Interpretations of Automotive SPICE Generic Practices on Level 2

EUROSPI² Academy

Motivation – Why "Interpretation of ASPICE CL 2"?

- **Guidance Gap**
  Despite existing VDA Guidelines, organizations continue to struggle with consistent interpretation — especially regarding GP 2.1.1 (Process Performance Objectives), but not exclusively.

- **Education & Awareness Deficit**
  There is a noticeable gap in education and practical training among both assessors and organizations.

- **Practical Industry Need**
  Clearer guidance and concrete, real-world examples are needed to support alignment and consistency in assessments and implementation.

- **Our Response**
  This article was developed to address these gaps through insights and practical examples and will also be considered in the upcoming 4.1 A-SPICE Guideline

GP 2.1.1 Identify the objectives and define a strategy for the performance of the process.

- A process performance objective provides the **starting** point for detailed process-specific planning.
- Process performance objectives need to be defined **as a basis for the detailed planning** (see GP 2.1.2).

- **They are not a repetition of process outcomes at Capability Level 1.** → In this respect, performance objectives **target** how to **organize the establishment of the process outcomes**

- The definition of process performance objectives can be done based on the **SMART** principles

- Process performance objectives can either be **quantitative** (e.g., requirements to be implemented for specific releases, maximum/minimum efforts to be spent) **or** **qualitative** (e.g., adherence to an Automotive SPICE capability level). However, the defined quantitative process performance objectives **do not require process measurements** as defined in MAN.6 or Automotive SPICE Capability Level 4

Source: Automotive SPICE 2.0 Guidelines

Examples from the VDA guideline

- Effort, costs, or budget targets (min/max limits)
- Process-specific deadlines for work packages or frequency of activities (e.g: dates for process-specific work packages)

- **Metric-oriented objectives** e.g:
  - **For SUP.10: max nr. of open CR 6 weeks before the next product release**

  Why this is not a good example: I can have many CRs opened but planned for the later releases. A better goal would be to ensure that all CRs which are coming in are analyzed within x days Or the max allowed time (e.g 6 weeks) of CRs without any recorded decisions /analyzed

Examples from the VDA guideline

SUP.8: not more than 60% of CIs in status “in work” 2 months before next delivery baseline

Critical Observation

❌ **Lacks Context & Relevance**: 60% threshold gives little insight into delivery readiness.

⚠️ **Misleading**: Many “in work” items may not be risky if the critical ones are already complete.

🔍 **Missing Factors**: Work product maturity, approval status, and alignment with release priorities.

✅ **Better Objective**: Focus on readiness of agreed, necessary items for milestone achievement.

"100% of all configuration items relevant for a Quality Gate/milestone, or release shall be available in the expected maturity state (reviewed and approved) at least N weeks prior to the planned Quality Gate/milestone review, ensuring release readiness and minimizing last-minute risks."

Work products review and criteria (GP 2.2.1, GP 2.2.4)

Expectations

- Quality criteria or dedicated review checklists are available for work products (project needs to identify them)
- Relevant reviewers are involved. Mandatory reviewers not defined in the PAM → considered best practice to include a system tester as a reviewer during the review of the system requirements specification.

- Be realistic -> Reviews with checklists with 40+ questions/criteria performed in 2h ?? is it feasible and does it bring any added value?
- Regularly reflect on the reviews, how effective are reviews with 0 findings


Q&A