

How to Model and Transform Executable BPMN Process Models

BACHELOR'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Bachelor of Science

in

Software & Information Engineering

by

Dragana Sunaric

Registration Number 11814569

to the Faculty of Informatics

at the TU Wien

Advisor: Ao.Univ.Prof. Dipl.-Inf. Dr.-Ing. Jürgen Dorn

Vienna, 1st January, 2022

Dragana Sunaric

Jürgen Dorn

Declaration of Authorship

Dragana Sunaric
Address

I hereby declare that I have written this Doctoral Thesis independently, that I have completely specified the utilized sources and resources and that I have definitely marked all parts of the work - including tables, maps and figures - which belong to other works or to the internet, literally or extracted, by referencing the source as borrowed.

Vienna, 1st January, 2022

Dragana Sunaric

Acknowledgements

write Acknowledgements

Abstract

write Abstract

Contents

Abstract	vii
Contents	ix
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Goal of This Thesis	2
1.2 Structure of This Thesis	2
2 Automating Business Processes	3
2.1 Why Automate Processes?	3
2.2 Executable vs Conceptual Process Models	4
2.3 Making Process Models Executable	5
3 Evaluating and Optimizing Executable Process Models	13
3.1 Six Sigma and Value Added Analysis	13
3.2 Quantitative Analysis	17
4 Concept and Implementation	25
4.1 Software Architecture	25
4.2 Interface	26
4.3 Suggestions for improvement	27
5 Case Study	31
5.1 The example model	31
5.2 Evaluation by the Software	33
5.3 Comply with Naming Conventions	35
5.4 Eliminate Manual Tasks	36
5.5 Extend automation boundaries	36
5.6 No two consecutive Tasks handled by the same resource	36
5.7 Inclusive Gateways over combining parallel and exclusive Gateways . .	37
5.8 Value Added Analysis	38
5.9 Evaluate Suggestions Quantitative	38
6 Conclusion	39
	ix

List of Figures	41
Listings	43
Acronyms	45
Bibliography	47

Introduction

Business Process Model and Notation (BPMN) is an widely used and established diagramming language with the purpose of visualizing business processes in organizations. Process models are usually created by process analysts together with domain experts. BPMN-models created that way contain incomplete and implicit information for the specific business domain and are therefore called conceptual BPMN model. By involving IT-experts these conceptual BPMN models can be made executable and automated using a Workflow Managment System (WfMS). [15]

Today WfMSs like Camunda BPM and Alfresco Process Services (BPM) are widely used by big organizations [5] [1]. Real-life processes being executed in WfMSs can be complex and have to be changed and reevaluated together with the software that is executed in these processes as requirements and guidelines for the specific domain change continuous.

Using an WfMS to directly automate processes defined as BPMN has the advantage to be readable for IT-experts as well as domain-experts. As a consequence both parties have a common understanding of the process and communication is easier when changes have to be made to the process or the software. In order for the cooperation between IT and business to work smoothly, executable BPMN model should be as simple to understand as possible and be in line with known standards and best practices.

Applying guidelines for good executable BPMN models does not only increase readability but can also have direct impact on process costs. Due to the pricing scheme of some enterprise WfMSs, which take into account the total number of nodes passed by process instances, eliminating non necessary handovers and therefore reducing the number of nodes in the BPMN model, can have an impact on the required license.

1.1 Goal of This Thesis

The goal of this thesis is to give practical guidance on how to apply best practices and methodologies to create and good executable BPMN models and to improve existing models to satisfy these best practices.

1.2 Structure of This Thesis

This goal will be achieved by stating the current research on creating executable BPMN models in chapter 2.

After that, this work will take a look at methods for transforming and improving existing executable BPMN models and how to use them to create models in line with the stated best practices. In order to compare two process models, this work will also provide methods for measuring metrics like time and cost of processes defined as BPMN models. This will be shown in chapter 3

Along with this thesis a software was developed that scans a given BPMN model for used Anti-patterns. The documentation and implementation details of the developed software can be found in 4.

Finally this thesis will provide detailed information about how to use mentioned guidelines together with the developed software in practice with a case study in chapter 5.

Automating Business Processes

The following chapter will provide an overview of the current research on best practices when creating executable BPMN models. First it will discuss the motivation behind process automation and using WfMSs and the benefit it might bring to an organization. Then it will state the differences between an conceptual BPMN model, that cannot be deployed on an WfMS, and an executable BPMN model. Finally this chapter will list the steps necessary to turn an conceptual BPMN model executable.

2.1 Why Automate Processes?

Introducing an WfMS in an organization is often done in order to open the possibilities to automating parts of a process or even the whole process. While process automation in itself can be useful, there are some other advantages of introducing an WfMS, besides the possibility to automate certain process steps.

2.1.1 Shorten Process Lifetime

Managing processes manually requires handling tasks such as handling handovers from one entity to another. This can lead to unnecessary waiting periods between two tasks. By implementing an WfMS resource allocation and parallelization can be automated where possible to assure optimal use of process resources. [17]

2.1.2 Reduce Process Cost

By reducing process lifetimes and increase productivity due to better handling resources process costs can be reduced [17]. in this context it has to be said, that due to the high price for workflow management systems the overall cost does not have to decrease necessarily after implementing an WfMS [18].

2.1.3 Workload Reduction

As stated earlier, managing processes needs to be done either by an WfMS or manually which creates additional workload for an organization. Workloads for employees executing the processes are also kept steady due to dynamic resource assignment. [15][17]

2.1.4 Enforce Rules

Defining the processes that is directly executed and controlled by an WfMS enables the organization to enforce the execution of the process as it is designed without giving employees the room for shortcuts. Following rules and protocols regarding the process can be automated and enforcing guidelines and laws in an organization becomes easier. [15]

2.1.5 Create Transparency

Using an WfMS provides insights to the actually processes that are executed in the organization. This makes it easier to determine the performance of processes by providing historical information of completed process instances and provides insight of the current status of processes that are still in progress. [17]

2.2 Executable vs Conceptual Process Models

Process models are inherently business-oriented as their purpose is initially to define and visualize the processes happening in an organization. Business-oriented or conceptual BPMN model are meant to be read by domain experts and contain usually implicit information known to these experts [15]. They are typically incomplete, meaning that not every possible outcome of a process is modeled. In fact, usually only the best-case scenario, also known as the 'happy-path', of a process is modeled in an conceptual BPMN model [16].

Due to their incompleteness, business-oriented models cannot be executed in an WfMS just like that but have to be turned into an executable BPMN model. executable BPMN model are meant for IT-experts and should be a technical representation of the business process while still begin readable by domain experts. They should leave no room for interpretation as they have to contain all the information necessary for the process to be executed by an WfMS. Besides the visual information, executable BPMN model also need to contain execution properties like interface definitions and variables that are used by the process. Those variables are called Process Variables.[15]

An algorithm on how to efficiently turn an conceptual BPMN model executable as stated in the book *Fundamentals of Business Process Management* [15] is described in the next section.

2.3 Making Process Models Executable

As stated earlier, BPMN models can not directly be executed by a Business Process Management System Business Process Management System (BPMS) but have to be converted from an conceptual BPMN model into an executable BPMN model.

There are different approaches on how this conversion can take place. In [15] performing such a transformation is broken down into 5 steps:


1. Identify the automation boundaries
2. Review manual tasks
3. Complete the process model
4. Bring the process model to an adequate granularity level
5. Specify execution properties

2.3.1 Identify the Automation Boundaries

The first step in turning an conceptual BPMN model in an executable BPMN model is to identify which steps can be automated using a WfMS.

Tasks which can inherently be automated are called Automated tasks [15, p. 317]. Taking a look at the BPMN 2.0 standard an Automated task can be one of the following Task types:

- **Service Task:** A Task that invokes a service. This service can be a webservice or application code.
- **Send Task:** Used to send a message to an external participant (A participant that is not part of the process).
- **Receive Task:** Used to receive a message from an external participant.
- **Script Task:** Executes a script that can be interpreted by the WfMS.
- **Business Rule Task:** Executes a rule. (e.g. provides input for a business rule engine and gets the output of that calculation)



(a) Service Task (b) Send Task (c) Receive Task (d) Script Task (e) Business rule Task

Figure 2.1: Automated tasks according to the BPMN 2.0 standard [22]

Usually, not every step in a process can be fully automated. Processes can also have **manual tasks** and **user tasks**. While both describe activities performed by humans, **user tasks** are aided by the orchestration and resource management functionalities of a WfMS and **manual tasks** do not interact with the business process execution engine at all.




Figure 2.2: Manual and user tasks according to the BPMN 2.0 standard [22]

2.3.2 Review Manual Tasks

As mentioned earlier manual tasks are not automated and do also happen without the aid of a WfMS. Most WfMS implement manual tasks as a pass through activity, meaning the manual task is ignored [2][8][3]. In order to incorporate all aspects of the process into the WfMS, it is necessary to evaluate if the identified manual tasks in our BPMN-model can be substituted by other BPMN constructs. This can be done in the following ways:

- **Automate the task:** Trying to extend the current automation boundaries would be the best case scenario Receive Task. Depending on the nature of the task that is currently performed manually, this might not always be possible.
- **Turn it into a user task:** If the task cannot be automated or the organization lacks the resources to automate the task yet, another possibility is to change the manual task into a user task. The WfMS manages task assignments and after completion, the system is notified via a worklist handler . [26]

In the case that neither an automated task nor an user task is suitable for modeling the manual task, one might also consider isolating the task and modeling the rest of the process. If this is also not possible, due to the manual task being crucial for the expressiveness of the model, it might be reconsidered if this process can or should be considered to be executed using a WfMS[16, p. 228]

2.3.3 Complete the Process Model

Usually conceptual BPMN models are not complete and leave out certain information that are seen as implicit knowledge or as not important by the person modeling the process. These gaps in the model might be crucial when a complete picture of the process is needed for automation.

A common incompleteness in many conceptual models is ignoring errors and only implementing the 'happy-path' of a process. The 'happy-path' is the best-case scenario that

can happen in the execution of a process. While it might be sufficient for a conceptual model, the corresponding executable BPMN model has to define what happens in case any error occurs.

Apart from defining alternative process paths, in this step of turning an model executable, it is also necessary to model the input and output data of tasks and gateways. In the BPMN 2.0 specification this is done using Data Stores and Data Objects.




Figure 2.3: Data store and data objects according to the BPMN 2.0 standard [22]

2.3.4 Bring the Process Model to an Adequate Granularity Level

The granularity of tasks in an conceptual BPMN model does differ from the granularity needed in an executable BPMN model. As mentioned before, using an WfMS is not just about the possibility of automation, but mainly the orchestration and deciding who needs to be doing which task. [16]

Therefore consecutive tasks that are done by the same participant should be clustered together to minimize handovers that have to be unnecessarily processed by the workflow management system. [15] However there are some exceptions to this rule:

- **Tracking progress:** In order to know how much the process has advanced, it can be useful to split certain tasks even if they are done by the same participant.
- **Handling exceptions:** If different errors and exceptions can occur for a set of tasks that it performed by the same participant, it is recommended to keep these tasks separated.
- **Managing resources:** Sometimes consecutive tasks are performed by participants that have the same role, but could to be done by two different participants in order to maximize capacity. In this case it is also recommended to dis-aggregate the task accordingly.

2.3.5 Specify Execution Properties

The final step in turning an conceptual BPMN model executable is to specify the implementation details of our BPMN model. While the changes performed up to this step had an impact of the graphical rendering, the execution properties are not graphically

embedded into BPMN but are encoded into the Extensible Markup Language XML (XML) specification of the BPMN-model. [15] A schematic representation of the structure of BPMN is provided in figure 2.4. For an insight in the full specification of the BPMN 2.0 XML, the XML-schema can be found on the OMG-Website[4].




Figure 2.4: Structure of the BPMN format [15]

Process Variables

In order to use data in different elements of our process, we need process variables that can be read, created and modified during the processes execution. Every Process variable has a **data type** that can either be simple (strings, integers, doubles, booleans, dates, times, ...) or complex (composed of other types). A complex type needs to be described as an XML Schema Definition XSD (XSD)-schema file as shown in listing 2.1.

```

1 <xs:element name="person">
2     <xs:complexType>
3         <xs:sequence>
4             <xs:element name="name" type="xs:string"/>
5             <xs:element name="address" type="xs:string"/>
6             <xs:element name="city" type="xs:string"/>
7             <xs:element name="country" type="xs:string"/>
8         </xs:sequence>
9     </xs:complexType>
10 </xs:element>

```

Listing 2.1: The XML-Schema Definition for a complex type 'person'

The corresponding complex XML object can be seen in listing 2.2.

```

1 <person>
2     <name>Dragana Sunaric</name>

```

```
3      <address>Wiedner-Hauptstrasse 5</address>
4      <city>1040 Wien</city>
5      <country>Austria</country>
6 </person>
```

Listing 2.2: An instance of the complex type 'person'

The definition of common errors, messages and escalations that are either thrown or listened to by events and tasks are also part of the execution properties.

Messages

Every BPMN element has at least an **id** that identifies the given element and a descriptive **name** of the element.[22] Despite of the properties that all BPMN elements have, messages have no additional variables that need to be set. An example for a message specification can be seen in listing 2.3.

```
1 <message id="Message_ID" name="Message_NAME"/>
```

Listing 2.3: Example for a message definition

Errors

Errors additionally have an **errorCode** that specifies the given Error. Events can listen for this specific error code and trigger when it is thrown. An example error is defined in listing 2.4.

```
1 <error id="Error_ID" name="Error_NAME" errorCode="Error_CODE"/>
```

Listing 2.4: Example for a error definition

Escalations

Similar to errors, escalations additionally have an **escalationCode** that can be used to listened to this escalation by events. An example for a escalation specification is shown in listing 2.5.

```
1 <escalation id="Esc_ID" name="Esc_NAME" escalationCode="Esc_CODE"/>
```

Listing 2.5: Example for a escalation definition

Input and Output Variables

The earlier mentioned process variables are active during the whole process life-cycle. While having globally available variables has its advantages, some data used in the process might only be used in single tasks. There are even approaches to eliminate globally available process variables all together [10]. For data that is only used in individual

elements of the model it is possible to define input and output values for each task. These variables are only visible within the specific task and have to be defined as an XSD-schema file, similarly to complex process variables. [15]

Service Tasks

Service tasks can be used to call external application or web-services. In order to do that, the interaction with the given service has to be defined in the process model. The called service has to provide an interface that describes the available service-operations and their parameters as well as the associated return values. Service operations can be synchronous, meaning the process instance waits for the operation to return a value or error code, or asynchronous, meaning the process does not wait for a response and carries on with the process after calling the service. Based on the service interface definition, input and output variables have to be defined for the service-call. The WfMS does this by copying the above mentioned Input values of the Task into the service call and if defined, copy the output values of the service call into the output values of the service task. [15]

2.3.6 Apply Naming Conventions

In order to create readable models, it is recommended to apply naming conventions for BPMN 2.0 diagrams. While there are many suggestions for naming conventions, none is defined or recommended by the BPMN 2.0 standard [22] itself. The following is a suggestion for naming different BPMN elements based on [16], [?] [27] and [23].

Events

Names of events should start with a business object (noun) followed by a verb. In order to indicate that something just happened, the verb should be in the past participle form. The noun can be specified by an adjective in front. Examples for good event names:

- *order delivered*
- *Large order delivered*

Tasks

Tasks should be named starting with a verb and followed by a business object (noun). The object can be specified using an adjective. If needed, the task name can also answer how the task will be accomplished by appending an explanation to the task name. Examples for good task names:

- *deliver order*
- *deliver large order*
- *deliver large order with truck*

Gateways

Gateways only need to be named if they are divergent exclusive gateways. Divergent exclusive gateways should consist of at least a noun followed by a verb and a question mark to indicate what is evaluated at this gateway. Alternatively a whole question can be asked. Examples for good gateway labels:

- *order delivered?*
- *was order delivered in time?*

Sequence Flows

Sequence flows only need to be named if they come out of diverging Event based, exclusive or inclusive gateways. Sequence flows that follow one of those gateways should have labels that indicate the outcome of the gateway condition.

General Rules

All tasks, events and gateways should have a label. Sequence flows should have a label if they leave an exclusive, inclusive or event based gateway. Generally the naming convention should be consistent and for readability it is recommended to avoid long names. As a rule of thumb, having labels that are no longer than 5 words is recommended[15].

Evaluating and Optimizing Executable Process Models

This chapter will give an introduction on how existing process models can be evaluated and optimized. First, it will show how process steps can be eliminated using *value added analysis* as part of the *six sigma* initiative. After that, this chapter will give an introduction to methods for measuring metrics like time and cost of processes defined as BPMN models in order to better evaluate two alternative processes.

3.1 Six Sigma and Value Added Analysis

3.1.1 Introduction to Six Sigma

The first analysis and optimization technique discussed in this chapter originates from the six sigma initiative. The name six sigma stands for the interval of 6σ in the normal distribution that indicates the aimed success rate of 99.99966% of a process [25][30]. A representation of the statistical meaning can be seen in figure 3.1. Apart from the goal to decrease the error rate, 6σ is also a methodology for systematically improving other aspects of process quality [28].




Figure 3.1: The standard normal distribution showing the 6σ interval (graphic from [30])

While countless tools are available as part of six sigma, the two main methodologies applied in these tools are **Define, Measure, Analyze, Improve, Control** [24] (DMAIC), used for improving existing processes, and **Define, Measure, Analyze, Design, Verify** [24] (DMADV), used when creating new processes [24].

Applied in the context of (executable) business processes, six sigma provides a method to identify and eliminate inefficient or needless steps in a process, called *value added analysis* [31].

3.1.2 Value Added Analysis (VAA)

The aim of value added analysis is to determine the value of each activity in a process and identify activities that can be eliminated [15][20]. When performing value added analysis, every step in a process is classified by the kind of value it adds [20]:

- **RVA (Real value added):** Activities that contribute to the external customers expected output are viewed as *real value adding*.
- **BVA (Business value added):** Some activities in processes are not performed with the customer in mind but are needed to keep the company running. These are classified as *business value adding*.
- **NVA (No value added):** Activities that neither contribute to external customer requirements nor keep the business running are considered as *non value adding*. There are two kinds of such steps, activities that are necessary because of bad process design (e.g. reworking, waiting, moving,...) and activities of bureaucratic nature (e.g. reporting, logging, ...).

To make this more practical, H. James Harrington provided a flowchart 3.2 with which every activity can be classified in one of those three categories[20].




Figure 3.2: The value added analysis flowchart adapted from [20]

To demonstrate the value added analysis, the exemplary *Missing Part Process* will be used. This fictional process demonstrates what happens when a customer of a furniture shop reports a missing part in his/her order and requests a new part to be shipped. The corresponding process model is shown in figure 3.3

3. EVALUATING AND OPTIMIZING EXECUTABLE PROCESS MODELS




Figure 3.3: The *Missing Part Process* BPMN model

In figure 3.4 the tasks in the missing parts process (figure 3.3) are colored according to their category after applying the flowchart in figure 3.2. Green tasks are real value adding activities, yellow tasks business value adding activities and red tasks are no value adding activities.




Figure 3.4: missing parts process (figure 3.3) with tasks colored based on their value

After this categorization is done, one can start with waste elimination. The first goal is to try to eliminate the impact of NVA activities. This can be done for example by automating the activity. In the context of the missing parts process (figure 3.3) this could mean automating the customer notification after the ordered product enters the warehouse.

Another approach for waste elimination is minimizing handovers. For example the process can be altered in a way, that the warehouse administration directly triggers the product ordering instead of sending the order to the logistics department. Apart from eliminating NVA steps, this is also the opportunity to evaluate BVA steps. If the BVA steps do not align actual business goals or do not bring enough value to the business goal they are applied for, they should also be eliminated or simplified. [15][20]

3.2 Quantitative Analysis

In order to measure and justify changes in the status quo process, a quantitative method for analyzing and comparing alternative processes is needed. In the context of Business Process Management (BPM), accessible measures about three different dimensions of a process can be investigated: the process as a whole, resources involved in the process and individual tasks in a process. [15]

Before discussing methods for measuring process performance, it is necessary to define what is measured. The three key performance measures of a process are: cost, quality and time[15]

The following chapter will present methods for qualitative analysis of processes. Starting with the definition of the three dimensions of process performance.

3.2.1 Performance Measures

As mentioned above, the performance of a process can be measured using the three dimensions: cost, quality and time.

Cost

The purpose of process redesign is often to reduce cost or to increase turnover, yield or revenue of the process. A cost notion that is often from interest when it comes to process redesign is operational cost, which also includes labor cost. Automation is often viewed as the solution when it comes to reducing labor cost but the costs that are needed for developing and maintaining a software should not be neglected [15]. Introducing a WfMS itself is quite expensive and scales for some systems with the number of processes that are executed.

Quality

Another metric important for a process is the quality of the process output. One quality

measure is the error rate. According to the six sigma initiative, the goal should be to have an error rate below 99.99966%.

Time

Cycle time or *throughput time* is the time it takes for a process from start to finish [12]. In the case of the *missing part process* shown in 3.3, the cycle time would be the time that elapses from the moment the customer notices that a part is missing to the time the missing part is shipped. While the *cycle time* of the whole process as a metric is highly relevant for client satisfaction, it is on its own usually not tangible when it comes to improvement of the process. The *cycle time* usually consists of two constituents [15]:

- *Processing time*: The time where the request is actively processed, meaning the process participants (e.g. people or software) actually spend this time executing activities.
- *Waiting time*: The time a process spends waiting. Waiting time includes the time the process is waiting in a queue for resources to finish the processing of previous processes and other waiting times, like waiting for an event to happen.

3.2.2 Flow Analysis

The Idea behind (work)flow analysis is to estimate the overall performance of a process given the performance of individual tasks.

Flow analysis is especially useful in order to analyze alternative process designs. By considering the performance of each step in the process, the potential benefit of process redesigns can be quantified and the impact of automating individual tasks becomes visible.

In the following section, the analyzed performance measure that is used for evaluation will be execution time.

Sequential Tasks

The first calculation starts with sequential tasks or blocks. The execution time of consecutive tasks in a process can be added together to calculate the total time of those two tasks. Considering the tasks in figure 3.5, where the runtime of each task is brackets below the task name, this would result in a process time of 30s for this block. [19] [15]




Figure 3.5: a process with two sequential executed tasks

Considering a more general process model P with sequential blocks $B_1, B_2 \dots B_n$ the runtime R_P of process P can be calculated using the formula 3.1.

$$R_P = \sum_{i=1}^n B_i \quad (3.1)$$

Parallel Tasks

The cycle time of parallel tasks or blocks can be calculated using the maximum time of the two parallel blocks. Given the parallel block in figure 3.6, this would result in a process time of 20s for this block.[15]




Figure 3.6: a process with two parallel executed tasks

Considering a more general process model P with parallel blocks $B_1, B_2 \dots B_n$ the runtime R_P of process P can be calculated using the formula 3.2.

$$R_P = \arg \max_i B_i \quad (3.2)$$

Alternative Sequence Flows

When having two or more alternative sequence flows with different execution times, additional knowledge about the likelihood of those alternatives is needed [15]. When looked at the alternative executed tasks in figure 3.7, the average cycle time can be estimated by multiplying the probability of the two alternatives with the execution time of the tasks and summing up the results. This results in $10 * 70\% + 20 * 30\% = 13s$ estimated execution time.




Figure 3.7: a process with two alternative sequence flows

Generally, the cycle time R_P of a process P with one or more alternative blocks, that have the runtimes $B_1, B_2 \dots B_n$ and a likelihood of $p_1, p_2 \dots p_n$ respectively, is estimated with the formula 3.3. [15]

$$R_P = \sum_{i=1}^n B_i * p_i \quad (3.3)$$

Repeating Tasks

According to the BPMN-Standard[22] defined by OMG, there are multiple ways to indicate that a task or sequence is executed more than once:

- **Multiple Instances:** Three lines in the bottom of the task indicate that a task is executed multiple times - once for every instance or element. There are two kinds of multi-instance tasks: sequential, meaning the instances are processes one after another and parallel, meaning the instances are processed at the same time.



Figure 3.8: Multiple instance tasks

The execution time of these tasks can be estimated using the same calculations as described above with parallel and sequential tasks.

Having a process P consisting of only one multi-instance task with the runtimes $B_1, B_2 \dots B_n$ for each instance, the total runtime R_P of process P can be calculated using the formula 3.2 when the instances are executed parallel and 3.1 when the instances are executed sequential.

- **Activity Looping:** A loop in the bottom center of the activity indicates, that this task is performed more than once. The definition on when this task repeats is specified in the *loopCharacteristics*-XML Element.



Figure 3.9: A task with activity looping

- **Sequence Flow Looping:** Whenever a whole sequence flow instead of a task needs to be repeated, a *Sequence Flow Looping*-pattern can be used where the looping condition is defined within a exclusive gateway. The default flow points back to the start of the repeating sequence flow.




Figure 3.10: The sequence flow looping pattern

The execution time of both **sequence flow looping** sequences and **activity looping** tasks are dependent on the probability that these sequences are repeated. Looking at the two equivalent processes in 3.11 the probability of Task A repeating is 20% for each loop taken. Task A is always executed at least once. The probability for Task A being executed twice is $20\% = 0.2$. The probability of Task A being executed three times is $0.2 * 0.2 = 0.04$. Following this pattern, the execution time can be estimated with the infinite sum $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} 0.2^i * 10s$.




Figure 3.11: a process with sequence flow looping (left) and the equivalent using activity looping (right)

Generally a the total execution time R_P of a repeated sequence where the inner part has a execution time of $R_{Repeated}$ and a probability of $p, 0 < p < 1$ to be repeated in each loop can be calculated using the formula int 3.4

$$R_P = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} p^i * R_{Repeated} \quad (3.4)$$

Queues As mentioned before, the cycle time of a process consists of the time the process is actively executed (*processing time*) and the time the process spends waiting (*waiting time*). In the previous section basic flow analysis was introduced to approximate and analyze these measures. While the processing time can be approximated using basic flow analysis, getting an idea about the total expected waiting time of a process is more complex, since flow analysis as it is has no tool to estimate queuing time.

In order to bridge this gap, the flow analysis can be extended using an queuing approximation algorithm [19].

3.2.3 Cycle Time Efficiency & Littles Law

As mentioned before, the cycle time (CT) of a process consists of the time the process is actively executed (*processing time*) and the time the process spends waiting (*waiting time*). Besides looking at overall cycle time, it might also be useful to analyze the processing time relative to the cycle time. This measure is called *cycle time efficiency*. In this context, the *processing time* is often also called *theoretical cycle time (TCT)*. The *cycle time efficiency* (CTE) can be calculated using the formula 3.5.[15]

$$CTE = \frac{TCT}{CT} \quad (3.5)$$

The theoretical cycle (TCT) time can be calculated by applying flow analysis. For determining the cycle time (CT) two other measures are needed.

The first one is the *arrival rate* (λ) that denotes the average number of process instances that start the process in a given period. The second measure needed is the *work-in-process (WIP)* which is the average number of active process instances at any given time. If the WIP is stable, meaning it does not increase infinitely, the Process itself is called stable. Those three measures, the arrival rate λ , the WIP and the cycle time (CT) are related through *Littles Law* which is described in formula 3.6.[21]

$$WIP = \lambda * CT \quad (3.6)$$

Usually, the actual cycle time of a process is harder to determine than the WIP or the arrival time, therefore one can transform *Littles Law* to determine the cycle time using

the other two measures (see formula 3.7).

$$CT = \frac{WIP}{\lambda} \tag{3.7}$$

Concept and Implementation

The following chapter will describe the software that was implemented as part of this thesis. The software is supposed to read in an BPMN2.0 Diagram and return a set of suggestions how this BPMN can be improved.

This chapter will start with describing the technical implementation and used technologies that were used as well as details on how the software is structured and how it can be used. Moreover, this chapter will describe the REST-interface that was implemented and Objects returned by the software.

Finally the suggestions that can be made to an executable BPMN will be described in section 4.3. Some of this suggestions will not be suitable to automation. Explanations on why certain suggestions were implemented and others not will also be provided in this section.

4.1 Software Architecture

The software was implemented as a spring boot server[13] application. The software was developed using git[9] as version control system and the git project is available as an open source project on <https://github.com/dsunaric/epms-service>.


The implemented uses maven[11] as a build-tool, therefore software artifacts can be added to the local repository using the command `mvn install`. This also generates the API sources into the `target` directory. After that the packaged `.jar` file can be run using the command `java -jar target/*.jar`.

4.1.1 BPMN Processing

For reading in and processing the BPMN models the Camunda-Model-API[6] was used. The reason for that was the detailed documentation and better usability compared to using an XML parser. The Camunda Model API is able to process most BPMN 2.0 elements. A list of supported elements can be found in the *instance* package[7].

4.1.2 Folder structure

The following describes the important parts of the projects folder structure:



4.2 Interface

The API was designed and developed using OpenAPI and Swagger[14]. The OpenAPI definition is written in one *.yaml* file which is located in the folder `epms-service/src/main/resources/api`.

After starting the software, the API description is accessible on `localhost:8080/documentation/v3/api-docs` and can directly be used for code generation by potential frontend applications.

The application has only one REST-Endpoint, `GET /suggestions`. This endpoint has the process model as request body and returns a list of **AppliedRules** Objects.

One **AppliedRule** object has the following attributes:

- **title:** The title of the applied Rule
- **description:** The description of the rule. Explains when the rule applies.

- **details:** Explains details about the rule and gives explanation about the effected elements.
- **effectedElements:** A list of elements that violate this rule. The id, name and type (event or task) of the effected element is returned.

4.3 Suggestions for improvement

This section describes a set of possible suggestions for improving a BPMN Model. Not all of those rules were implemented as some are not suitable for automation or would be beyond the scope of this thesis.

4.3.1 Comply with Naming Conventions

BPMN models, no matter if conceptual or executable, should meet naming conventions as it is described in section 2.3.6. One aspect of naming conventions is the recommended maximum length of five words for any label.

Since natural language processing would go beyond the scope of this thesis and naming conventions apply to not only executable BPMN, this suggestion for improvement was not fully automated in the context of this thesis. Because of its simplicity, suggesting to rename an element when the label is too long (greater than five words) was implemented.

4.3.2 Extend automation boundaries

The first step of turning a conceptual process model executable is identifying the automation boundaries 2.3.1. In order to optimize an existing process, one could think of extending those existing boundaries and brainstorming ideas to automatize tasks that are not yet automatable.

This requires a lot of domain specific knowledge and can therefore not be simply implemented.

4.3.3 Eliminate Manual Tasks

?? As describes in section 2.3.2 manual tasks should not be part of an executable BPMN diagram and should if possible be automated using service tasks or, if that is not possible, be replaced by user tasks.

Manual tasks are identified by the software. The returned effected elements represent a list of manual tasks in the given diagram.

4.3.4 Complete the process model

Another manual step to improve a process model, is making sure the process model is complete section 2.3.3.

Since this would also require domain specific knowledge, the software does not include analyzing the process model for incompleteness.

4.3.5 No two consecutive Tasks handled by the same resource

Two task that are executed one after the other should be merged, if they have the same entity executing the task. As described in section 2.3.4, bringing the model to an adequate granularity level minimizes handovers and overhead. In case of user tasks this means the same usergroup is executing both tasks. Automated tasks that follow each other should also always be merged to minimize flownodes.

The software recognizes such consecutive tasks and returns a list of effected elements that represent the tasks that can be merged with its direct successor. In case that three or more tasks can be merged, this algorithm will return every task that can be merged with its successor on its own. Therefore if “task1” , “task2“ and “task3“ can be merged all together, the algorithm will return “task2“ and “task3“ as effected elements.

An example on when this rule is satisfied can be found in figure 4.1. The software will return *Task A*, *Task B* and *Task D* as effected elements, indicating, that *Task D* should be merged with its successor (*Task E*), *Task A* should be merged with *Task C* and *Task B* should be merged with *Task C*, therefore merging all three Tasks (*Task A*, *Task B* and *Task C*)together. An example for an resulting process model, after this suggestions are applied, can be found in figure 4.2.




Figure 4.1: Example of a process where tasks can be merged




Figure 4.2: change necessary for the process in 4.1 so satisfy this rule

Inclusive Gateways over combining parallel and exclusive Gateways

?? The following suggestion does not originate directly from the best practices mentioned in chapter 2 and chapter 3 but is a common anti-pattern when designing processes. In order to save flownodes, inclusive gateways should be used instead of a parallel gateway followed by one or more exclusive gateways. An example for this kind of pattern is shown in 4.3.




Figure 4.3: Example for a parallel gateway followed by one or more exclusive gateways

The software applies this rule whenever a parallel gateways is followed by one or more exclusive gateways. The returned effected elements are a list of parallel gateways that

are followed by one or more exclusive gateways in the given diagram. In the example shown in 4.3, the returned element would be *GW1* and the change to comply with this rule would be shown in 4.4




Figure 4.4: change necessary for the process in 4.3 so satisfy this rule

4.3.6 Value Added Analysis

In order to eliminate tasks in a process that have limited value for the customer, a value added analysis as explained in section 3.1.2 can be performed.

This would also require domain specific knowledge and is therefore not done by the software.

4.3.7 Evaluate Suggestions Quantitative

Finally, all process models that result by applying any of those suggestions made by the software or manually, can be evaluated against each other using quantitative measures. The section 3.2 describes approaches to estimating quantitative measures using flow analysis.

Since BPMN 2.0 has no option to integrate estimations for quantitative measures for processes or tasks, and estimation would require detailed knowledge about the process at hand, this will not be implemented.

Case Study

In the previous chapter a set of suggestions for improving a BPMN diagram were listed. As it was also mentioned, only a fraction of these improvements can be automated.

This chapter will provide an example how the mentioned not automatable and automatable suggestions can be applied together to an existing BPMN model.

At first, the example BPMN model used for this case study and the evaluation that is done by the software on this BPMN will be explained. After that, the suggestions as they are listed in section 4.3 will be implemented one by one, using the software evaluation as aid.

In the end, the original BPMN will be compared with the final result using quantitative measures as described in section 3.2.

5.1 The example model

The used BPMN model for this chapter will be a fictitious client registration process which is an adapted real live process used in the telecommunication in order to be used in this thesis. The graphical representation of the process model can be found in figure 5.1 and the full XML structure is in the appendix section ??




Figure 5.1: Example of a process where tasks can be merged together

5.2 Evaluation by the Software

In order to evaluate the best practices that were automated by the software as mentioned in section 4.3, the BPMN Model was given as input for the software. The full output can be found in section ?? the following output for each Suggestion/Rule was given:

Comply with Naming Conventions

As described in chapter 4.3.1, this algorithm scans the BPMN model for events, tasks or gateways that have more than five words in their label. The following list of elements is returned that violate this rule:

```

1  "effectuatedElements": [
2  {
3      "id": "ServiceTask_DefaultDocWorkflowPostAwaitConfirmation",
4      "name": "validate address, validate payment and create
           contract",
5      "type": "Task"
6  },
7  {
8      "id": "DecideIdAndCsProcess",
9      "name": "Decide non default doc flow and idnetification
           Process",
10     "type": "Task"
11 },
12 {
13     "id": "save_member_for_riskident",
14     "name": "save new member in backend service",
15     "type": "Task"
16 }
```

Eliminate Manual Tasks

When searching for manual tasks in the process (see section ??), only one can be identified and is returned:

```

1  "effectuatedElements": [
2  {
3      "id": "data_to_warehouse",
4      "name": "store data into datastore",
5      "type": "Task"
6  }
```

No two consecutive Tasks handled by the same resource

Another rule that was implemented was that no two consecutive tasks should be processed by the same resource. The Software identified the following tasks that could be merged with its successor:

```

1  "effectuatedElements": [
```

```
2  {
3      "id": "CancelRelatedWebIdent",
4      "name": "Cancel Related Identification Process Instances",
5      "type": "Task"
6  },
7  {
8      "id": "ReserveMsisdn",
9      "name": "Reserve phone number",
10     "type": "Task"
11 },
12 {
13     "id": "BookAutoTopups",
14     "name": "Book further multi options",
15     "type": "Task"
16 },
17 {
18     "id": "ServiceTask_0p0tajd",
19     "name": "Start Belated Porting",
20     "type": "Task"
21 },
22 {
23     "id": "ServiceTask_0e2r82f",
24     "name": "Create Porting-Info History Entry",
25     "type": "Task"
26 },
27 {
28     "id": "BookSingleTopups",
29     "name": "Book further single options",
30     "type": "Task"
31 }
32 ]
```

Inclusive Gateways over combining parallel and exclusive Gateways

As described in section ?? it is preferred to use inclusive gateways instead of combining parallel and exclusive gateways. The only element that violates that rule in the given BPMN is returned:

```
1  "affectedElements": [
2  {
3      "id": "ParallelGateway_0crudor",
4      "name": null,
5      "type": "Gateway"
6  }
7  ]
```

5.3 Comply with Naming Conventions

Based on the naming conventions defined in section 2.3.6 unnamed Tasks, Events and Gateways were named and Elements returned in listing 5.2 where renamed. In figure 5.2 a segment of the example BPMN is shown and figure 5.3 shows the corresponding changes after renaming.




Figure 5.2: Segment of the BPMN model in figure 5.1




Figure 5.3: Segment 5.2 with implementing naming conventions

The full renaming change can be found in the appendix chapter ???. The full XML representation of this process can be found in [?]

5.4 Eliminate Manual Tasks

The only manual task in this BPMN model is the *cancel promotion* task. Cancelling promotions can only be done manually by a service agent in this fictitious case and can therefore not be automated. In this case, the manual task can be change into a *user task* and the advantages of a worklist handler can be utilized as described in section 2.3.2. The original segment with the manual task can be seen in figure 5.4. The corresponding change in this section of the mode is shown in figure 5.5.




Figure 5.4: Segment of the BPMN model in figure 5.1 with the only manual tasks




Figure 5.5: Segment that is shown in figure 5.2 with changing the manual tasks to a user task

The full BPMN change can be found in [?].

5.5 Extend automation boundaries

Since the process model is already fully automated apart from the *cancel promotion* task and this task is not automatable yet, as already mentioned in the last section, the automation boundaries cannot be extended further.

5.6 No two consecutive Tasks handled by the same resource

According to the rules described in section 4.3.5, the list of elements given in 5.2 can be merged with their direct successor. The segments of the BPMN model with the listed elements can be found in figures 5.6 and 5.8 and the respective change is shown in figures 5.7 and 5.9.




Figure 5.6: Segment of the BPMN model in figure 5.1 with consecutive service tasks



Figure 5.7: Segment that is shown in figure 5.6 with merged consecutive service tasks




Figure 5.8: Segment of the BPMN model in figure 5.1 with consecutive service tasks

Figure 5.9: Segment that is shown in figure 5.8 with merged consecutive service tasks

The full BPMN change can be seen in the appendix section ??.

5.7 Inclusive Gateways over combining parallel and exclusive Gateways

The only case in this BPMN model where a combination of parallel and exclusive gateways was used instead of an inclusive gateway is in the segment shown in figure 5.10. The

corresponding change in this section of the model is shown in figure 5.11.




Figure 5.10: Segment of the BPMN model in figure 5.1 where parallel and exclusive tasks are combined instead of using an inclusive gateway




Figure 5.11: Segment that is shown in figure 5.10 with using an inclusive gateway

The full BPMN change can be found in [?].

5.8 Value Added Analysis

5.9 Evaluate Suggestions Quantitative

CHAPTER 6

Conclusion

write conclusion

List of Figures

2.1	Automated tasks according to the BPMN 2.0 standard [22]	5
2.2	Manual and user tasks according to the BPMN 2.0 standard [22]	6
2.3	Data store and data objects according to the BPMN 2.0 standard [22] . .	7
2.4	Structure of the BPMN format [15]	8
3.1	The standard normal distribution showing the 6σ interval (graphic from [30])	14
3.2	The value added analysis flowchart adapted from [20]	15
3.3	The <i>Missing Part Process</i> BPMN model	16
3.4	missing parts process (figure 3.3) with tasks colored based on their value .	16
3.5	a process with two sequential executed tasks	18
3.6	a process with two parallel executed tasks	19
3.7	a process with two alternative sequence flows	20
3.8	Multiple instance tasks	20
3.9	A task with activity looping	21
3.10	The sequence flow looping pattern	21
3.11	a process with sequence flow looping (left) and the equivalent using activity looping (right)	21
4.1	Example of a process where tasks can be merged	28
4.2	change necessary for the process in 4.1 so satisfy this rule	29
4.3	Example for a parallel gateway followed by one or more exclusive gateways	29
4.4	change necessary for the process in 4.3 so satisfy this rule	30
5.1	Example of a process where tasks can be merged together	32
5.2	Segment of the BPMN model in figure 5.1	35
5.3	Segment 5.2 with implementing naming conventions	35
5.4	Segment of the BPMN model in figure 5.1 with the only manual tasks . .	36
5.5	Segment that is shown in figure 5.2 with changing the manual tasks to a user task	36
5.6	Segment of the BPMN model in figure 5.1 with consecutive service tasks .	37
5.7	Segment that is shown in figure 5.6 with merged consecutive service tasks	37
5.8	Segment of the BPMN model in figure 5.1 with consecutive service tasks .	37
5.9	Segment that is shown in figure 5.8 with merged consecutive service tasks	37
		41

5.10	Segment of the BPMN model in figure 5.1 where parallel and exclusive tasks are combined instead of using an inclusive gateway	38
5.11	Segment that is shown in figure 5.10 with using an inclusive gateway . . .	38

Listings

2.1	The XML-Schema Definiton for a complex type 'person'	8
2.2	An instance of the complex type 'person'	8
2.3	Example for a message definition	9
2.4	Example for a error definition	9
2.5	Example for a escalation definition	9

Acronyms

BPM Business Process Management. 17

BPMN Business Process Model and Notation. 1–7, 14, 25, 39

BPMS Business Process Management System Business Process Management System. 4

DMADV Define, Measure, Analyze, Design, Verify [24]. 14

DMAIC Define, Measure, Analyze, Improve, Control [24]. 14

WfMS Workflow Managment System. 1–3

XML Extensible Markup Language XML. 2, 7

XSD XML Schema Definition XSD. 8

Bibliography

- [1] Activity customers. <https://www.alfresco.com/customers>. Accessed: 2022-04-21.
- [2] Activity user guide - manual tasks. <https://www.activiti.org/userguide/#bpmnManualTask>. Accessed: 2022-07-09.
- [3] Bizagi user guide - activities. <https://help.bizagi.com/process-modeler/en/index.html?activities.htm>. Accessed: 2022-07-09.
- [4] Bpmn xml schema specification. <https://www.omg.org/spec/BPMN/20100501/BPMN20.xsd>. Accessed: 2022-04-13.
- [5] Camunda customers. <https://camunda.com/about/customers/>. Accessed: 2022-04-21.
- [6] Camunda model api. <https://docs.camunda.org/manual/7.16/user-guide/model-api/>. Accessed: 2022-06-26.
- [7] Camunda model api - supported elements. <https://docs.camunda.org/javadoc/camunda-bpm-platform/7.16/org/camunda/bpm/model/bpmn/instance/package-summary.html>. Accessed: 2022-06-26.
- [8] Camunda user guide - manual tasks. <https://docs.camunda.io/docs/components/modeler/bpmn/manual-tasks/>. Accessed: 2022-07-09.
- [9] Git. <https://git-scm.com/>. Accessed: 2022-06-26.
- [10] How to say goodbye to process variables - video from camunda community summit 2022. <https://page.camunda.com/ccs2022-goodbyetoprocessvariables>. Accessed: 2022-07-09.
- [11] Maven. <https://maven.apache.org/>. Accessed: 2022-06-26.
- [12] Six sigma terms. <https://www.sixsigmadaily.com/six-sigma-terms/>. Accessed: 2022-04-26.

- [13] Spring boot. <https://spring.io/projects/spring-boot>. Accessed: 2022-06-26.
- [14] Swagger. <https://swagger.io/>. Accessed: 2022-06-26.
- [15] Marlon Dumas, Marcello La Rosa, Jan Mendling, and Hajo A. Reijers. *Fundamentals of Business Process Management*. Springer Publishing Company, Incorporated, 2nd edition, 2018.
- [16] J. Freund and B. Rücker. *Real-Life BPMN (4th Edition): Includes an Introduction to DMN*. Independently Published, 2019.
- [17] Andreas Gadatsch. *Grundkurs Geschäftsprozess-Management: Analyse, Modellierung, Optimierung und Controlling von Prozessen*. Springer-Verlag, 2020.
- [18] Horst Gruber and Christian Huemer. Profitability analysis of workflow management systems. In *2009 IEEE conference on commerce and enterprise computing*, pages 233–238. IEEE, 2009.
- [19] Byung-Hyun Ha, Hajo A Reijers, Joonsoo Bae, and Hyerim Bae. An approximate analysis of expected cycle time in business process execution. In *International Conference on Business Process Management*, pages 65–74. Springer, 2006.
- [20] H James Harrington. Value analysis (value-added analysis). In *The Innovation Tools Handbook, Volume 2*, pages 377–394. Productivity Press, 2016.
- [21] John DC Little and Stephen C Graves. Little’s law. In *Building intuition*, pages 81–100. Springer, 2008.
- [22] OMG. Business Process Model and Notation (BPMN), Version 2.0.2, December 2013.
- [23] Razvan Radulian. Rethinking bpmn: how to build good process models using bpmn, 2020.
- [24] K Selvi and Rana Majumdar. Six sigma-overview of dmaic and dmadv. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Modern Engineering*, 2(5):16–19, 2014.
- [25] Samia M Siha and Germaine H Saad. Business process improvement: empirical assessment and extensions. *Business process management journal*, 2008.
- [26] Geno Stefanov. Business process automation with bpms. In *Proceedings of International Conference on Application of Information and Communication Technology and Statistics in Economy and Education (ICAICTSEE)*, page 617. International Conference on Application of Information and Communication ..., 2014.
- [27] Gerardo Navarro Suarez, Jakob Freund, and Matthias Schrepfer. Best practice guidelines for bpmn 2.0. *BPMN*, 2, 2010.

- [28] Geoff Tennant. *Six Sigma: SPC and TQM in manufacturing and services*. Routledge, 2017.
- [29] Helge Toutenburg and Philipp Knöfel. *Six Sigma: Methoden und Statistik für die Praxis*. Springer-Verlag, 2008.
- [30] N Vivekananthamoorthy and S Sankar. Lean six sigma. In *Six Sigma Projects and Personal Experiences*. IntechOpen, 2011.
- [31] Jan Vom Brocke and Michael Rosemann. *Handbook on business process management 1: Introduction, methods, and information systems*. Springer, 2014.