Figure, Table	Comment and rationale	Proposed new text	Disposition
210	JPN32	32	TH	4.4.2		Add the item of the data collected. It is important input of the assessment process. The data shall include performed date and standards name/identification used in the organization unit.	h) the data collected include performed date for assessed process and standards name/identification used in the organization unit	Accept with change - rename 4.4 defining the initial assessment input
211	JPN33	33	TH	4.4.2	h)	the identity and roles of assessees and support staff with specific responsibilities for the assessment; ~ it is not clear the diference of assessee and support staff.	i) the identity and roles of all participants of assessments include support staff with specific responsibilities for the assessment;	Accept with change - replace support staff with assessment support staff
212	JPN34	34	TH	4.5.2	d)	the assessment approach used; ~ clarify the meaning of the assessment approach	d) the assessment approach used; 1) self-assessment 2) independent assessment	Accept with change. Add bullet and refer to part 3 for guidance.
213	JPN35	35	E	4.4.2	e)	'section' ~ This document do not have section.	'clause'	Accept
214	JPN36	36	TH	4.5.2	b)	the assessment input; ~ 'performed date for assessed process' are important information in assessment and the compliance with defined rule should be assessed.	b) the assessment input include performed date for assessed process and standards name/identification used in the organization unit	Overtaken by Events - cf Japan 32.I209+I197
216	JPN37	37	TH	6		Assessment models ~ It is confused the set of models. Models for process assessment include process assessment models and process reference model.	models for process assessment	Accept. NB clause 3.4 must change to process assessment model for consistency. CF UK1
217	JPN38	38	E	6.2.1 (, 6.3.1)	title	Introduction ~ Introduction already exist in clause 6.	Delete	Reject

WG10 ID	National Body ID	ID	Category (TH, TL, E, G)	Clause, Sub-clause	Paragraph, Figure, Table	Comment and rationale	Proposed new text	Disposition
218	JPN39	39	TH	6.3.3		A process assessment model shall address all, or a continuous subset, of the levels (starting at level 1) of the measurement framework for process capability for all of the processes within its scope ~ a measurement framework for process capability is starting level 0.	A process assessment model shall address all, or a continuous subset, of the measurement framework for process capability(starting at level 0) for all of the processes within its scope	Accept
182	JPN4	4	TH	Introduction	1st sentence	This part of ISO/IEC 15504 assumes familiarity with the relevant guidance parts of the standard. ~ The position of this part against other parts is definition part of Process Assessment. So assumption of familiarity with the relevant guidance parts should not be asked. The relationship between this part and other parts should be clarified at part1.	'This part is the definition of Process Assessment framework. The relevant guidance parts may use for more detail understanding of Process Assessment.'	Accept
219	JPN40	40	TL	6.3.3		It would be permissible for a model, for example, to address solely level 1, or to address levels 1, 2 and 3, but it would not be permissible to address levels 2 and 3 without level 1. ~ capability level start from 0.	It would be permissible for a model, for example, to address level 0 and 1, or to address levels 0, 1, 2 and 3, but it would not be permissible to address levels 2 and 3 without level 1.	Reject. Assessment models "start" at level 1: level 0 is the absence of level 1
220	JPN41	41	TL	7.1		There are tree types of conformance to the requirements of ISO/IEC 15504. - Conformance for process assessments. - Conformance to Process Assessment Models. ~ There are two types of models for process assessment, one is Process Reference Models and another is Process Assessment Models. Therefore 'assessment models' in this clause needs to specify which assessment model or both..	There are tree types of conformance to the requirements of ISO/IEC 15504. - Conformance for process assessments. - Conformance to Process Reference Models. - Conformance to Process Assessment Models.	Accept - change '...two...' to read '...three...' Add 'Conformance of process reference models.'
221	JPN42	42	TH	7.3		add conformance to process reference model. The referenced clause, clause 6.2, does not define process assessment models.	Add 'Verifying conformity of process reference models' clause and change 'clause 6.2' to 'clause 6.3'	Accept

WG10 ID	National Body ID	ID	Category (TH, TL, E, G)	Clause, Sub-clause	Paragraph, Figure, Table	Comment and rationale	Proposed new text	Disposition
183	JPN5	5	TH	Introduction		It is primarily addressed to the competence assessor and other people, such as the sponsor of the assessment, who need to be assured that the requirements have been met. ~ process improvement shall be addressed for process assessment.	It is primarily addressed to the people who want to improve the process which include to develop software, system and service. It is also addressed to the assessor and sponsor of the assessment, who need to be assured that the requirements have been met.	Reject
184	JPN6	6	E	Introduction		a) performing an assessment; b) process reference models; c) process assessment models; d) conformity assessment. - the proposed items are in the contents of the document.	a) performing an assessment; b) measurement framework for process capabilities c) process reference models; d) process assessment models; e) conformity assessment.	Reject - covered in introduction already
185	JPN7	7	TH	1.2	a)	encourages self-assessment; - encourages improvement	a) encourages self-assessment and improvement;	Accept With change - add bullet on both PI and CD.
186	JPN8	8	TH	1.2		a) encourages self-assessment; b) takes into account the context in which the assessed process operates; c) produces a process rating; d) addresses the ability of the process to achieve its purpose; e) is appropriate across all application domains and sizes of organization; f) provides an objective benchmark between organisations. ~ change the order from priority of the experiences.	a) encourages self-assessment and improvement; b) addresses the ability of the process to achieve its purpose; c) takes into account the context in which the assessed process operates; e) is appropriate across all application domains and sizes of organization; e) produces a process attribute rating; f) provides an objective benchmark between organisations.	Accept in principle - TR to check offline.
187	JPN9	9	TH	3.1		assessor an individual having the competencies for rating process capabilities based upon objective evidence. - Sometime it is confused process attribute rating and capability determination.	assessor an individual having the competencies for rating process attributes based upon objective evidence.	Accept
275	SNV	1	G	1.2		Why is IS 15504 not intended to be used for certification? The market demands a standard, which allows customers to require a minimum capability for a selected set of processes. This would be best supported by certifying suppliers using an agreed PRM	delete this paragraph	Accept with change - keep statement as a note (UK14 refers)

WG10 ID	National Body ID	ID	Category (TH, TL, E, G)	Clause, Sub-clause	Paragraph, Figure, Table	Comment and rationale	Proposed new text	Disposition
						and IS 15504.		
276	SNV	2	G	4.1	1	At this point of the document the definition of an assessment PROCESS seems not appropriate.	The purpose of a Process Assessment is to determine the extent to which the organization's standard processes contribute to the achievement of its business goals and to help the organization focus on the need for continuous process improvement. As a result of a successful Process Assessment:	Reject - consistency with 12207
277	SNV	3	G	4.2.2	.a) 5)	please clarify, which requirements have to be met (ISO 15504, sponsor's requirements, ...)		Accept - "of this IS"
278	SNV	4	G	4.5.1		<i>The identification of the objective evidence gathered, including the rationale for selection of evidence</i> is confidential in most assessments. If confidentiality does not permit to deliver this information to the sponsor, then measures shall be foreseen that this information can only be accessed by the competent assessor.	Information which is pertinent to the assessment and will support understanding the output of the assessment shall be compiled and included in the assessment record for retention by the sponsor or another person or body being agreed by the sponsor.	Overtaken by events
279	SNV	5	G	5	All	There is a requirement that ISO 15504 shall be compatible with ISO 9001. It is not clear if the proposed Capability dimension will meet this requirement.	Analyse ISO 9001 standard and provide evidence that the IS 15504 process attributes support any relevant requirement in IS 9001:2000	Refer to OWG
280	SNV	6	G	5.3.1	5	<i>new outcome on communication: good!</i>		Noted
281	SNV	7	G	5.3.1	6	The performance of the process should meet the defined objectives, not only the work products! (work product management is addressed in PA2.2)	the performance of the process is managed to produce work products such that it meets defined objectives.	Accept - review wording

WG10 ID	National Body ID	ID	Category (TH, TL, E, G)	Clause, Sub-clause	Paragraph, Figure, Table	Comment and rationale	Proposed new text	Disposition
282	SNV	8	G	5.3.1		The second outcome of PA2.1, "resources required for performing the process are made available, allocated and used;" seems to be the same as the third outcome of PA.3.2 (section 5.4.2) "the required resources are available, allocated and used to support the performance of the defined process." Is the only difference here that the process is a defined process? If so, that seems to imply that to achieve P.A. 3.2, there must be a defined process. But this means that PA 3.2 is not independent from PA.3.1.	We propose not to require a defined process for full achievement of PA3.2	Reject - a defined process is required for Level 3 capability
283	SNV	9	G	5.4.1	4	The term 'process usage data' is more appropriate than 'historical process performance data'	process usage data is used as a basis for understanding ..	OBE

WG10 ID	National Body ID	ID	Category (TH, TL, E, G)	Clause, Sub-clause	Paragraph, Figure, Table	Comment and rationale	Proposed new text	Disposition
284	SNV	10	G	5.4.1	4 and 5	Combine the two outcomes, to reduce the weight of them when it comes to rating of this attribute.		Reject - outcomes do not imply any weighting
1	UK	1	TH	all		Within the standard there is constant confusion with s(l)oppy terminology on Process Reference Model, reference model, Process Assessment Model, assessment model, exemplar assessment model, conformity assessments etc	Always use the terms Process Reference Model, Process Assessment Model, conformant process assessment	Accept
2	UK	2	E	Foreword		remove 2 occurrences of CD reference	remove 2 occurrences of CD reference	Reject - template issue
3	UK	3	E	Introduction	3rd para	Split into new para at 'This part ..		Accept
4	UK	4	E	Introduction	3rd para b) & c)	use capital letters for P R M and P A M		Accept
5	UK	5	E	Introduction	4th para	process attributes are used before described. Rephrase	The capability dimension has nine process attributes that are grouped ..	Accept
6	UK	6	E	Introduction	6th para	delete 2nd sentence (an assessment team is described in definitions as one or more assessors. This sentence is meaningless or is meant to convey something other than definition	delete 2nd sentence	Accept

WG10 ID	National Body ID	ID	Category (TH, TL, E, G)	Clause, Sub-clause	Paragraph, Figure, Table	Comment and rationale	Proposed new text	Disposition
7	UK	7	E	Introduction	8th para 1st and 2nd sentence	Reword for exactness	Process assessment is an activity that CAN BE performed AS PART OF A process improvement initiative or as part of a capability determination APPROACH as described in ISO/IEC 15504-4. THE formal ..	Accept
8	UK	8	E	Introduction	8th para last sentence	Reword for exactness	.... Also defines the RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE VARIOUS PARTIES IN THE PERFORMANCE OF AN assessment.	Accept
9	UK	9	E	Introduction	9th para	reword for clarity and delete e.g. (move to next para	conformant Process Assessment Models) mapped to a Process Reference Model.	reject
10	UK	10	E	Introduction	10th para	reword	ISO/IEC 12207 AM1 provides a	OBE

WG10 ID	National Body ID	ID	Category (TH, TL, E, G)	Clause, Sub-clause	Paragraph, Figure, Table	Comment and rationale	Proposed new text	Disposition
							Process Reference Model for the software life cycle. ISO/IEC 15504-5 provides an exemplar Process Assessment Model that is consistent with and mapped to the Process Reference Model in ISO/IEC 12207 AM1.	
11	UK	11	E	1.1		delete - for the engineering of software products and systems (the scope of 15504 is now process assessment and not exclusive to software and systems)		Accept
12	UK	12	E	1.1		reword conformant assessments (to be clear with different types of conformity)	conformant process assessments	Accept
13	UK	13	E	1.2	f)	amend text 'provides' (it may provide if the purpose is clearly defined)	may provide	Accept
14	UK	14	TL	1.2	2nd	Either 1) delete the paragraph or 2) Insert as a note (as it is written is may be construed as a potential requirement, in fact moves are already underway to provide certification of process capability)	delete OR change to NOTE	Accept. CF SNV1.
15	UK	15	E	1.2	note	alter 'assessment model'	Process Assessment Model	Accept
16	UK	16	TL	4.1	1st	This paragraph needs to be deleted and reworded to introduced the context of process assessment as described in Figure 1. (the purpose of process assessment depends on purpose and scope laid down in assessment input, the purpose of a process assessment process is generally to provide a framework and approach to perform process assessment)	left to WG	Overtaken by events

WG10 ID	National Body ID	ID	Category (TH, TL, E, G)	Clause, Sub-clause	Paragraph, Figure, Table	Comment and rationale	Proposed new text	Disposition
17	UK	17	E	4.1	2nd	reword ' this clause of ISO/IEC 15504-2' (6.2 sets out requirements for PRMs, 6.3 sets out requirements for PAMa and 7 sets out basis for verification of conformity	left to WG	Overtaken by events
18	UK	18	TH	4.2	b)5)	reword 'objective evidence' (it is identification of not the objective evidence itself) (see also clause 4.5.2 c)	Identification of objective evidence	Accept
19	UK	19	TL	4.3.2	g)	reword (according to clause 7 it is a 'party' who performs verification, not necessarily the competent assessor)	on completion of the assessment, confirm that the conformity of process assessment is performed	Overtaken by Events
20	UK	20	TL	4.4.1		reword (in most of assessments performed the sponsor delegates this authority)	... sponsor of the assessment, or his/her delegated authority.	Accept - ' ... or the delegated ...'
21	UK	21	TL	4.4.2	b)	delete ' including alignment with business goals (in the majority of assessments with small companies many do not have business goals)	delete ' including alignment with business goals' OR reword ' that may include alignment with business goals'	Overtaken by Events

WG10 ID	National Body ID	ID	Category (TH, TL, E, G)	Clause, Sub-clause	Paragraph, Figure, Table	Comment and rationale	Proposed new text	Disposition
22	UK	22	TL	4.4.2	c)4)ii)	suggest deletion (most do not understand what 'demographics' is and what is required is covered by i,iii & iv)	delete OR reword to be more descriptive	Reject - refer to part 3 for guidance note on meaning of demographics.
23	UK	23	TH	4.4.2	c)4)v)	delete - in practice most organisations assessed to date do not have quality characteristics defined, and they are not going to invest time to specify for purpose of assessment)	delete	Accept
24	UK	24	E	4.4.2	d)4)	The >> the	The >> the	Accept
25	UK	25	E	4.4.2	e)	assessment model >> Process Assessment Model	assessment model >> Process Assessment Model	Accept
26	UK	26	E	4.4.2	e)	delete 'be model(s) of good engineering practice (this is superfluous and need to also be deleted in wider scope of new part 2 to process assessment	delete text	Overtaken by events
27	UK	27	TL	4.4.3		sponsor OR HIS / HER DELEGATED AUTHORITY (see 4.3.1 above)	see 4.3.1	Accept - ' ... or the delegated ...'

WG10 ID	National Body ID	ID	Category (TH, TL, E, G)	Clause, Sub-clause	Paragraph, Figure, Table	Comment and rationale	Proposed new text	Disposition
28	UK	28	E	4.5.2	c)	The >> the	The >> the	Accept
29	UK	29	TL	4.5.2	c)	delete ', including rationale...evidence' (not necessary / superfluous, should be in the method approach not in assessment record)	delete ', including .... Evidence'	Accept
30	UK	30	TH	5	all	in process attribute definitions and outcomes be very clear in definition between IDENTIFIED, DEFINED and DOCUMENTED. Also provide a note to explain exactly what is meant	left to WG	Reject - Common dictionary meanings refer.
31	UK	31	E	5	2n	process model >> Process Reference Model	process model >> Process Reference Model	Accept
32	UK	32	TH	5.3.1	1st outcome	delete the e.g. (found not to be useful in all processes and can be misleading) (inconsistent with all other outcomes where no e.g. are present)	delete the e.g.	Accept
33	UK	33	TH	5.3.1	1st & 5th outcome	inconsistency in 1st outcome with 'identified' and in 5th outcome where is states 'defined'	change 5th outcome to identified	Overtaken by Events

WG10 ID	National Body ID	ID	Category (TH, TL, E, G)	Clause, Sub-clause	Paragraph, Figure, Table	Comment and rationale	Proposed new text	Disposition
34	UK	34	TH	5.3.2	1st outcome	delete functional and non-functional (in practice not all organisations specify non functional requirements, and as written can potentially skew assessment ratings between different teams due to requirement to define non functional requirements	delete functional and non-functional OR place as a note Requirements may include functional and non functional requirements	Accept with change - place as a note.
35	UK	35	TL	5.3.2	1st outcome	delete specified (superfluous)	delete specified	Accept
36	UK	36	E	5.4	NOTE	delete NOTE (wider use of revised 15504)	delete the NOTE	Accept - Amplify & refer to part 1
37	UK	37	TL	5.7.2	P	delete 'systematic' (at P rating it is hardly systematic!)	delete systematic	Accept, insert "some", delete sound from p & l
38	UK	38	TH	5.7.2	L	delete 'performance .. Work units' (we are accessing processes, there may not and usually are not different areas or work units)	delete 2nd sentence	Accept with change - performance of the assessed process may vary. Also remove reference to OU in "f".

WG10 ID	National Body ID	ID	Category (TH, TL, E, G)	Clause, Sub-clause	Paragraph, Figure, Table	Comment and rationale	Proposed new text	Disposition
39	UK	39	E	5.7.2	F	delete 2nd sentence (to be consistent with no comments in other NPL etc)	delete 2nd sentence	Overtaken by events
40	UK	40	E	6.1		process models >> Process Assessment Models	process models >> Process Assessment Models	Accept
41	UK	41	TL	6.2.2		delete 'externally' (may be construed to mean something unintended, what is the difference between external and internally?)	delete 'externally'	accept - delete externally defined
42	UK	42	TL	6.2.2	3rd para	This sentence needs rewording to refer to the elements in the PRM consisting of purpose, outcomes, description etc	left to WG	Reject - substance of the comment is unclear
43	UK	43	E	6.2.2	last sentence	must >> shall	must >> shall	Accept
44	UK	44	E	6.2.3	b)	6.2.3 should be 6.2.4	6.2.3 should be 6.2.4	Accept
45	UK	45	E	6.2.3	c)	reword (easier reading)	a description of the context for intended use	Accept
46	UK	46	TH	6.2.3	2nd & 3rd paras	In the requirements spec there is no requirement to map PRMs to 12207 or 15528 purpose and outcomes. The only purpose to do this would be if all assessments performed were being fed into some benchmarking facility whereby one wanted to compare results against a common PRM of 12207 or 15288. There is no such requirement in the standard. It may be an aim of some parties but this is outside the scope of the international standard and in the scope of the spice project. These clauses MUST be deleted OR the clauses changed to a NOTE and the shall changed to a MAY, however the best place to do this is in the new part 4.	delete the 2 sentences	Accept with change.

WG10 ID	National Body ID	ID	Category (TH, TL, E, G)	Clause, Sub-clause	Paragraph, Figure, Table	Comment and rationale	Proposed new text	Disposition
						There is no certainty at this stage that 15288 will be consistent with 12207 or that it will describe purpose and outcomes in the prescribed format.		
47	UK	47	E	6.2.3	lat sentence	this clause should refer to 6.2.4	refer to 6.2.4	Accept
48	UK	48	TH	6.2.4	c)	This statement needs to be thoroughly reviewed and supported before this requirement is stated as-is. Currently outcomes in many processes contain outcomes related to reviewing, roles, responsibilities, resources etc. . If this is a requirement clarification IS NECESSARY	WG to review and consider rewording	Withdrawn
49	UK	49	TL	6.2.4	2nd para bullets	similarly to comment previous, these statements on outcomes in the bullets need to be checked by WG for completeness and any constraints before definitively specifying this list	WG to review and consider rewording	reject.
50	UK	50	E	6.3.1	last sentence	delete 'detailed' (superfluous)	delete 'detailed'	Accept
51	UK	51	E	6.3.2		delete 'based on ... And be' (similar previous comments on revised scope of 15504	delete 'based on ... And be'	Reject
52	UK	52	E	6.3.3	1st para	delete 'all, or' (superfluous)	delete 'all, or	reject - emphasis
53	UK	53	E	6.3.3	2nd para	delete 'all, or' (superfluous)	delete 'all, or	reject - emphasis

WG10 ID	National Body ID	ID	Category (TH, TL, E, G)	Clause, Sub-clause	Paragraph, Figure, Table	Comment and rationale	Proposed new text	Disposition
54	UK	54	E	6.3.3	2nd para	for all >> for each	for all >> for each	Accept
55	UK	55	TL	6.3.3	2nd para	to address FOR A GIVEN PROCESS (as worded may give impression that all processes in model have to have same CL)	to address FOR A GIVEN PROCESS	Accept
56	UK	56	E	6.3.4	2nd para	delete 'effective' (this can be considered part of an attribute)	delete 'effective'	Accept
57	UK	57	TL	6.3.4	3rd para	replace 'process management practices that realize' with ' extent of achievement of' (correct wording)	replace 'process management practices that realize' with ' extent of achievement of'	Accept
58	UK	58	TH	6.3.5	3rd para	delete 'of process performance' (applies to process performance and capability indicators)	delete 'of process performance'	Accept
59	UK	59	E	6.3.5	b)	delete 'definitions of' (superfluous)	delete 'definitions of'	Accept
60	UK	60	TH	7.1		Are there not several conformances? 1) conformance of PRMs, conformance of PAMs, conformance of process assessments.	WG to consider and reword	Overtaken by Events
61	UK	61	TH	7.1	3rd para	verification of conformance can be by different parties not just competent assessor. Refer to anomaly requirement 4.3.2. G)	change 4.3.2. G) as already identified	Overtaken by events - cf UK 19
62	UK	62	E	7.2		should ensure read verify ?	change ensure to verify	Overtaken by events

WG10 ID	National Body ID	ID	Category (TH, TL, E, G)	Clause, Sub-clause	Paragraph, Figure, Table	Comment and rationale	Proposed new text	Disposition
63	UK	63	E	7.2	2nd sentence	delete 'of conformance and' (it is the verification evidence that is being retained)	delete 'of conformance and'	Reject
64	UK	64	E	7.2	3rd sentence	delete (superfluous and obvious)	delete	Accept
65	UK	65	E	7.3	1st sentence	replace 'obtain objective evidence' with 'verify' (consistency, correctness, objective evidence covered in next sentence)	replace 'obtain objective evidence' with 'verify'	Overtaken by events
66	UK	66	TH	7.3		No coverage of Verification of conformity of PRMs	WG to provide suitable text	Overtaken by Events
67	UK	67	TH	5.3.1 & 5.4.2		There is an anomaly between PA2.1 outcome 1 when responsibility is allocated and PA 3.2 where it is allocated, identified and assigned. This has been raised in early drafts wg10n319 and the action was to CLARIFY with a note. This has not been done. (this anomaly has been raised several times by experienced assessors	clarify with note	Overtaken by Events
68	UK	68	TH	5.4.1		Outcome 3 and 4 are misplaced. During assessments these outcomes are found more than anything to skew rating results. AT WD levels these points were raised wg10n319. The action was to move outcome 3 to PA4.2. This has not been done. Experiences of using defined process in outcome 4 is not generally done on a process by process basis. this outcome should be part of a general processes improvement process and not an outcome at PA3.1	move outcome 3 to PA4.2, delete outcome 4	Accept with change - in bullet 3 delete "historical", add "collected" before "and used". Leave bullet 4, Part 3 to explain how it is done.
69	UK	69	TH	5.4.2		In assessments of many companies it has been found not general practice to DOCUMENT competencies as part of a standard process. This should be removed from the DOCUMENTED element. Also competencies are not ASSIGNED. It should also be removed from ASSIGNED	relate COMPETENCIES only to IDENTIFY and not to ASSIGN or DOCUMENTED	Accept with change - reword bullet 1 "the standard process identifies the competencies, roles & responsibilities for performing the defined process".

WG10 ID	National Body ID	ID	Category (TH, TL, E, G)	Clause, Sub-clause	Paragraph, Figure, Table	Comment and rationale	Proposed new text	Disposition
70	UK	70	TH	5.5.1		delete business goals in description and outcome 1. Measures are not commonly described or linked to business goals especially not at an individual process level. In assessments of larger companies it is almost impossible to relate process measures to overall business goals, and in smaller companies, business goals are more often than not, not defined.	remove wording related to 'business goals'	Accept - CF ZAR8
71	UK	71	TL	5.5.1	outcome 4	remove 'across the organisational unit' (it is self evident, it should be for the process in scope in the assessment)	remove 'across the organisational unit'	Reject
72	UK	72	TH	5		This is a MAJOR comment based on the experience of over 150 assessments performed and is supplemental to all other comments on clause 5.		Referred to OWG
77	UK	73	TL	3.1		An assessor is said to be an individual having the competencies for rating process <b>capabilities</b> . However 4.2.2 (d) says it's process attributes which are rated	An assessor is '...an individual having the competencies for rating process <b>attributes...</b> ' or just '...for assessing processes...'	Accept
78	UK	74	TL	4.1		Delete the word <b>standard</b> . First sentence talks of '...the extent to which an organization's <b>standard</b> processes contributes to the achievement of ....' yet this terminology - of Standard Processes - is associated with Level 3 process capability	...the extent to which an organisation's processes...'	Overtaken by Events
79	UK	75	E	4.4.2	(c )(4)(ii)	<i>The terminology used here lacks clarity and precision</i> '...The demographics of the organizational unit...' Many native English speakers would be unsure what this means. Do you mean the age profile? What has this to do with process assessment?		Referred to Part 3 for guidance to be included
80	UK	76	TL	4.4.2	(f)	The identify of assessors will typically not be known when the assessment input is defined. Should this information not be generated during the Planning activity?		Reject
81	UK	77	TH	5		<i>The terminology used here lacks clarity and precision</i> . Unsure what is meant by 'Optimizing meeting relevant process		Accept with changes

WG10 ID	National Body ID	ID	Category (TH, TL, E, G)	Clause, Sub-clause	Paragraph, Figure, Table	Comment and rationale	Proposed new text	Disposition
						'Optimizing ...meeting relevant process objectives...' The terminology of defined <i>project</i> objectives and <i>business</i> objectives is well understood at project and corporate level respectively, but the term <i>process</i> objectives is not.		
82	UK	78	TL	5		<i>The terminology used here lacks clarity and precision.</i> Second para. '...compared to a clearly defined process model...' Is this a reference model or an assessment model?		See AT 13.
83	UK	79	E	5.1		Not clear why no process attributes are listed here	At this level there is little or no evidence.....purpose <b>and there are no process attributes defined</b>	Reject
84	UK	80	TL	5.2		No mention of process outcomes, yet these are key to determining whether the process implementation is complete	The implemented process achieves its specified process purpose <b>and defined process outcomes</b>	overtaken by Events: FRA 1,2,17
85	UK	81	TM	5.2.1		Doesn't actually say that as a result of full achievement of the attribute the process outcomes are all achieved.	As a result of full achievement of this attribute...(additional final bullet point) - the process outcomes are all fully achieved	overtaken by events - cf France 1,2.
86	UK	82	TM	5.3		Although the Attributes can be understood with respect to primary lifecycle processes, they are far less easy to interpret with respect to supporting and other processes. <i>In its present form this wording could not reliably underpin contractually sensitive process assessment activities, i.e. source selection.</i>		Reject as per UK 91. Treat in Part 3
87	UK	83	E	5		Does not always make it clear that it is the <i>implemented</i> process which is achieving process outcomes, being measured, being managed etc		Overtaken by events

WG10 ID	National Body ID	ID	Category (TH, TL, E, G)	Clause, Sub-clause	Paragraph, Figure, Table	Comment and rationale	Proposed new text	Disposition
88	UK	84	TM	5.3.1		<i>The terminology used here lacks clarity and precision. Wording like '...the objectives for the performance of the process..' or '...issues arising from the performance of the process are effectively communicated to all relevant stakeholders...' is vague and capable of more than one interpretation. In its present form this wording could not reliably underpin contractually sensitive process assessment activities, i.e. source selection.</i>		Reject as per UK 91. Treat in Part 3
89	UK	85	TM	5.3.1		Final bullet point '...The performance of the process is managed to produce work products...' Although this concept can be understood with respect to primary lifecycle processes, it is far less easy to interpret with respect to supporting and other processes. These other processes may not themselves <i>primarily</i> be producing work products, but may rather be supporting other lifecycle processes which do. <i>In its present form this wording could not reliably underpin contractually sensitive process assessment activities, i.e. source selection.</i>		Reject as per UK 91. Treat in Part 3
90	UK	86	TH	5.3.2		Although this process attribute can be understood with respect to primary lifecycle processes, it simply takes the wrong focus with respect to supporting and other processes. These other processes may not themselves primarily be producing work products, but may rather be supporting other lifecycle processes which do. <i>In its present form this wording could not reliably underpin contractually sensitive process assessment activities, i.e. source selection.</i>		Reject - refer to part 3 for guidance note to the effect that some processes generate a limited number of Work Products. Assessors need to use judgement in this case as to whether the attributes are achieved.
91	UK	87	TH	5.3		Level 2 currently contains no mention of a defined approach or a defined way of working. This is out of line with the concept of level 2 maturity as expressed within other widely used process assessment		Reject - defined is L3

WG10 ID	National Body ID	ID	Category (TH, TL, E, G)	Clause, Sub-clause	Paragraph, Figure, Table	Comment and rationale	Proposed new text	Disposition
						models.		
92	UK	88	TH	5.3		Although the opening sentence clearly expresses the idea that process activities execute in a managed fashion, i.e. planned, tracked , verified and adjusted, there is no explicit mention within the process attribute bullet lists of planning or tracking or adjustment with respect to <i>performance</i> . Only bullet point 4 of PA2.1 mentions managing performance, and instead of expanding the concept set out at the outset, it is <i>less</i> specific. <i>In its present form this wording could not reliably underpin contractually sensitive process assessment activities, i.e. source selection.</i>		Accept with changes - split bullet 5 into 2 bullets: - The performance of the process is planned and monitored - The performance of the process is controlled
93	UK	89	TM	5.4.2		In its present form, the wording of the introductory sentence of the process resource attribute is insufficiently distinct from the second bullet point of PA2.1. We need to make clear exactly what is different about Level 3 capability. This entire process attribute, as currently expressed, is capable of more than one interpretation, and in its present form could not reliably underpin contractually sensitive process assessment activities, i.e. source selection.		Reject as per UK 91. Treat in Part 3
94	UK	90	TM	5.5.1		The first 3 bullet points of this attribute are similar to the Level 2 measurement process within CMMI. Is this really how we understand Level 4 capability?		Noted.
95	UK	91	TH	5.5		The Level 4 concept as currently expressed is clearly meaningful with respect to some processes, principally the super-ordinate primary lifecycle processes within the ISO 12207 Annex F reference model. However the Level 4 concept cannot be interpreted meaningfully with respect to most other processes in isolation i.e. Software construction, Verification, Measurement etc. <i>In its present form this concept could not</i>		Reject. Refer to Part 3 to provide guidance.

WG10 ID	National Body ID	ID	Category (TH, TL, E, G)	Clause, Sub-clause	Paragraph, Figure, Table	Comment and rationale	Proposed new text	Disposition
						<i>reliably underpin contractually sensitive process assessment activities, i.e. source selection.</i>		
73	UK	72a	TH	5		The capability model as defined in TR 15504-2 and as would be revised by minor changes to outcomes (even though TH) is found to be severely deficient. Assessments have been trialled with a varying number of attributes and some have found to be very successful, useful and stable. Some of the main general points are as follows:		Referred to OWG
74	UK	72b	TH	5		Performance management is better simply stated as 'planned and tracked'. This is an easy concept to grasp. Work product management needs to be amended to distinguish between work product documents and work product records that demonstrate achievement. Records demonstrating achievement need also to be managed but different criteria apply (ISO9001 points out a major difference to this effect). Also whilst technical work products and plans etc need to be specified at level 2, quality achievement can be assured without producing records of achievement or without documented procedures. They would however need to be produced at a potential level 3. A major problem in the process definition attribute has been outcome 3 referring to historical data, this is obviously misplaced at this level. It has been found difficult to interpret in several situations what is a 'standard process' - is it company wide, departmental wide, or as we are assessing an organisational unit is it sufficient that it be OU wide (i.e. in minimal terms project based)? Instead of standard process therefore more understandable is a defined		Referred to OWG

WG10 ID	National Body ID	ID	Category (TH, TL, E, G)	Clause, Sub-clause	Paragraph, Figure, Table	Comment and rationale	Proposed new text	Disposition
						<p>and documented process (within the context of assessment.</p> <p>As stated above an extremely useful split has been to make Quality Achievement a process attribute at level 3 with the emphasis on quality activities for the process and records demonstrating achievement of quality, something sadly hidden in the current attribute definitions. The current level 4 and 5 have been found to be of little real use in assessments to date, and also the emphasis on organisation wide in TR 15504-2 hasnt helped. This is starting to be addressed in the CD 15504 but basically only attributes that can assess the extent to which a PROCESS under assessment at the basic level of a project (OU) can only be considered useful. It has therefore been found very useful to provide a set of replacement attributes for CL 4 and 5 and to provide new definitions.</p> <p>At CL 4 it has been useful to rename as Established, it has been found useful to include an attribute concerning skills, competencies and training together with an attribute on on some form of stability or usage - however the latter has not been found successful and needs to be replaced by some other attribute definition.</p> <p>At CL 5 one single attribute associated with measurement has found to be useful, focussing solely on effectiveness and efficiency. General measurement should be handled as a process in itself with a process definition. The work from WG13 and emcompassed in 12207 AM1 should accomplish this Measurement is a global process where measurement plans and measures to be collected have to be defined and looked at across a wide range</p>		

WG10 ID	National Body ID	ID	Category (TH, TL, E, G)	Clause, Sub-clause	Paragraph, Figure, Table	Comment and rationale	Proposed new text	Disposition
						of proceses. Eficiency and effectiveness however can be related to each individual process (and ties in closely with ISO9001 requirements ). Lastly the attribute Continual Improvement brings in all the process feedback mechanisms etc for continual improvement.		
75	UK	72c	TH	5		In the Capability Dimension provided therefore all attributes with the exception of usage have found to be much clearer and a better approach to measuring capability. It provides greater granularity and is focussed on process attributes that can be assessed at the OU (single process instance). Organisational wide attributes need to be defined as processes in their own right and assessed with wider OU context than single process		Referred to OWG
76	UK	72d	TH	5		The following is therefore proposed (with justification) to replace the capability dimension as currently defined. This is not a theoretical proposal but one trialled and tested in over 150 organisations.	see attachment1	Referred to OWG
261	ZAR	1	E	Scope	1.2f)	Extra space in front of point.	provides an objective benchmark between organisations.	Accept
262	ZAR	2	TL	4.2.2	a)4)	Duplicate recording of identity in assessment plan and assessment input (4.4.2f and 4.4.2 g), however must retain information concerning assigned responsibilities	the defined responsibilities of each assessors and assessees in the assessment;	Overtaken by events
263	ZAR	3	E	4.3.3	Top of page	Spacing before headings on new pages is too large in some cases		Noted - template issue
264	ZAR	4	E	1	Top of page	Spacing before headings on new pages is too large in some cases		Noted - template issue

WG10 ID	National Body ID	ID	Category (TH, TL, E, G)	Clause, Sub-clause	Paragraph, Figure, Table	Comment and rationale	Proposed new text	Disposition
265	ZAR	5	E	5.3.1	2nd bullet	Grammar. Change 'authority for performing the process of the process are assigned'.	authority for performing the process activities is assigned	Accept
266	ZAR	6	E	5.3.2	4th bullet	Punctuation error - ".,;"	work products are appropriately identified and documented, and changes are controlled;	Accept
267	ZAR	7	E	5.4.1	2nd bullet	Clarity.	performance of the defined process is conducted in accordance with an appropriately selected and/or tailored standard process;	Accept
268	ZAR	8	TH	5.5	Paragraph 1	According to the statement explaining Level 5, it seems as though the key difference is the focus on business goals, but business goals are referred to in the Level 4 process attributes.	The previously described Established process now executes consistently within defined limits to achieve its process outcomes in support of business objectives	Accept with change - Delete Business goals in bullet 1, refer to part 3 to provide guidance as to when business goals are needed. CF UK 70.
269	ZAR	9	E	5.5.2	Top of page	Spacing before headings on new pages is too large in some cases		Noted - template issue
270	ZAR	10	TH	5.6	Paragraph 1	According to the statement explaining Level 5, it seems as though the key difference is the focus on business goals, but business goals are referred to in the Level 4 process attributes.	The previously described Predictable process is continuously improved to meet relevant current and projected business goals	Accept

WG10 ID	National Body ID	ID	Category (TH, TL, E, G)	Clause, Sub-clause	Paragraph, Figure, Table	Comment and rationale	Proposed new text	Disposition
271	ZAR	11	E	6.2.4	Top of page	Spacing before headings on new pages is too large in some cases		Noted - template issue
272	ZAR	12	E	6.2.4	c)	Incorrect cross-reference	Change 4 to 5	Accept
273	ZAR	13	TL	6.3.4	Paragraph 2	Work products are not the only process performance indicators - so are base practices. Also, last paragraph refers to process management practices. Part 3, 6.2.2 refers to both	The detailed elements of the process assessment model shall constitute a set of indicators of process performance that focus attention on the effective implementation of the processes in the scope of the model, through their work products and process-specific detailed practices.	Accept
274	ZAR	14	E	7.3		Incorrect cross-reference	Change 6.2 to 6.3	Accept
215		36a	E	5.8	Table 1	Capability level ratings	Capability level achieved	Reject - defined term

WG10 ID	National Body ID	ID	Category (TH, TL, E, G)	Clause, Sub-clause	Paragraph, Figure, Table	Comment and rationale	Proposed new text	Disposition
---------	------------------	----	-------------------------	--------------------	--------------------------	-----------------------	-------------------	-------------

**Supplementary Comments received from USA also considered in Plenary.**

0	USA	14	TH	5.5-6		There are implications of SPC ("special causes of variation") in these clauses. If the measurement framework is intended to portray SPC as an essential aspect of operating at capability level 5 then it should be explicit about this. If SPC is not intended then the explanation of the outcomes to be sought need to be more robust and complete. Note that 15504-3 clause 6 suggests that the full rigor of SPC is not intended. Whether this is the intent or not clarification in 15504-2 is needed on this point. Some people believe that the phrases "special cause" and "common cause" can only be operationalized in the context of SPC.		Referred to Part 3
0	USA	21	TH	4.5.2		Current wording strongly suggests that an assessment that has not resulted in a set of process profiles is not 15504-conformant	Relax this requirement; not all assessment sponsors will want the actual profiles, but may be interested in having a 15504-conformant assessment.	Defer to FCD - impacts on 4.2.2.d also.
0	USA	26	TL	6.2.3		The actions taken to achieve consensus in the community of interest are required but not identification or characterization of the community itself.	Add requirement for identification or characterization of the community of interest.	Accept
0	USA	27	TL	6.2.3a		The domain to which the process reference model applies should be specified along with the scope within that domain.	Replace "of the scope" by "of the domain and scope"	Accept

