

ASPICE Gap-Assessment Checklist

Where does your team actually stand? A 15-minute honest self-assessment — before you spend a cent on tools or consultants.

How to score. For each item give yourself 0 none · 1 exists · 2 planned / monitored / owned · 3 standardized across the org. Most OEMs ask for 1–3. Total each section — the low numbers are your real gap.

Foundations

01 — are you measuring the right thing?

- ☐ We treat ASPICE as an **assessment model**, not an implementation blueprint.
- ☐ We know which **capability level** our OEM/customer actually requires — and by when.
- ☐ We know which **process areas** are in scope (not "all 130 pages by default").
- ☐ Our process is sized to the assessment — not bloated beyond it.

Engineering

02 — SWE.1-6, the V-model spine

- ☐ Requirements are **traceable** to source (customer / system) and to design.
- ☐ Architecture and design are documented and **linked** to requirements.
- ☐ **Bidirectional traceability** requirements ↔ design ↔ code ↔ tests exists and is current.
- ☐ Test cases map to requirements; coverage is evidenced, not asserted.
- ☐ Traceability is **maintained continuously** — not reconstructed before an assessment.

Supporting processes

03 — where most gaps hide

- ☐ **Configuration management** — baselines, versioning, reproducible evidence.
- ☐ **Change management** — change records live *natively in your tools*, not retyped.
- ☐ **Problem resolution** — issues tracked, linked, closed with evidence.
- ☐ **Quality assurance** — reviews recorded as a byproduct of work, not signed PDFs.

The Excel-hell test

04 — the pain diagnostic

- ☐ Are you recreating tool-native artifacts (commits, PRs, reviews) as **Excel/PDF**? (**yes = gap**)
- ☐ How many **engineer-hours/week** go to compliance paperwork vs engineering? (**>20% = red**)
- ☐ Could you produce assessment-ready evidence **on demand** — or only via a fire drill?

Readiness

05 — the honest score

- ☐ Do decisions in your evidence carry a **confidence / audit trail** (who read/reviewed what)?
- ☐ If an assessor asked "show me the trace for this requirement" — could you, in minutes?
- ☐ Is compliance a **project** (spikes before assessments) or a **property** (continuous)?

Your score → your next step

Mostly 0-1

You're rebuilding paperwork by hand — the biggest, most fixable cost.

Mostly 2

You have process but it's manual — the continuous/agentive way is your leverage.

Mostly 3

You're ahead — the question is cost, not capability.

Want a senior ASPICE engineer to run this on one of your **actual repos** and show you the gaps on a call?

[Book a Compliance Teardown →](#)

Lukas Timm — ex-P3 automotive, ASPICE practitioner, known in the assessor community; shipped a working agentive-compliance product to a Tier-1 (13k LOC → 7 ASPICE v4.0 docs, 100% bidirectional traceability, 98.5% confidence, 0 human handoffs).

ALPHAVANT • VERA — AGENTIVE CONTINUOUS COMPLIANCE

thenewautomotive.com/start