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Motivation

Example: Health Care Workflow in Flow Chart

- OK
  - [pm, s, gm]
  - [pm, s, dt, pm, s, gm]
- Missing
  - [pm, pm, s, gm]
  - [pm, s, pm, s, gm]
  - [pm, s, gm, gm, pm, s, gm]

- The given flow chart is rigid.
  - possibility of adding several prescriptions before and after signing is missing
Motivation

Flexibility versus Support in workflows

• **Flexibility:** ability to
  - defer: decide to decide later
  - change: decide to change model
  - deviate: decide to ignore model

• **Support:** provide analysis and guidance

• unstructured: do whatever you want, but get no support (ex: email programs)

• structured: support, but no flexibility (traditional workflows)

Classical trade-off between flexibility and support

[1] W.M.P. van der Aalst et al. Declarative workflows: Balancing between flexibility and support
Motivation

Imperative versus Declarative models

• Imperative:
  • explicitly specify the control flow
  • over-constrain the control flow
  • adding a new constraint requires to make a new model

• Declarative:
  • implicitly specify the control flow
  • specify constrains to forbid the unwanted behavior
  • difficult to perceive what are the next possible actions
  • difficult to get an overview about how to get to the end.

Goal

• Develop a formal process model which makes it easy
  • to describe loosely constrained workflows in an incremental way
  • to understand and to execute
  • to serve as basis for well founded typed workflow language

Related Work

• Declare: declarative workflow language

• Event Calculus
  • Nihan Kesim Cicekli and Ilyas Cicekli. Formalizing the specification and execution of workflows using the event calculus. (2006)
Overview of Dynamic Condition Response Structures

- Causality relation
- Condition and response relations
- Event Structures
- Condition Response Event Structures
- Dynamic Condition Response Structures
- Distributed Dynamic Condition Response Structures

- Binary conflict relation
- Repeated execution of events & dynamic include and exclude relation
- + Distribution of events
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**Event Structures**

**Definition**
A labeled *prime event structure* (ES) over an alphabet $\text{Act}$ is a 4-tuple $(E, \leq, \#, l)$ where

- $E$ is a (possibly infinite) set of events
- $\leq \subseteq E \times E$ is the causality relation between events which is partial order
- $\# \subseteq E \times E$ is a binary conflict relation between events which is irreflexive and symmetric
- $l : E \to \text{Act}$ is the labeling function mapping events to actions

1. Causality relation satisfies principle of finite causes:
   $\forall e \in E : \{e' \in E \mid e' \leq e\}$ is finite.

2. Conflict relation satisfies principle of conflict heredity:
   $\forall e, e', e'' \in E.e \# e' \land e \leq e'' \Rightarrow e' \# e''$

3. A run is a sequence $e_0, e_1, .. e_n$ such that, $e_i \downarrow \leq \{e_0, .. e_{i-1}\}$ for $\forall i, j. \neg(e_i \# e_j)$
Event Structures

- Events structures are missing
  - finite representation of infinite behavior
  - accepting condition
  - distribution of events
Example in Event Structures

Example: Health Care Workflow in Event Structures

Events $E = \{pm, s, gm, dt\}$
Causality Relation: $pm \leq s \leq gm$, $s \leq dt$
Conflict Relation: $gm \# dt$
Possible Runs
- $[pm, s, gm]$
- $[pm, s, dt]$
- $[pm, s]$
- $[pm]$

How can we make sure that every time when $pm$ happens eventually $gm$ also happens?
Condition Response Event Structures (CRES)

Definition

A labeled condition response event structure (CRES) over an alphabet \(Act\) is a tuple \((E, \leq_C, \leq_R, \#, I)\) where

- \(\leq_C \subseteq E \times E\) is the condition relation between events which is partial order

- \(\leq_R \subseteq E \times E\) is the response relation between events, satisfying that \(\leq = \leq_C \cup \leq_R\) is a acyclic relation

- \(E, \#, I\) are same as Event Structures

Runs and accepting conditions

1. if \(e \leq_C e'\) then \(e\) must happen before \(e'\)

2. if \(e \leq_R e'\) then after \(e\) happens, \(e'\) must eventually happen or become in conflict for the computation to be accepting.
Condition Response Event Structures - 2

Proposition

The labelled prime event structure \((E, \leq, \#, I, \text{Act})\) has the same runs as the accepting runs of the CRES structure \((E, \text{Act}, \leq_C, \leq_R, \#, I, \text{Act})\) where \(\leq_C \subseteq \leq, \leq_R = \emptyset\)

- \(E = \{pm, s, gm, dt\}\)
- \(\leq_C = \{(pm, s), (s, gm), (s, dt)\}\)
- \(\leq_R = \{(pm, s), (pm, gm)\}\)
- \(\# = \{(gm, dt)\}\)
- Possible runs
  - \([pm, s]\) OK, but not accepting
  - \([pm, s, gm]\) accepting
  - \([pm, s, dt]\) accepting

How would we able to re-execute \textit{prescribe medicine} and/or \textit{sign} after \textit{don’t trust}?
Dynamic Condition Response Structures (DCRS)

Definition

A dynamic condition response structure (DCR) is a tuple $D = (E, \text{Act}, \rightarrow\bullet, \bullet\rightarrow, \pm, l)$ where

- $\rightarrow\bullet \subseteq E \times E$ is the condition relation
- $\bullet\rightarrow \subseteq E \times E$ is the response relation
- $\pm : E \times E \rightarrow \{+,%，,*\}$ is the dynamic inclusion/exclusion relation.
- The rest are same as Condition Response Event Structures

1. condition relation in DCRS ($\rightarrow\bullet$) is same as condition relation in CRES ($\leq_C$)
2. response relation in DCRS ($\bullet\rightarrow$) is same as response relation in CRES ($\leq_R$)
3. conflict relation is generalized to include relation $+$ exclude relation to include/exclude events dynamically.
4. $\pm(e, e') = +$ if event $e$ gets executed, then it will include event $e'$
5. $\pm(e, e') = %$ if event $e$ gets executed, then it will exclude event $e'$
6. conflict relation is monotone (once an event is in conflict it stays in conflict), but dynamic inclusion/exclusion allows an event to alternate between being in conflict and not.
7. execution of an event only depends on the condition relation restricted to the currently included events.
Dynamic Condition Response Structures (DCRS)

Proposition

The condition response event structure \((E, \leq_C, \leq_R, \#, I, Act)\) has the same accepting runs as the accepting runs of the DCR structure \((E, Act, \rightarrow\bullet, \bullet\rightarrow, \pm, I)\) where \(\rightarrow\bullet = \leq_C, \bullet\rightarrow = \leq_R, \forall e, e' \in E. \pm(e, e') = \%\) if \(e = e'\) or \(e \neq e'\) and otherwise \(\pm(e, e') = *\).

- \(E = \{pm, s, gm, dt\}\)
- \(\rightarrow\bullet = \{(pm, s), (s, gm), (s, dt)\}\)
- \(\bullet\rightarrow = \{(pm, s), (pm, gm), (dt, ss)\}\)
- \(\rightarrow+ = \{(s, gm), (s, dt)\}\)
- \(\rightarrow\% = \{(gm, dt), (dt, gm)\}\)

Possible runs

- \([pm, s, dt, s, gm]\)
- \([pm, s, dt, pm, s, gm]\)
- \([pm, s, pm, s, gm]\)
Distributed Dynamic Condition Response Structures

Definition
A *distributed* dynamic condition response structure (DDCR) is a tuple

\[(E, \text{Act}, \rightarrow\bullet, \bullet\rightarrow, \pm, I, R, P, \text{as})\]

where \((E, \text{Act}, \rightarrow\bullet, \bullet\rightarrow, \pm, I)\) is a dynamic condition response structure, \(R\) is a set of *roles*, \(P\) is a set of *principals* (e.g. persons/processors/agents) and \(\text{as} \subseteq (P \cup \text{Act}) \times R\) is the role assignment relation to executors and actions.

- assigning roles to actions provide granularity of permissions
- assigning principals to roles gives the permission to execute actions
DCRS Graphical Notation

Example: Health Care Workflow in DDCRS

- **OK**
  - ✓ [pm, s, gm, gm]
  - ✓ [pm, s, dt, s, gm]
  - ✓ [pm, s, dt, pm, s, gm]
  - ✓ [pm, pm, s, gm]
  - ✓ [pm, s, pm, s, gm]

- **Not Possible**
  - ☞ [pm, gm]
  - ☞ [pm, s, dt, gm]

- **Not Accepting**
  - ○ [pm, s, gm, pm]
  - ○ [pm, s, dt]
Conclusion and Future Work

Conclusion

• We have given a formal process model which is
  • easy to describe loosely constrained workflows in incremental way
  • easy to understand and to execute
  • conservatively extends both the model of event structures and the process language used by our industrial partner Resultmaker.

Future work

• Weaker accepting condition for infinite runs by mapping to generalized Buchi automaton.
• model checking and verification using SPIN tool.
• Support for Data, Time, Sub-processes, Exceptions and Compensation
• Quantitative and probabilistic modalities on constraints
• Type system for DCRS and categorical constructions
Semantics of distributed DCRS

Definition
For a distributed DCR $D = (E, Act, \rightarrow, \bullet, \pm, l, R, P, as)$ the corresponding labelled transition systems $T(D)$ to be the tuple $(S, (E, I, R), \rightarrow) \subseteq S \times (P \times Act \times R) \times S$ where $S = P(E) \times P(E) \times P(E)$ is the set of states, $(E, I, R) \in S$ is the initial state, and $\rightarrow$ is the transition relation given by

$$(E, I, R) \xrightarrow{(e, (p, a, r))} (E \cup \{e\}, I', R')$$

where

- $e \in I$, $l(e) = a$, $p$ as $r$, and $a$ as $r$
- $\{e' \in I \mid e' \rightarrow \bullet e\} \subseteq E$
- $I' = (I \cup \{e' \mid \pm(e, e') = +\}) \setminus \{e' \mid \pm(e, e') = \%\}$
- $R' = (R \setminus \{e\}) \cup \{e' \mid e \rightarrow e'\}$

- map to a labelled transition system to defined accepting runs

- states of transition system will be $(E, I, R)$ where $E \subseteq E$ is set of happened events, $I \subseteq E$ represents set of currently included events, $R \subseteq E$ represents set of pending response events

- first condition says that only currently include events can be executed, the label $(p, a, r)$ says that the label of event $e$ must be $a$, which must be assigned to a role $r$ and principal $p$

- second condition says that all condition events to $e$ must have been executed

- third and fourth conditions are updates to sets of included and pending responses.

- Accepting condition: all runs which are ending with states where $R \cap I = \emptyset$
DCRS graphical notation
Condition and Response relations

1. Condition relation

- OK
  - ✓ []
  - ✓ [c, a, a, b, c, b]
  - ✓ [a, b, b, a, a]
  - ✓ [c, c, a, a, a, c]

- Not OK
  - ○ [b]
  - ○ [c, b, c, a, b]

same as precedence relation in DECLARE\(^2\)
\(\Diamond (b) \Rightarrow ((!b) \cup a)\)

2. Response relation

- OK but not accept
  - ✓ [b]
  - ✓ [a, c, b, a]

- OK and Accept
  - ✓ []
  - ✓ [c, a, a, b, b, c]
  - ✓ [a, c, c, a, a]

same as response relation in DECLARE\(^2\)
\(\Box (a \Rightarrow \Diamond b)\)

DCRS Graphical Notation

Include and Exclude relations

• OK
  ✓ []
  ✓ [a, b, c, a, b]
  ✓ [b, c, a, a]

• Not OK
  ○ [c, b]
  ○ [a, b, c, b]