Modeling of Cross-Organizational Business Processes - Current Methods and Standards

Jörg Ziemann

Institut für Wirtschaftsinformatik am Deutschen Forschungszentrum für künstliche Intelligenz

Thomas Matheis

Jörn Freiheit

Max-Planck-Institut Saarbrücken

# Background – Cross-Organizational BP projects @ IWi

- Cross-Organizational Business Processes and Interoperability recently tackled by various research projects

- National, e.g.
  - P2E2 (Peer-to-Peer Enterprise Environment)
  - ArKoS (Architektur kollaborativer Szenarien)

- EU, e.g.
  - ATHENA IP (www.athena-ip.org)
    - Focus on Enterprises, ended march 2007
  - Interop (www.interop-noe.org)
    - Network of Excellence, ended march 2007
  - R4eGov IP (www.r4egov.eu)
    - Focus on Public Administrations, start march 2006, duration 3 years
    - Goal: **secure** interoperations of **web service enabled** legacy public sector applications via **collaborative workflows**
    - Demonstrate on real cases, driven by demanding public administrations, capable of leading the way in Europe.
    - 5 Uses cases, including
      - Eurojust-Europol (Netherlands, Den Haag)

Research question and methodic

- Which modeling languages could we use or extend to describe our processes? Such that …
  - they describe the important characteristics on the conceptual level,
    - Interaction sequence, security perimeters, involved actors, etc.
  - support an automated analysis of the models,
    - Verification, monitoring, controlling
  - represent a basis for the model-driven generation of executable code?
    - Mapping to Services and SOA based workflows

- Methodic
  - Analysis of literature, expert interviews, analysis of related projects and case studies
  - Description of requirements on modeling languages
  - Description of concepts that fulfill these requirements
  - Evaluation of languages regarding both
    - Selected concepts,
    - but also directly to requirements
  - Evaluation regarding
    - Typical, "core" language attributes
    - Existence of concepts supplementing/extending the core

Languages tackled

Value Chain Diagram

"Picture" Approach

EPC

BPMN

Petri Nets

UML

PIM4SOA/UPMS Let's dance

BPEL, XPDL, WS-CDL

WS-Security, WS-atomicTransaction, etc.

Collaborative House of Business Engineering

Standards on corresponding levels

Requirements

Generic vs. CBP specific requirements

- ## Business Process modeling in general
  - Business Process (BP): Sequence of organizational activities undertaken for the purpose of creating output
  - Requirements on BP models, e.g.
    - Correctness, easiness, operational, adaptability/flexibility, support of various enterprise dimensions (cp. Frank, van Laak 2005)

- ## CBP specific requirements, e.g.
  - Heterogeneity of actors involved in process
  - Different trust spheres
  - Distributed, complex processes

- ## Some solution for BP modeling requirements have to be transferred to CBP, e.g.
 - Controlling
  - Process automation

CBP modeling languages – Requirements …

```
┌──────────────┐          ┌──────────────┐          ┌──────────────┐  ┌──────────────┐          ┌──────────────┐
│ Trust limited│          │   Complex,   │          │   Hetero-    │  │ Need to plan │          │   Need to    │
│      to      │          │  distributed │          │   genous     │  │and execute   │          │ anaylse joint│
│ collaboration│          │   processes  │          │ stakeholders │  │joint activites│         │  activities  │
│    space     │          │              │          │              │  │              │          │              │
└──────────────┘          └──────────────┘          └──────────────┘  └──────────────┘          └──────────────┘

┌──────────────┐   ┌──────────────┐ ┌──────────────┐  ┌──────────────┐
│ Higher need  │   │  Complexity  │ │  Automatic   │  │  Need for    │
│ for security │   │   reducing   │ │verification  │  │  precise     │
│ and confi-   │   │ illustration │ │of processes  │  │ descriptions │
│  dentiality  │   │              │ │              │  │              │
└──────────────┘   └──────────────┘ └──────────────┘  └──────────────┘

┌──────────┐ ┌──────────┐      ┌──────────┐      ┌──────────┐ ┌──────────┐ ┌──────────┐
│ Describe │ │Keep private│    │Specify the│     │Mapping to│ │Support of│ │Support for│
│rights and│ │information │    │interface of│    │executable│ │data flow /│ │analysis/ │
│  roles   │ │  private  │     │ partners │      │processes │ │ Messages │ │controlling of│
│          │ │           │     │ formally │      │          │ │          │ │   CBP    │
└──────────┘ └──────────┘      └──────────┘      └──────────┘ └──────────┘ └──────────┘
```

Requirements in the light of CBP automation

… and concepts for CBP modeling

Concepts supporting
CBP modeling

Concepts supporting CBP modeling – Displaying trust spheres with private, public and global processes

- Public process displays only those part of a private process from one partner relevant for interaction with others
- Global process displays all possible interactions between partners
- Orchestration vs. Choreography
- Apart from technical approaches ("Let's dance", BPEL) EPC based concepts exist
  - Horizontal transformation
  - Vertical transformation

- Public process displays only those part of a private process from one partner relevant for interaction with others

- Can be derived from private processes, e.g.

  – "Show just those activities where messages are send or received from organizational unit 'Buyer' "

- Concept exist to transform EPC view processes to BPEL protocols

- **Can be seen as complementary to public processes**

- **In order to detect controllability, a strategy for the own workflow is generated** (cp. Lohmann et al. 2006)
  - A strategy describes a set of workflows that could interact with the own workflow

- **Developed for open workflow nets (oWFN)**
 - Extension of Workflow Nets (low-level petri nets)

- Interaction sequences which can be used in different contexts
- Exist on different vertical levels, mainly on the technical ones
  - EPC/IEM patterns (cp. Interop)
  - RosettaNet Partner Interface Processes (PIPs)
 - Service Interaction patterns (cp. Barros et al.)

Concepts supporting CBP modeling – Swim lanes

- Global models are divided into subsets according to different actors
- Subsets can also be seen as "view processes"

- Applied in EPC and Petri Nets …
- … but more common in BPMN and UML Activity diagrams
 - UML Sequence diagrams are implicitly separated into Swim lanes

Concepts supporting CBP modeling –
# Distributed transactions

- Can be seen as interaction pattern
- Special model elements for
  - Compensation spheres
  - Compensation activities
- BPMN offers explicit support

Transaction: Setup JIT

Involve Europol

Undo all activities for JIT

Involve Eurojust

Undo all activities for JIT

JIT setup succesfull

Proceed with JIT

Transaction failed: One Partner cannot be involved

Initiate alternative Investigation form

Exception: Communication could not be established

Initiate manual solution

- Detailed description of individual interactions
- Enterprise dimensions useful
- Explicit support for EPC
  - Kupsch, Klein 2004

- Use of ontologies to unambiguously describe objects comprised in process
  - Structured glossary shared by a community
- Two aims:
  - Horizontal understanding / matchmaking
  - Vertical model Transformation / Synchronization
- Concept for EPC exist (cp. Thomas/Fellmann)


```
<OrderVerificationFunction rdf:about="#OrderVerificationFunctionInstance">
    <rdfs:label>Auftrag pruefen</rdfs:label>
    ...
</OrderVerificationFunction>
```

```
<function id="2">
    <name>Auftrag pruefen</name>
    <attribute typeRef="classId" value="OrderVerificationFunction"/>
    <attribute typeRef="instanceId" value="OrderVerificationFunctionInstance"/>
</function>
```

Connections: Relation   ----------   Semantic Aquivalence of different representation forms   ⟺

Summary

Summary - Concepts supported by selected business process modelling languages

	UML	Petri nets	BPMN	EPC
Swim-lanes	+	o	+	o
Private, public and global processes	o	+	o	+
Visualization of static interfaces	o	-	o	+
Semantic annotation of modelling languages	-	-	-	+
Representing long running transactions	-	-	+	-
Controllability	o	+	o	o
Interaction patterns	o	+	o	o

Summary - Requirements fulfilled by selected business process modelling languages

|	UML	Petri nets	BPMN	EPC
Keep private information private	o	o	o	+
Specify the interfaces formally	o	+	-	o
Mapping the CBP to executable processes	+	+	+	o
Support of data flow	o	+	o	o
Support of involved roles	-	o	-	+
Support of analysis/controlling of the CBP	-	+	-	+

Future work

- Definition of Collaborative Business Metamodel
  - Common metamodel for EPC / BPMN
    - Automatic transformation/switch between BPMN and EPC models
  - Basis for BPEL transformation
    - Annotation of XML documents
    - Annotation of Web Services representing business functions
  - Deriving View Processes from Private Processes
    - Abstraction of process elements
    - Aggregation of process elements

- Further development of corresponding tool
  - "Business Interoperability Interface Modeler"
  - EPML based
  - Realizing above mentioned functions

CBP-M2
-Event -Function -Link -XOR Join -XOR split -OR Join -Or Split -AND Split -AND Join -Document

EPC
-Org. Unit

BPMN
-Compensation Sphere -Empty Conncector -Fault Handling -Event Handler

Business Interoperability Interface Modeler

Thank you!

joerg.ziemann@iwi.dfki.de