

Workshop Proceedings

**Workshop on
Algorithms & Theories for the
Analysis of Event Data (ATAED'2016)**

Toruń, Poland, June 20-21, 2016

Satellite event of the conferences

**16th International Conference on Application of
Concurrency to System Design (ACSD 2016)**

**37th International Conference on Application and Theory
of Petri Nets and Concurrency (PN 2016)**

Edited by
Wil van der Aalst, Robin Bergenthum, and Josep Carmona

These proceedings are published online by the editors as Volume 1592 at CEUR
Workshop Proceedings

<http://ceur-ws.org/Vol-1592>

Copyright © 2016 for the individual papers is held by the papers' authors.
Copying is permitted only for private and academic purposes.
This volume is published and copyrighted by its editors.

Preface

Ehrenfeucht and Rozenberg defined regions about 20 years ago as sets of nodes of a finite transition system. Every region relates to potential conditions that enable or disable transition occurrences in an associated elementary net system. Later, similar concepts were used to define regions for Petri nets from languages as well. Both *state-based* and *language-based* approaches aim to constrain a Petri net by adding places deduced from the set of *regions*. By now, many variations have been proposed, e.g., approaches dealing with multiple tokens in a place, region definitions for Petri nets with inhibitor arcs, extensions to partial languages, regions for infinite languages, etc.

Initially, region theory focused on *synthesis*. We require the input and the behavior of the resulting Petri net to be equivalent. Recently, region-based research started to focus on *process mining* as well where the goal is *not* to create an equivalent model but to *infer* new knowledge from the input. Process mining examines observed behavior rather than assuming a complete description in terms of a transition system or prefix-closed language. For this reason, one needs to deal with new problems such as noise and incompleteness. Equivalence notions are replaced by trade-offs between fitness, simplicity, precision, and generalization. A model with good *fitness* allows for most of the behavior seen in the event log. A model that does not *generalize* is “overfitting”. Overfitting is the problem that a very specific model is generated whereas it is obvious that the log only holds example behavior. A model that allows for “too much behavior” lacks *precision*. Simplicity is related to Occam’s Razor which states that “one should not increase, beyond what is necessary, the number of entities required to explain anything”. Following this principle, we look for the *simplest* process model that can explain what was observed in the event log. Process discovery from event logs is very challenging because of these and many other trade-offs. Clearly, there are many theoretical process-mining challenges with a high practical relevance that need to be addressed urgently.

All these challenges and opportunities are the motivation for organizing the *Algorithms & Theories for the Analysis of Event Data* (ATAED) workshop. The workshop first took place in 2015 as a succession of the *Applications of Region Theory* (ART) workshop series. After the success of the initial workshop, it is only natural to bring together researchers working on region-based synthesis and process mining again.

The ATAED’2016 workshop took place in Toruń on June 20-21, 2016 and was a satellite event of both the 37th International Conference on Application and Theory of Petri Nets and Concurrency (Petri Nets 2016) and the 16th International Conference on Application of Concurrency to System Design (ACSD 2016). Papers related to process mining, region theory and other synthesis techniques were presented at ATAED’2016. These techniques have in common that “lower level” behavioral descriptions (event logs, partial languages, transition systems, etc.) are used to create “higher level” process models (e.g., various classes of Petri nets, BPMN, or UML activity diagrams). In fact, all techniques that aim at learning or checking concurrent behavior from transition systems,

runs, or event logs were welcomed. The workshop was supported by the IEEE Task Force on Process Mining (www.win.tue.nl/ieeetfpm/).

After a careful reviewing process, eleven papers were accepted for the workshop. Overall, the quality of the submitted papers was good and most submissions matched the workshop goals very well. We thank the reviewers for providing the authors with valuable and constructive feedback. Moreover, we were honored that *Marco Montali* was willing to give an invited talk on “*Marrying data and processes*”. We thank Marco, the authors, and the presenters for their wonderful contributions.

Enjoy reading the proceedings!

Wil van der Aalst, Robin Bergenthum, and Josep Carmona
June 2016

Program committee of ATAED’2016

Wil van der Aalst, TU Eindhoven, The Netherlands (co-chair)
Eric Badouel, INRIA Rennes, France
Robin Bergenthum, FernUni Hagen, Germany (co-chair)
Luca Bernardinello, Università degli studi di Milano-Bicocca, Italy
Seppe vanden Broucke, KU Leuven, Belgium
Andrea Burattin, University of Innsbruck, Austria
Toon Calders, Université Libre de Bruxelles, Belgium
Josep Carmona, UPC Barcelona, Spain (co-chair)
Paolo Ceravolo, University of Milan, Italy
Claudio Di Ciccio, Vienna University of Economics and Business, Austria
Manuel Mucientes, University of Santiago de Compostela, Spain
Benoît Depaire, Hasselt University, Belgium
Jörg Desel, FernUni Hagen, Germany
Dirk Fahland, TU Eindhoven, The Netherlands
Diogo Ferreira, Universidade de Lisboa, Portugal
Luciano Garca-Bañuelos, University of Tartu, Estonia
Stefan Haar, LSV CNRS & ENS de Cachan, France
Gabriel Juhás, Slovak University of Technology, Slovak Republic
Anna Kalenkova, Higher School of Economics NRU, Russia
Jetty Kleijn, Leiden University, The Netherlands
Robert Lorenz, Uni Augsburg, Germany
Hernán Ponce de León, Aalto University, Finland
Marta Pietkiewicz-Koutny, Newcastle University, GB
Marcos Sepúlveda, Universidad Católica de Chile, Chile
Jochen De Weerd, KU Leuven, Belgium
Alex Yakovlev, Newcastle University, GB

Table of Contents

P. De Koninck, J. De Weerd <i>Determining the Number of Trace Clusters: a Stability-based Approach</i>	1 - 15
B. Vázquez-Barreiros, D. Chapela, M. Mucientes, M. Lama, D. Borea <i>Process Mining in IT Service Management: A Case Study</i>	16 - 30
T. Tapia-Flores, E. Rodríguez-Pérez, E. López-Mellado <i>Discovering Process Models from Incomplete Event Logs using Conjoint Occurrence Classes</i>	31 - 46
B. Meis, R. Bergenthum, J. Desel <i>Synthesis of Elementary Net Systems with Final Configurations</i>	47 - 57
G. Juhás, R. Lorenz <i>Synthesis of bounded Petri Nets from Prime Event Structures with Cutting Context</i>	58 - 77
S. A. Shershakov, A. A. Kalenkova, I. A. Lomazova <i>Transition Systems Reduction: Balancing between Precision and Simplicity</i>	78 - 95
M. T. Gómez-López, D. Borrego, J. Carmona, R. M. Gasca <i>Computing Alignments with Constraint Programming: The Acyclic Case</i>	96 - 110
K. Barylska, E. Best <i>Properties of Plain, Pure, and Safe Petri Nets - with some Applications to Petri Net Synthesis</i>	111 - 125
J. Holderer, J. Carmona, G. Müller <i>Security-Sensitive Tackling of Obstructed Workflow Executions</i>	126 - 137
G. Janssenswillen, B. Depaire, T. Jouck <i>Calculating the Number of Unique Paths in a Block-Structured Process Model</i>	138 - 152
E. Rodríguez-Pérez, T. Tapia-Flores, E. López-Mellado <i>Identification of Timed Discrete Event Processes. Building Input-Output Petri Net Models</i>	153 - 167