

Workshop Proceedings

Workshop on  
**Algorithms & Theories for the  
Analysis of Event Data (ATAED'2018)**

Bratislava, Slovakia, June 25, 2018

Satellite event of the conferences

**18th International Conference on Application of  
Concurrency to System Design (ACSD 2018)**

**39th International Conference on Application and Theory  
of Petri Nets and Concurrency (PN 2018)**

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

Copyright © 2018 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 more than 25 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 Brussels in 2015 as a succession of the *Applications of Region Theory* (ART) workshop series. The second workshop took place in Toruń and the third in Zaragoza. After the success of these workshops, it is only natural to bring together researchers working on region-based synthesis and process mining again.

The ATAED’2018 workshop took place in Bratislava on June 25, 2018 and was a satellite event of both the 39th International Conference on Application and Theory of Petri Nets and Concurrency (Petri Nets 2018) and the 18th International Conference on Application of Concurrency to System Design (ACSD 2018). Papers related to process mining, region theory and other synthesis techniques were presented at ATAED’2018. 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/ieetfpm/](http://www.win.tue.nl/ieetfpm/)).

After a careful reviewing process, seven 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 *Stefanie Rinderle-Ma* was willing to give an invited talk on “*Challenges in Business Process Intelligence: Compliance, Collaboration, and Change*”. We thank Stefanie, the authors, and the presenters for their wonderful contributions.

Enjoy reading the proceedings!

Wil van der Aalst, Robin Bergenthum, and Josep Carmona  
June 2018

#### **Program committee of ATAED’2018**

Wil van der Aalst, RWTH Aachen, Germany (co-chair)  
Abel Armas Cervantes, QUT, Australia  
Eric Badouel, INRIA Rennes, France  
Robin Bergenthum, FernUni Hagen, Germany (co-chair)  
Luca Bernardinello, Università degli studi di Milano-Bicocca, Italy  
Andrea Burattin, University of Innsbruck, Austria  
Josep Carmona, UPC Barcelona, Spain (co-chair)  
Paolo Ceravolo, University of Milan, Italy  
Claudio Di Ciccio, Vienna University of Economics and Business, Austria  
Benoît Depaire, Hasselt University, Belgium  
Jörg Desel, FernUni Hagen, Germany  
Dirk Fahland, TU Eindhoven, The Netherlands  
Chiara Di Francescomarino, FBK-IRST, Italy  
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  
Wen Lijie, Tsinghua University, China  
Robert Lorenz, Uni Augsburg, Germany  
Manuel Mucientes, University of Santiago de Compostela, Spain  
Marta Pietkiewicz-Koutny, Newcastle University, GB  
Uli Schlachter, Uni Oldenburg, Germany  
Arik Senderovich, Technion, Israel  
Matthias Weidlich, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Germany  
Jochen De Weerd, KU Leuven, Belgium  
Moe Wynn, Queensland University of Technology, Australia  
Alex Yakovlev, Newcastle University, GB

## Table of Contents

Pieter Kwantes and Jetty Kleijn <i>On the synthesis of industry level process models from enterprise level process models</i>	6 - 22
Luca Bernardinello, Irina Lomazova, Roman Nesterov, and Lucia Pomello <i>Compositional Discovery of Workflow Nets from Event Logs Using Morphisms</i>	23 - 38
Luca Bernardinello, Carlo Ferigato, Lucia Pomello, and Adrián Puerto Aubel <i>On the Decomposition of Regional Events in Elementary Systems</i>	39 - 55
Wil M.P. van der Aalst <i>Relating Process Models and Event Logs</i> <i>21 Conformance Propositions</i>	56 - 74
Raymond Devillers, Evgeny Erofeev, and Thomas Hujsa <i>Synthesis of Weighted Marked Graphs from Constrained Labelled Transition Systems</i>	75 - 90
Kamila Barylska, Anna Gogolińska, Łukasz Mikulski, Anna Philippou, Marcin Piątkowski, and Kyriaki Psara <i>Reversing Computations Modelled by Coloured Petri Nets</i>	91 - 111
Georgy Lukyanov and Andrey Mokhov <i>Concurrency Oracles for Free</i>	112 - 127