Verification of Data-Driven Business Processes

dr.ir. Rik Eshuis

Technische Universiteit **Eindhoven** University of Technology

Where innovation starts

TU

Verifying business processes



Process modeling perspectives for information systems



Separation of concerns: engineer models separately



6-7-2017 PAGE 3

Process modeling perspectives for information systems



Separation of concerns: engineer models separately



6-7-2017 PAGE 3

Early process verification approaches: dedicated tools

- Applying algorithms from Petri nets / graph theory
- Correctness formalized in fixed properties:
 no deadlock + no lack of synchronization



~ soundness

Sample tools: Woflan, FlowMake



6-7-2017

PAGE 4

Early process verification approaches: standard tools

- Applying verification tools like SMV and Spin
 - Translate process model into state machine
- Declarative properties (in temporal logic)
 - correctness
 - user defined properties (compliance)
- Sample: integrating NuSMV with activity diagram editor
 - "Safe" activity diagrams
 - Automated translation
 - Visualize counterexamples in diagram of editor



Early process verification approaches: standard tools

- Applying verification tools like SMV and Spin
 - Translate process model into state machine



Verifying business processes: early days



Abstraction

- Early verification tools focus on behavior
- Implies abstraction from other views is required:
 - Example: abstraction from data in classical Petri nets
- At the expense of precision



Gain precision by incorporating data flow aspects in verification problem



Data-driven processes: Two types of data flow





Verifying process models with data objects

- Different object nodes with same name refer to same object
- Integrity constraints based on CRUD lifecycle, e.g.
 - A created object is not used before creation
 - An object is not updated in parallel



Verifying process models with shared variables

- Activities can read, write variables
- Properties: absence of
 - Missing data: access variable before it is initialized
 - Redundant data: written variable is not used
 - Conflicting data: variable is written by two activities
- Dedicated verification (flow analysis, Petri nets)

Sherry X. Sun, J. Leon Zhao, Jay F. Nunamaker Jr., Olivia R. Liu Sheng: Formulating the Data-Flow Perspective for Business Process Management. Information Systems Research 17(4): 374-391 (2006)

Natalia Sidorova, Christian Stahl, Nikola Trcka: Soundness verification for conceptual workflow nets with data: Early detection of errors with the most precision possible. Inf. Syst. 36(7): 1026-1043 (2011)



6-7-2017

PAGE 10

Verifying semantic process models

- Process models with shared variables and pre/postconditions for activities
- Process gets stuck at activity if precondition fails
- How can we diagnose correctness of process models with pre/postconditions?

Diana Borrego, Rik Eshuis, María Teresa Gómez López, Rafael M. Gasca: Diagnosing correctness of semantic workflow models. Data Knowl. Eng. 87: 167-184 (2013)



Example



Example



Diagnosis



6-7-2017 PAGE 13

Diagnosis approach

- Workflow graphs + pre/postconditions
- Encode correct control flow execution (subgraph) as Integer Programming model
 - Rik Eshuis, Akhil Kumar: An integer programming based approach for verification and diagnosis of workflows. *Data Knowl. Eng.* 69(8): 816-835 (2010)
- Encode pre/postconditions as Constraint Satisfaction Problem
- Combined IP+CSP model processed by CSP solver





Algorithm

- Convert workflow graph into SSA form
- For each activity a with precondition p
 - Find subgraph that leads to a but does not include a
 - Encode subgraph as CSP+IP model
 - Add not(p) to CSP+IP model
 - If solution exists, then error
- If no error found, then the workflow graph is correct





Results

- Seamless integration of process and data verification
- Extensive feedback to fix data flow errors
- Fully implemented (using CSP solver)

nalysis	
caeses CAEPIAmini	
osing	
	esses DAEPIAmini osing nust-correctness for activity D. tion of variables: {dinner=60, r

Three types of data flow





6-7-2017 PAGE 19

Three types of data flow



University of Technology

From structured to semi-structured processes



Requires novel verification techniques

6-7-2017 PAGE 20

Structured vs semi-structured processes: Taylor versus Drucker on work



- Scientific management
- Standardize processes to increase efficiency



- Management by objectives
- Participants choose actions to meet goals

Routine work can be analyzed and a common pattern derived ... it can be automated by traditional process automation means.

Knowledge work ... does not have the level of repeatability found in routine work. When it comes to work automation, any advantage gained from similarities is overwhelmed by additional costs of having to accommodate the differences.

K. D. Swenson, Mastering the Unpredictable. Meghan-Kiffer Press, 2010

Knowledge-intensive Processes (KiPs)

- Performed by knowledge workers (experts)
- Includes knowledge-intensive decision making
- Driven by data and knowledge
- Progressing towards objectives
- Adaptive



Di Ciccio, Marrella, Russo: Knowledge-Intensive Processes: Characteristics, Requirements and Analysis of Contemporary Approaches. J. Data Semantics 4(1): 29-57 (2015)

Vaculín, Hull, Heath, Cochran, Nigam, Sukaviriya: *Declarative business artifact centric modeling of decision and knowledge intensive business processes.* EDOC 2011: 151-160

6-7-2017 PAGE 22

Routine vs knowledge-intensive process



Case Management is ...

- the management of long-lived collaborative processes that coordinate
 - knowledge,
 - content,
 - correspondence and
 - resources

Michael White: Case Management: Combining Knowledge With Process, BP Trends 2009

- to progress a case to achieve a particular goal;
- where the path of execution cannot be predetermined in advance of execution;
- where human judgment is required to determine how the end goal can be achieved;
- and where the state of a case can be altered by external
 PAGE 24 Out-of-band events.

Artifact-centric process models (data-flow inside out)

- Business artifact: key conceptual business entity used in business operation
- Business artifact specified by integrated ...
 - data model
 - life cycle model
- Example artifacts: parcel, order, patient, ...
- Languages
 - IBM Guard-Stage-Milestone schemas
 - OMG Case Management Model and Notation (CMMN)



Guard-Stage-Milestone (GSM) schemas









- Business rules specify when stage/milestone changes state
 - Might refer to status of other stages/milestones (besides attrib)
- Rules need to be evaluated in right order to ensure that all changes have maximal effect
- Unit of change triggered by external event is called a B-step

Two challenges for Case Management (and how they impact verification)

- How to design Case Management schemas?
- How to manage changes in Case Management schemas?



Challenge 1: How to design Case Management schemas?

- Blank sheet (lot of work)
- Modify template (but who designs template?)
- Start from classical process model



Computing

April 2016, Volume 98, <u>Issue 4</u>, pp 345–373

Synthesizing data-centric models from business process models



Start from classical process model

- 1. Create process model with object flows for default behavior
- 2. Transform into object-centric model (automated)
- **3.** Transform into GSM schema (automated)
- 4. Extend GSM schema with exceptional behaviour



Part of process model



Object-centric model



Guard-Stage-Milestone model



\mathbf{Stages}	Guard rules		Terminating rules			
complete order	\mathbf{ON} +open		ON cpl(complete order)			
send shipment	\mathbf{ON} +finalized		ON cpl(send shipment)			
send bill	ON + d					
receive arrival info	ON +se	$\mathbf{Milestones}$		Achieving rules		Invalidating rules
close order	ON + d	open		IF true	ON	+finalized
		finalized		ON -complete order	ON	+dispatched
		dispatched		ON -send shipment	ON	+delivered
		send bill completed		ON -send bill	ON	-dispatched
		delivered		ON -receive arrival info	ON	+closed
		closed		ON -close order		

Extending Guard-Stage-Milestone model with exceptions



Stages	Guard rules			Terminating rules		
complete order	ON +open		O	N cpl(complete order)		
send shipment	\mathbf{ON} +finalized		Oľ	N cpl(send shipment)		
send bill	ON					
receive arrival info	ON D	ON PIUS additional rules les				Invalidating rules
close order	ON + a	open		IF true	ON	+finalized
		finalized		ON -complete order	ON	+dispatched
-		dispatched		\mathbf{ON} -send shipment	ON	+delivered
		send bill completed delivered		ON -send bill	ON	-dispatched
				ON -receive arrival info	ON	+closed
		closed		ON -close order		

Verification challenges for Case Management

 Verify that key properties of default process are preserved in case management schema



Challenge 2: How to manage changes in Case Management schemas

- Case Management schemas are by their very nature constantly changing
 - Adaptive Case Management

How to define:

- Conditions under which Case Management schemas can be changed, while preserving properties
- Change operations that guarantee preservation of properties
 - Rule modification, delete/insert stage/milestone

Rik Eshuis, Richard Hull, Mengfei Yi: Property Preservation in Adaptive Case Management. ICSOC 2015: 285-302



Guard-Stage-Milestone (GSM) schemas



6-7-2017 PAGE 37

Change example 1: modifying rules





Verification challenges for Case Management

- Verify that key properties of default process are preserved in case management schema
- Verify that changes in case management schemas preserve user-defined properties
- Thinking a bit further
- Instant verification
 - Run-time
 - Zero-time
 - Automated data abstraction
- Resource view
 - Policies
 - Performance analysis

Conclusion

Process verification from single to multi-view:

- Incorporating data flow
- Data flow inside-out
- Challenges
 - Run-time instant verification data-driven processes
 - Incorporating resource view





Thank you!

