

An Evaluation Framework to Ensure the Quality of the Conceptual Models of Business Processes in a Biodiesel Plant

Narayan Debnath*

Eastern International University, VIENAM

Carlos Salgado[†], Mario Peralta[†], Daniel Riesco[†], Lorena Baigorria[†], and Germán Montejano[†]
Universidad Nacional de San Luis, ARGENTINA

Abstract

The objective of this work is to make a proposal to improve the quality of business processes in a biodiesel plant. As a first approximation, the analysis, and studies of the conceptual models of business processes that the company had were carried out, with the aim of being able to have a panoramic view of the current situation of the organization. A framework was applied to measure the quality of business process models, which provides a set of metrics and indicators to carry out said measurement. The objective of the frameworks is providing the organizations a means to help them to maintain objective and accurate information about the maintainability, understandability, comprehensibility, coupling and cohesion of the models, facilitating the evolution of the Business Processes of the companies involved in continuous improvement. It provides support to the management of BPs by facilitating early evaluation of certain quality properties of their models. The organizations benefit in two ways: (i) guaranteeing the understanding and dissemination of the BPs and their evolution without affecting their execution, (ii) reducing the effort necessary to change the models, this reduces the maintenance and improvement efforts. This framework is made up of two evaluation methods that face the same problem from two different approaches. One approach refers to the numerical and the other is closer to linguistic expressions similar to everyday language. Both methods provide important results to different areas of the business, giving the framework an added value when analyzing the BP conceptual models, since it allows organizations to choose the way to evaluate the models according to the characteristics that are desired to analyze the business models.

Key Words: Quality of conceptual models, business processes, workflow, evaluation method, and logistics.

1 Introduction

The Business Process Modeling (BPM) is an essential step to achieve the objective of a Business Process (BP), as established by the BP definition, in order to obtain beneficial results for the stakeholders [14]. A BP model describes the activities involved in the business and how they are related to and how they interact with the necessary resources to achieve the objectives of the process [3]. From this point of view, the BPM is used to capture, document or redesign BPs [12].

The BP models present a global vision of the organization. This vision, allows a better understanding of the company's dynamics and the relationships that occur within it and with its environment. This is the case both in the field that refers to customers and their suppliers and/or service providers. BPM is the technique par excellence to align the developments with the goals and objectives of organizations, since the models play a fundamental role in the specification of the BP. In the literature, you can find different conceptualizations of BP [7, 9, 15]. Therefore, the Workflow Management Coalition (WfMC) defines a BP as: *A set of two or more procedures or linked activities that collectively perform a business objective or a political goal, normally within the context of an organizational structure in which functional relationships and roles are defined* [17]. However, keeping in mind the various definitions of BPs, it can be said that, normally, a BP: (i) is associated with operational objectives and business relationships, (ii) may be contained entirely within an organizational unit or may encompass different organizations, (iii) has defined conditions that trigger its start, (iv) produce outputs defined at its completion, (v) may involve formal or relatively informal interactions among participants, and (vi) may consist of manual and/or automated activities. The conceptual model development represents a part of BP implantation. It is a key task of the first phase of BP life cycle. The users use the models as tools to easily understand the process that these models represent. Furthermore, they are the starting point when some changes or adaptations to new business needs are required for BPs. Therefore, the quality of these models is of vital importance to help improve the performance and evolution of the organization and do not become a risk factor. Under these

* School of Computing and Information Technology. Email: narayan.debnath@eiu.edu.vn.

[†] Departamento de Informática, Facultad de Ciencias Físico-Matemáticas y Naturales. Email: {csalgado, mperalta, driesco, flbaigor, gmonte}@unsl.edu.ar.

considerations, a framework is proposed to evaluate conceptual models of BP. The objective is to provide a means to organizations to help them study the quality of their BP models from the point of view of their **understandability** and **adaptability** to changes. Regarding these characteristics, the **understandability** allows the user to comprehend if the BP models are suitable and how to use them in particular tasks and conditions of use. It provides an indication of how easy it is to learn to read and interpret these models in order to understand the reality they are representing. The **adaptability** represents the capacity of the model to be modified effectively and efficiently due to evolutive, corrective or perfective needs. The modification of the model effectively and efficiently adapts without introducing defects or degrade their understandability.

Based on what was previously expressed, the application of a framework for the analysis and study of BP models from the perspective of the expected quality characteristics of a BP model of a medium company is presented. Said framework focuses on the use of continuous logic [4, 5] or fuzzy logic (FL) [18, 19], depending on the characteristics of the models and the processes that these models represent.

2 The Framework: F2BPM

The F2BPM framework is a means/tool that proposes the study and analysis of the BP models of an institution and/or organization. The main objective is to guide the development of such models by specifying requirements and evaluating quality characteristics. This framework is made up of three parts, each of which collaborates with the previous one. These parts are summarized as:

1. Apply the parser to the model, to determine its syntactic correctness.
2. Select and apply the evaluation method, according to the reality or the needs to be evaluated:
 - a. Method based on continuous logic operators [1], or
 - b. Method based on fuzzy logic [2].
3. Analyze results and generate reports and recommendations.

The Syntactic Analyzer checks the correct conformation of the BP model studied. At this stage, it is corroborated, for example, if the model meets or satisfies good practices or modeling guides for conceptual BP models [11]. These practices are summarized below:

- G1:** Minimize the amount of elements in a model, since its size has a negative impact on its understanding.
- G2:** Minimize the possible paths of each element, since the greater the number of inputs and outputs that an element has, the more difficult it is to understand.
- G3:** Indicate, as far as possible, a single starting element and a single final element in each process.
- G4:** Modeling in the most structured way possible by balancing the decision gates using the gates as parentheses: one to open in possible paths and another

to close them to join them again.

- G5:** Avoid the use of OR gates, since the models containing only AND and XOR gates generally contain fewer errors.
- G6:** Use “verbal” type labels to define the actions of the tasks, for example “to analyze documentation” instead of “documentation analysis”.
- G7:** Decompose the model if it has more than 50 elements, using, for example, sub-processes to make the general model more understandable.

Compliance with the modeling guidelines by the BP models means that the models are understandable and adaptable to the needs of the organizations, facilitating the task of the different actors that intervene in the process of BP conceptual modeling. Once the models are correct, we proceed to do the study and/or analysis through the use of one (or both) of the two alternatives provided by the F2BPM framework. Organizations can choose to work with: (i) operators of continuous logic, or (ii) to get closer to the natural and proper language of human beings through the use of *FL*, or some of its alternatives, or, if is not clear which of the alternatives is more appropriate for the particular situation. Both alternatives can be applied and then perform a comparative analysis of the results obtained.

The motivation of the method that works with operators of the continuous logic, [1], arises from the need of the organizations to have a means that allows them to represent their BP in an efficient way and that, in addition, allows them to communicate and interact with other processes. The objective of the method is to provide a means to help designers, analysts and developers involved in the definition and modeling of the BP of an organization to obtain models of quality processes. Throughout the phases of the method, the most relevant and frequent characteristics that BP conceptual models should satisfy are determined, grouped, and analyzed. These characteristics are reflected on a structure that will allow studying the degree to which the models satisfy them. In Figure 1 some desirable characteristics and sub-characteristics are detailed for all BP models.

-
1. Task/Activities
 - 1.1. Simples/Atomics
 - 1.2. Composed / Subprocesses
 2. Synchronization points of the execution flow
 - 2.1. Decision Points
 - 2.2. Union Points
 - 2.3. Split Points in Parallel and / or Concurrent Execution
 3. Events
 - 3.1. Start Events
 - 3.2. Intermediate Events
 - 3.3. Final Events
 4. Participants / Actors
 - 4.1. Internals
 - 4.1.1. Number of Participants/Actors
 - 4.1.2. Communication between Participants / Actors

- 4.2. Externals
 - 4.2.1. Number of Participants/Actors
 - 5. Resources
 - 5.1. Produced in the Process (Internals)
 - 5.2. Externals
-

Figure 1: Requirement tree

In the next phase of method, elementary criteria are defined that will serve as measures of the degree to which the models evaluated satisfy the individual characteristics. To obtain the overall evaluation, these elementary criteria are combined until a single indicator of the overall satisfaction of the elementary characteristics is obtained, in order to finally carry out an analysis of the results obtained and outline the corresponding conclusions.

The second proposed method [2], is based on the fact that a FL system converts input variables (quantitative and qualitative) into linguistic variables through membership functions or fuzzy sets, which are evaluated by a set of fuzzy rules of the if-then type. Then, the outputs of the system become clear values (crisp) through a concretion process (*defuzzification*), which provides information for decision making. A FL system uses any type of information and processes it in a similar way as human thought. FL systems are adequate to treat qualitative, inaccurate, and uncertain information, which also allow dealing with complex processes, which makes it an interesting alternative for modeling decision-making problems. The diffuse control allows operating with vague or ambiguous concepts of the qualitative human reasoning, based on a mathematical support that allows extracting quantitative conclusions from a set of observations (premises) and qualitative rules (knowledge based).

When you have inaccurate and insufficient information, using statistical tools is not enough to obtain significant results. FL arises precisely to deal with this type of problem and to achieve an optimal solution. In this way, a combination between a FL system and the experience or knowledge that decision makers have is an excellent way to obtain good results. In the BP model development process the information about the business rules is usually imprecise or insufficient, which leads to the model being imprecise. Based on what was expressed, the use of FL in the evaluation of these models will allow, through the mechanisms provided by this logic, to evaluate imprecise and ambiguous situations produced in the construction of the models.

3 Evaluation of the PN Models of a Biodiesel Company

One of the fundamental aspects of any evaluation method is to show that it is of practical use. To achieve this goal, [13] presents a classification of three work proposals:

- (i) Experimentation,
- (ii) Cases of study,
- (iii) Surveys.

For the practical validation of the method, and following the

classification proposed in [13], a case study is presented in which the framework was applied to analyze the BP model of a local company. The decision to use case studies for the validation of the framework was due to the fact that, in general, there is no absolute control of the variables to be evaluated. This is because, in most cases, these variables depend on the particular reality that is being studied. For this reason, the application of case studies was considered more appropriate than the realization of experiments, in which it is necessary to have a greater control of the intervening variables, or the development of surveys, for which a certain history of application of the method and the opinion of those who used it should be available.

The main point was to improve the quality in a biodiesel plant in regards to the processes. But this brought with it an extra weight that had to be worked with a fuel that respects the environment, which does not contain sulfur, therefore it does not contribute to the greenhouse effect. It generates fewer emissions of polluting gases and substances that are harmful to health, such as carbon dioxide, carbon, soot, or benzene. These are some of the qualities of the fuel, but BP needed to be optimized in order to guarantee quality throughout the plant process. As a first task, a meeting was held with the directors of the company. There, they had access to the scant digitized documentation that the company had.

The general process is briefly described. There is an input of crude oil, to the degummed sub-process, which is rectified, removes the acidity, which eliminates fatty acids and phosphorus. To achieve this, they go through a trans-sterilization process to obtain biodiesel. In the middle of the process of obtaining biodiesel, it is possible to extract glycerin, that is also subjected to a process of separation of fatty acids that, to a lesser extent, have still remained from the trans-sterilization process. Glycerin is obtained in two varieties, a concentrated glycerin that is exported and another of lesser quality that is sold at a national level for the production of other products such as soaps among others.

Based on the above, the case study was the application of the framework for the evaluation of the BP model of the company, which aims to position itself successfully within the market. Thus, according to what the framework establishes, the BP model was analyzed to determine if it was syntactically correct through a parsing based on ALLOY [6, 8]. When checking this syntactic validity, it was necessary to prove if the model reliably represents the business logic. Part two of the framework was applied, in which the method to be used for the evaluation of the models is determined. In this stage, the method based on FL was chosen. The choice of this method was due to the use of FL [2], which allows a closer approach to the way of thinking of human beings; allows allowing the ambiguities that arise in terms of the interpretation of the different business rules that may arise. Below is a summary of the evaluation:

PHASE 1: Based on the BP model that the company owned (Figure 2) and using a set of defined metrics to measure the elements of a model, the data of the different components are collected. The amount of the different elements is counted as:

tasks, events, floodgates, among others. The information obtained is summarized in Table 1. It should be noted that, in this table, the metrics have been grouped according to the

contribution they provide to the good practices associated with the BP model.




Figure 2: BP model

Table 1: Used metrics

| TASKS/PROCESSES | GATES | EVENTS | PARTICIPANTS | RESOURCES |
|-----------------|----------|----------|--------------|-----------|
| TNT = 18 | TNGD = 0 | TNSE = 2 | NPI=12 | NRI=8 |
| TNCS = 0 | TNGU = 0 | TNIE = 4 | NPE=2 | NRE=23 |
| | NPF = 1 | TNEE = 4 | | |

PHASE 2: The method proposes a set of variables of predefined inputs and outputs. This set can be extended, if necessary, by the members of the quality team involved in the process of quality evaluation of the models.

Of the suggested set of input/output variables, the following were taken for analysis. The choice of variables was limited to the metrics that allows the model to be addressed in terms of the components of most interest and that were the basis for the evaluation. In this sense, the following variables were taken:

INPUT: Number of Tasks/Activities of the Model, Number of Gates, Number of Processes, Match Start and Final Events, Number of Internal, Intermediate, and External Events; Numbers of both Internal and External Resources; Number of Internal and External Participants.

OUTPUT: Understanding of the Model, Maintainability of the Model, Coupling Level, Cohesion Level.

According to the phases of the method, once the variables have been defined, membership functions that indicate the degree of belonging of an element in a given universe must be established. The belongings functions that are used in this analysis are those proposed in the method presented in [2]. Figures 3 to 5 show these functions for the resources, events, and task/activities elements, respectively.

PHASE 3: At this stage, the decision to choose the knowledge base for the application of the method must be taken. The knowledge base contains the information associated with the domain of reality that is being studied.

| Membership Functions | Function $\mu A(x)$ | Input Variables | Parameters |
|----------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|
| A1: Scarce | 0 if $x \leq a$ $(x-a)/(m-a)$ if $a < x \leq m$ $(b-x)/(b-m)$ if $m < x \leq b$ 0 if $x > b$ | Number of resources (internals and externals) | $a = 5$ $b = 19$ $m = 12$ |
| A2: Several | 0 if $x < a$ $(x-a)/(b-a)$ if $a \leq x \leq b$ 1 if $b < x \leq c$ $(d-x)/(d-c)$ if $c < x \leq d$ 0 if $x > d$ | Number of resources (internals and externals) | $a = 14$ $b = 20$ $c = 27$ $d = 33$ |
| A3: Many | 0 if $x \leq a$ $(x-a)/(m-a)$ if $a < x \leq m$ $(b-x)/(b-m)$ if $m < x \leq b$ 0 if $x > b$ | Number of resources (internals and externals) | $a = 30$ $b = 60$ $m = 45$ |




Figure 3: Membership functions for resources

| Membership Functions | Function $\mu B(x)$ | Input Variables | Parameters |
|----------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|
| B1: Scarce | 0 | if $x \leq a$ | Number of Events $a = 5$ $b = 13$ $m = 9$ |
| | $2 \cdot [(x-a)/(b-a)]^2$ | if $a < x \leq m$ | |
| | $1 - 2 \cdot [(x-b)/(b-a)]^2$ | if $m < x \leq b$ | |
| | 1 | if $x > b$ | |
| B2: Several | 0 | if $x \leq a$ | Number of Events $a = 9$ $b = 29$ $m = 19$ |
| | $(x-a)/(m-a)$ | if $a < x \leq m$ | |
| | $(b-x)/(b-m)$ | if $m < x \leq b$ | |
| | 0 | if $x > b$ | |
| B3: Many | 0 | if $x \leq a$ | Number of Events $a = 26$ $b = 66$ $m = 46$ |
| | $(x-a)/(m-a)$ | if $a < x \leq m$ | |
| | $(b-x)/(b-m)$ | if $m < x \leq b$ | |
| | 0 | if $x > b$ | |




Figure 4: Membership functions for events

At this point, the linguistic rules must be defined that will serve to make decisions that, in turn will decide the way that the evaluator or who has to make the decisions must act. The rules follow the common sense of system behavior and are written in terms of the labels of membership functions. For the example that is studied there, a total of 30 rules are defined. Nevertheless, for the present example only the rules whose antecedents were calculated in the previous stage will be triggered. For example, for the variable resources: Scarce, Several, Many and for the variable Events: Scarce, Several, Many.

From the knowledge base, the subset of rules for the understandability feature is shown below.

- Rule 1:** IF (Several Resources) and (Several Events) THEN Moderately Understandable
- Rule 2:** IF (Several Resources) and (Scarce Events) THEN Mostly Understandable
- Rule 3:** IF (Many Resources) and (Several Events) THEN Moderately Understandable
- Rule 4:** IF (Many Resources) and (Scarce Events) THEN Mostly Understandable

PHASE 4: *Obtaining concrete values and system adjustments:* Until now, each of the four rules has been evaluated. The next step is to determine the fuzzy output by comparing the forces of all the rules that specify the same consequence, that is, the same output action.

At this stage, the ultimate goal is to find abrupt outputs. For this, each fuzzy output that was found in the previous stage of the evaluation rules, will modify their respective output membership function. The labels for these output functions refer to the understandability of the BP model, that is, they will be: Mostly Understandable, Moderately Understandable and Understandable. From the set of proposed output variables, this work is only concerned with model understandability (Figure 6) and comprehensibility (Figure 7).

A summary of the evaluation is shown below.

Input linguistic variables: Events, Resources.

Fuzzy Sets: Resources (x): Scarce, Several, Many (A1, A2, A3)

Events (y): Scarce, Several, Many (B1, B2, B3)

Output linguistic variables: Understandability of model

Fuzzy Sets: Understandability (w): Understandable, Moderately Understandable, Mostly Incomprehensible (D1, D2, D3).

Application of metrics to the model under study: **Events:** 10 and **Resources:** 31.

To Resources

$$\mu A1 (x=31) = 0$$

$$\mu A2 (x=31) = \frac{d-x}{d-c} = \frac{33-31}{33-27} = \frac{2}{6} = 0.33$$

| Membership Functions | Function $\mu A(x)$ | Input Variables | Parameters |
|----------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| C1: Scarce | 0 if $x \leq a$ $(x-a)/(m-a)$ if $a < x \leq m$ $(b-x)/(b-m)$ if $m < x < b$ 0 if $x \geq b$ | Number of Task/Activity of Model Number of Processes, Number of Sub-processes | $a = 5$ $b = 10$ $m = 7$ |
| C2: Several | 0 if $x < a$ $(x-a)/(b-a)$ if $a < x \leq b$ 1 if $b < x \leq c$ $(d-x)/(d-c)$ if $c < x \leq d$ 0 if $x > d$ | Number of Task/Activity of Model Number of Processes, Number of Sub-processes Number Total of data Objects in the Model | $a = 7$ $b = 20$ $c = 45$ $d = 75$ |
| C3: Many | 0 if $x \leq a$ $(x-a)/(m-a)$ if $a < x \leq m$ $(b-x)/(b-m)$ if $m < x < b$ 0 if $x \geq b$ | Number of Task/Activity of Model Number of Processes, Number of Sub-processes. | $a = 55$ $b = 85$ $m = 70$ |




Figure 5: Membership functions for tasks/activities

| Membership Functions | Function $\mu B(x)$ | Input Variables | Parameters |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|----------------------------------|
| D1: Understandable | 1 if $b \leq x \leq c$ $(d-x)/(d-c)$ if $c < x \leq d$ 0 if $x > d$ | Number of Events | $b = 0$ $c = 20$ $d = 30$ |
| D2: Moderately Understandable | 0 if $x \leq a$ $(x-a)/(m-a)$ if $a < x \leq m$ $(b-x)/(b-m)$ if $m < x \leq b$ 0 if $x > b$ | Number of Events | $a = 25$ $b = 55$ $m = 40$ |
| D3: Mostly Understandable | 0 if $x \leq a$ $(x-a)/(m-a)$ if $a < x \leq m$ $(b-x)/(b-m)$ if $m < x \leq b$ 0 if $x > b$ | Number of Events | $a = 50$ $b = 85$ $m = 70$ |




Figure 6: Membership functions for understandability

| Membership Functions | Function $\mu B(x)$ | Input Variables | Parameters |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|----------------------------------|
| D1: comprehensible | 1 if $b \leq x \leq c$ $(d-x)/(d-c)$ if $c < x \leq d$ 0 if $x > d$ | Number of Events | $b = 0$ $c = 15$ $d = 30$ |
| D2: Moderately Comprehensible | 0 if $x \leq a$ $(x-a)/(m-a)$ if $a < x \leq m$ $(b-x)/(b-m)$ if $m < x \leq b$ 0 if $x > b$ | Number of Events | $a = 25$ $b = 60$ $m = 45$ |
| D3: Mostly Comprehensible | 0 if $x \leq a$ $(x-a)/(m-a)$ if $a < x \leq m$ $(b-x)/(b-m)$ if $m < x \leq b$ 0 if $x > b$ | Number of Events | $a = 50$ $b = 85$ $m = 70$ |




Figure 7: Membership functions for comprehensibility

$$\mu A3(x=31) = \frac{x-a}{m-a} = \frac{31-30}{45-30} = \frac{1}{15} = 0.06$$

To Events

$$\mu B1(y=10) = 1 - 2 * \left[\frac{y-b}{b-a} \right]^2 = 1 - 2 * \left[\frac{10-13}{13-5} \right]^2 = 0.72$$

$$\mu B2(y=10) = \frac{y-a}{m-a} = \frac{10-9}{19-10} = \frac{1}{9} = 0.11$$

$$\mu B3(y=10) = 0$$

Evaluation of Rules

Rule N° 1: $\mu A2(x) = 0.33$; $\mu B2(y) = 0.11$

Rule N° 2: $\mu A2(x) = 0.33$; $\mu B1(y) = 0.72$

Rule N° 3: $\mu A3(x) = 0.06$; $\mu B2(y) = 0.11$

Rule N° 4: $\mu A3(x) = 0.06$; $\mu B1(y) = 0.72$

So far, each of the four rules has been evaluated. The next step is to determine the fuzzy output by comparing the forces of all the rules that specify the same consequence, that is, the same output action. In simple terms, if two or more rules try to affect the same output, the rule that is truer (of greater strength) will dominate. The method for the evaluation of rules used here is called MIN-MAX [10, 16], since it takes the minimum of the conditions to determine the strength of each rule and takes the stronger rule for each consequent, which determines the outputs.

The following values were obtained from the evaluation: $\mu B2(y)=0,11 - \mu A2(x)=0,33 - \mu A3(x)=0,06 - \mu A3(x)=0,06$.

Next, the Centroid of Gravity method is applied. Each output membership function is cut (lambda cut) at the level indicated by its respective output. The resulting cut membership functions are then combined to calculate their center of gravity:

$$\text{Output} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i \mu_c(x_i)}{\sum_{i=1}^n \mu_c(x_i)}$$

Output

$$= \frac{75*0,11+255*0,33+525*0,06}{1,2+1,98+0,06} = \frac{8,25+84,15+31,5}{3,24} = \frac{123,9}{3,24} = 38,24$$

Similarly, the evaluation is carried out for the comprehensibility characteristic of the model.

A summary of the evaluation is shown below.

Input linguistic variables: Events, Resources.

Fuzzy Sets: Resources (x): Scarce, Several, Many (A1, A2, A3)

Events (y): Scarce, Several, Many (B1, B2, B3)

Output linguistic variables: Comprehensible of model

Fuzzy Sets: Comprehensible (w): Comprehensible, Moderately comprehensible, Mostly comprehensible (D1, D2, D3).

Application of metrics to the model under study: **Events:** 10 and **Resources:** 31.

To Resources

$$\mu A1 (x=31) = 0$$

$$\mu A2 (x=31) = \frac{d-x}{d-c} = \frac{33-31}{33-27} = \frac{2}{6} = 0.33$$

$$\mu A3 (x=31) = \frac{x-a}{m-a} = \frac{31-30}{45-30} = \frac{3}{7} = 0.06$$

To Events

$$\mu B1 (y=10) = 1 - 2 * \left[\frac{y-b}{b-a} \right]^2 = 1 - 2 * \left[\frac{10-13}{13-5} \right]^2 = 0.72$$

$$\mu B2 (y=10) = \frac{y-a}{m-a} = \frac{10-9}{19-10} = \frac{1}{9} = 0.11$$

$$\mu B3 (y=10) = 0$$

Evaluation of Rules

Rule N° 1: $\mu A2(x) = 0.33$; $\mu B2(y) = 0.11$

Rule N° 2: $\mu A2(x) = 0.33$; $\mu B1(y) = 0.72$

Rule N° 3: $\mu A3 (x) = 0.06$; $\mu B2(y) = 0.11$

Rule N° 4: $\mu A3 (x) = 0.06$; $\mu B1(y) = 0.72$

For the components, processes, threads, and tasks that make up the analyzed model, the output is moderately understandable and comprehensible.

PHASE 5: Analysis and Documentation of the Obtained Results: This stage corresponds to the final stage of the method. In it, an analysis and comparison of the results obtained in the evaluation of the models with respect to the preferences of the users, obtained in the application of the method, must be carried out. In addition, the evaluation process and the obtained results must be documented, so that the documentation serves as a reference and history of the evolution of the studied BP model in future evaluations of models. This documentation can serve as a point of reference and comparison at the evaluation of new models and BPs. This phase deals with activities of analysis and comparison of the preferences of quality and the obtained results. Based on the established goals, and the point of view of those interested in the models and BPs to be evaluated, this stage culminates with the conclusions and recommendations of the case.

Both framework methods define a phase of analysis of results. This stage is one of the most relevant activities of the framework. Therefore, it is extremely useful to have the information gathered during the application of the method selected for the evaluation collected on structures and representations that are clear to read and interpret. The method proposes a standard form that should be completed once the evaluation of the models has been carried out. The form allows, among other things, what membership functions were used; if they were defined by the evaluating group or if others previously

defined and stored in a repository were used. There is also information about the models evaluated, and the analysis of the results obtained. In addition, data of the models, the evaluators are recorded and, if there are previous evaluations, a reference to them is included. These references serve as a point of contrast to analyze and evaluate the evolution of the models.

Finally, a field is included where a report of the analysis of the results can be presented. For reasons of space, the structure of the form is not shown in this paper. At this point, when analyzing the results of the framework application, emphasis was placed on the understandability of the results delivered and presented in the forms, and the perception of the different actors involved in the modeling process. For the case study, we worked with a group of 20 people, including administrative staff, technicians, quality staff, analysts, and designers. From the calculation of the output made in the previous point it can be seen that the model studied is moderately understandable and comprehensible.

4 Conclusions

Continuous improvement is a fundamental tool for all companies because it allows renewing or improving their BP. This implies a constant updating that makes the organizations more efficient and competitive. The BP model is the basis for better understanding the operation of an organization, documenting, and publishing the processes seeking standardization in the organization, achieving greater efficiency in the operation, and integrating solutions in service-oriented architectures. These characteristics give the organization a valuable tool to stay at a competitive level. Thus, the BP models are fundamental when analyzing the correctness and quality of the processes that they model.

From this point of view, the use of the framework is proposed with the possibility of applying any of the two methods that compose it. The first of the methods pursues the objective of providing organizations with a means to help them maintain objective information about the maintainability of the models. This facilitates the evolution of the BPs of the companies that constantly evaluate their processes to be involved in continuous improvement. In addition, it provides support to the management of BPs by facilitating the early evaluation of certain quality properties of their models. With this, the organizations benefit in two ways: (i) guaranteeing the understanding and dissemination of the BPs and their evolution without affecting their execution; (ii) and reducing the effort necessary to change the models with the consequent reduction of maintenance and improvement efforts.

However, when developing BPMs, information about the business rules that must be represented and modeled is often imprecise or insufficient, leading to inaccurate models. From this perspective, FL provides mechanisms to analyze and simulate human reasoning. Therefore, the use of fuzzy logic in the evaluation of BPM allowed, through the mechanisms provided by this logic, to evaluate those imprecise and ambiguous situations produced in the construction of this model.

Under these considerations, the BPs of a biodiesel producing company were analyzed, looking for decision-making points that would limit losses, waste, and plant shutdowns for different reasons. This paper presents one of the tasks that were carried out in order to understand and control the biodiesel production process. Among the points to analyze that were detected at the beginning were: 1. Waiting in production for complete deposits, 2. Idle times of the employees, 3. Shutdown of the plant due to waiting time for: a) Raw materials; b) Withdrawal of Fuel, 4. Management estimates.

In the BP models studied, they reflected that plant stoppages occurred repeatedly, because the tanks were full and the biodiesel was not withdrawn by the customers. This caused lost time for employees with the expenses that were incurred and final products in warehouses without the possibility of having movements. Initially, it led to expanding the capacity of the storage tanks to 1,000,000 liters, what relaxed the stoppage of the plant from the perspective of stock management. But there was still a problem with the logistics of the clients in the withdrawal of the merchandise. Regarding the purchase of the raw material, it was possible to see that there was a gap between the communication of the internal actors of the biodiesel plant. An excess of internal messages with unnecessary waiting time for administrative order, that they produced a plant stoppage every 45 days, due to a problem of an internal logistical/administrative nature. This ends up being solved by setting a minimum stock alert that anticipated purchases.

References

- [1] N. Debnath, C. Salgado, M. Peralta, M. Berón, D. Riesco, and G. Montejano, "MEBPCM: A Method for Evaluating Business Process Conceptual Models, A Study Case," Presented at the 9th ITNG, Las Vegas, Nevada, USA, 2012.
- [2] N. Debnath, C. Salgado, M. Peralta, D. Riesco, L. Baigorria, and G. Montejano, "A Fuzzy Logic-Based Method to Evaluate the Quality of Business Process Models," CATA 2017, 2017.
- [3] T. Dufresne and J. Martin, "Process Modeling for e-Business," Spring 2003, INFS 770 - Methods for Informations Systems Engineering: Knowledge Management and E-Business, George Mason University, 2003.
- [4] J. J. Dujmovic, "Quantitative Methods for Software Evaluation," Lecture Notes, Graduate Software Engineering Program. Universidad Nacional de San Luis, San Luis, Argentina., 1998.
- [5] J. J. Dujmovic, "A Method for Evaluation and Selection of Complex Hardware and Software Systems," *The 22nd International Conference for the Resource Management and Performance Evaluation of Enterprise Computing Systems. CMG96 Proceedings*, 1:368-378, 1996.
- [6] R. Gheyi, T. Massoni, and P. Borba, "Formally Introducing Alloy Idioms," Brazilian Symposium on Formal Methods., pp. 22-37, 2007.
- [7] Z. Irani, V. Hlupic, and G. M. Giaglis, "Business Process Re-Engineering: a Modeling Perspective," *International Journal of Flexible Manufacturing Systems*, Need volume number, 13:99-104., 2001, <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1011122916139>.
- [8] D. Jackson, *Software Abstractions: Logic, Language, and Analysis*, MIT Press, Cambridge, 2006.
- [9] C. Jiménez, L. Fariás, and F. Pinto, "Análisis de Modelos de Procesos de Negocios en Relación a la Dimensión Informática," *Revista Electrónica del DIICC*. <http://www.inf.udec.cl/revista/ediciones/edicion9/cjimen ez.pdf>, 2004.
- [10] D. P. Madau and L. A. Feldkamp, "Influence Value Defuzzification Method," *Proceedings of IEEE 5th International Fuzzy Systems*, New Orleans, LA, USA, 3:1819-1824, 1996, doi: 10.1109/FUZZY.1996.552647.
- [11] J. Mendling, H. Reijers, and W. van der Aalst, "Seven Process Modeling Guidelines," *Information & Software Technology*, 52(2):127-136, 2010.
- [12] B. Mora, F. Ruiz, F. García, and M. Piattini, "Experiencia en Transformación de Modelos de Procesos de Negocios desde BPMN a XPDL.," IDEAS, 2007.
- [13] C. Robson, *Real World Research: A Resource for Social Scientists and Practitioners-Researchers*: Blacwell, 1993.
- [14] A. Sharp and P. McDermott, "Workflow Modeling: Tools for Process Improvement and Application Development," London: Artech House, 2001.
- [15] G. Sparks, "An Introduction to UML," The Business Process Model. Sparx Systems, www.sparxsystems.com.au, 2000.
- [16] W. van Leekwijck and E. E. Kerre, "Defuzzification: Criteria and Classification, Fuzzy Sets and Systems," pp. 159-178, 1999.
- [17] WfMC, "Terminology & Glossary," Workflow Management Coalition, Document Number: WfMC-TC-1011. Document Status: Issue 3.0, 1999.
- [18] L. A. Zadeh, "Fuzzy Sets," *Information and Control*, 8:338-353, 1965.
- [19] L. A. Zadeh, "Outline of a New Approach to the Analysis of Complex System," *IEEE Transaction on System Man and Cybernetics*, 1:28-44, 1973

Narayan Debnath (photo not available) earned a Doctor of Science (D.Sc.) degree in Physics. Narayan C. Debnath is currently the Founding Dean of the School of Computing and Information Technology at Eastern International University, Vietnam. Dr. Debnath has been the Director of the International Society for Computers and their Applications (ISCA) since 2014. Formerly, Dr. Debnath served as a Full Professor of Computer Science at Winona State University, Minnesota, USA for 28 years (1989-2017). Dr. Debnath has been an active member of the ACM, IEEE Computer Society, Arab Computer Society and a senior member of the ISCA.

Carlos Celular (photo not available) earned a Master's degree in Software Engineering. He currently works as Adjunct Professor of the Department of Informatics, of the Faculty of Physical-Mathematical and Natural Sciences, of the National University of San Luis, Argentina. He is a Professor in undergraduate, graduate, and postgraduate career. He is the director of the undergraduate degree in Web Technology and co-director of the Master's degree in Software Quality careers. He is a member of different career committees of the Computer Science Department and postgraduate professor in the Master's Degree in Software Quality, Master's Degree in Software Engineering, Specialization in Software Engineering. He is a specialist in quality models and evaluation methods in software engineering processes and comprehensive professional in the area of analysis, design, development, and implementation of systems applied to business processes. He has extensive knowledge and expertise related to quality, both at the level of conceptual models of business processes, process workflows, as well as in terms of product quality. He is experienced in evaluating and comparing desirable features in products such as web and mobile applications. His skills and abilities are related to the use of metrics and quality indicators, optimization of business processes, with extensive expertise in business benchmarking, workflow models, planning and services including consulting in engineering and reengineering of business processes and development of business logistics. He is a member of the Software Engineering Quality Laboratory, and a member of various research projects in Software Engineering from 2002 to the present.

Mario Peralta (photo not available) Obtuvo un título de Especialista en Ingeniería de Software. Actualmente se desempeña como Profesor Adjunto del Departamento de Informática, de la Facultad de Ciencias Físico-Matemáticas y Naturales, de la Universidad Nacional de San Luis, Argentina. Profesor en carreras de pregrado, grado y posgrado. Codirector y profesor de la carrera de posgrado Especialización en Ingeniería de Software. Su área de experticia se centra en la Gestión de Procesos de Negocio y Procesos Workflow, en el análisis, diseño, desarrollo e implantación de sistemas aplicados a procesos de negocio. Conocimientos y experiencia en análisis de calidad de modelos de procesos de negocio, flujos de trabajo de procesos y de productos software. Habilidades y capacidades en la utilización de métricas e indicadores de calidad, optimización de procesos de negocio, como así también en la evaluación comparativa de negocios, modelos workflow, planificaciones y servicios. Experiencia en la administración de herramientas de gestión de procesos workflow corporativos. Es integrante de diversos proyectos de investigación en Ingeniería de Software desde 2002 y hasta la actualidad. Actualmente se desempeña como Director del Departamento de Informática, de la Facultad de Ciencias Físico-Matemáticas y Naturales, de la Universidad Nacional de San Luis.

He earned a Software Engineering Specialist degree. He currently works as Adjunct Professor of the Department of Informatics, of the Faculty of Physical-Mathematical and Natural Sciences, of the National University of San Luis, Argentina. He teaches undergraduate, graduate, and postgraduate careers. He is co-director and professor of the postgraduate course Specialization in Software Engineering. His area of expertise focuses on Business Process Management and Workflow Processes, on the analysis, design, development, and implementation of systems applied to business processes. He has knowledge and experience in quality analysis of business process models, process workflows and software products. His skills and abilities include the use of metrics and quality indicators, optimization of business processes, as well as in the comparative evaluation of businesses, workflow models, planning and services. He is experienced in the administration of corporate workflow process management tools. He is a member of various research projects in Software Engineering from 2002 to the present. He currently works as Director of the Department of Informatics, of the Faculty of Physical-Mathematical and Natural Sciences, of the National University of San Luis.

Daniel Riesco (photo not available) Obtained a PhD in Software Engineering from the University of Vigo, Spain. He currently works as an Associate Professor of the Department of Informatics, of the Faculty of Physical-Mathematical and Natural Sciences, of the National University of San Luis, Argentina. He is a professor in undergraduate and postgraduate courses. He is Director of the graduate programs in Master's in Software Engineering and PhD in Computer Engineering. He has proven experience in Software Engineering and Information Systems, in particular areas of Management and Modeling of Business Processes, Software Quality, Software Development Processes, Model Driven Engineering, Software Architecture, Cloud Computing, Web Services, and other web technologies. He is a member and director of various research projects in Software Engineering.

Lorena Baigorria (photo not available) earned a Master's degree in Software Engineering. She currently works as Adjunct Professor of the Department of Informatics, of the Faculty of Physical-Mathematical and Natural Sciences, of the National University of San Luis, Argentina. She teaches undergraduate, graduate, and postgraduate courses. She is director of the Computer Science Engineering degree career and co-director of the Master's in Software Engineering and a member of different career committees of the Computer Science Department. She is a postgraduate professor in the Master's Degree in Software Quality, Master's Degree in Software Engineering, Specialization in Software Engineering. Her

research areas focus on high quality software development management including analyzing usability improvements and software quality applying new technologies as orientation to aspects, mobile developments, cloud computing, web services. She is a member of various research projects in Software Engineering from 2002 to the present.

Germán Montejano (photo not available) obtained a PhD in Software Engineering from the University of Vigo, Spain. He currently works as an Associate Professor of the Department of Informatics, of the Faculty of Physical-Mathematical and Natural Sciences, of the National University of San Luis, Argentina. He is a professor in undergraduate and postgraduate courses. He is the director of the postgraduate courses Master's in Software Quality and Specialization in Software Engineering and co-director of the PhD in Computer Engineering. His area of expertise is focused on Software Engineering, Software Project Management, Financial Evaluation of Software Projects, Information Security, Cyber Security, Cyber Defense, Cloud Computing, Internet of Things. He is an experienced Professor with a demonstrated history of working in the higher education industry. He has a strong education professional skilled in Computer Science, Java, HTML, Linux, and Algorithms. He is a member and line director of various research projects in Software Engineering.