

Tools for Collaborative Business Process Modeling



Paz Pérez González

Industrial Management Research Group, University of Seville, Spain

Jose M Framinan

Industrial Management Research Group, University of Seville, Spain

INTRODUCTION

A business process can be defined as a set of related tasks that are carried out within a business or organization in order to obtain certain output that should add value for the business client or organization (Gunasekaran & Kobu, 2002). An enterprise can be then analyzed and integrated through its business processes. Thus, business process modeling (BPM) becomes a fundamental part of business process management, as it enables a common understanding and analysis of a company's business processes. Particularly, BPM using computer-aided design tools and a standard visual form of notation to describe, validate, and simulate business processes has taken on a new importance (Jonah, 2002).

There are a number of situations when BPM should be accomplished by many participants from different locations. One example may be the formation a virtual enterprise (VE), since all organizations within the VE should jointly define the rules and procedures of the common business processes. Another example may be the development of reference models to be employed in different branches within a single organization, or in different organizations. Participants in collaborative business process modeling (CBPM) activities may have different (or partial) competences and responsibilities within the business process to be modeled, or have similar (or common) ones. The former case will most likely apply to the first example, while perhaps the latter would correspond to the last one.

While efficiently managing the development of business process models is considered to be a challenge itself, the need of collaboration among participants with different background and skills poses additional requirements in terms of a consistent information flow between the participants in the process, the timely sharing of data and information, and harmonious support for the collaborative aspects of work (Mentzas, Halaris, & Kavadias, 2001). Therefore, CBPM should

encompass a set of procedures capable to (Lonchamp & Denis, 1997):

- Support the designers as far as possible during their collective work.
- Provide a sufficiently detailed model of collective design work for supporting it effectively.
- Provide a meta-model including concepts for describing all the various perspectives (process, organizational, functional, data and product views), as well as formal modeling techniques.

CBPM software tools could provide these functionalities and make possible obtaining business process models developed in a collaborative manner. Hence, our study focuses specifically on CBPM tools. While there are many available tools for enterprise analysis and business process management (particularly for the Web environment), not all of them fully support BPM. In this article, we develop a framework to synthesize the main requirements of CBPM tools. We then review a great number of available tools and classify them. The objective is to obtain a guide which provides a base for a correct selection of a CBPM tool. This guide would help selecting a tool depending on project or work requirements, BPM techniques adopted, degree of collaboration, knowledge of participants about BPM, etc. The study also point out to some areas where current BPM tools should be enhanced to cope with the specific features of CBPM.

BACKGROUND

Only few references deal with CBPM: Dean, Lee, Orwing, and Vogel (1994) develop and evaluate an electronic meeting system (EMS) based activity modeling group. They use a form-driven modeling tool with a link to a graphical viewer for the capture integrated

models. The EMS tool supports large group integration definition for function (IDEF0) modeling activity modeling. They compare modeling efforts supported by the EMS tool with those supported by analyst with a single-user tool, and conclude that the former allows a greater number of individuals to participate efficiently in model development.

In Dean, Lee, Pendergast, Hickey, and Nunamaker (1997), the authors discuss collaborative modeling issues in the context of software engineering. They provide a complete methodology for collaborative activity and data modeling, and scenarios, system use cases, and prototypes definition. The authors develop EMS modeling tools designed to allow users working in parallel to contribute directly during meetings.

Lonchamp et al. (1997) introduce the notion of collaborative work support and indicate a methodology for process modeling based both in design aspects (for decision-oriented modeling of methods and their creative activities) and cooperation aspects (collective modeling, conflict resolution task). In their work, a tool containing features for collaborative work (i.e., pop-up menus and dialogue boxes used in an asynchronous manner) is proposed.

Pendergast, Aytes, and Lee (1999) develop two tools to support collaborative graphical modeling and present a methodology for collaborative enterprise analyzer (EA). In the first tool, the users create (informal) graphical business models by groups. Later, analysts extract activity and data descriptions from these models and enter them into relational databases via text forms. Data are imported into an IDEF case tool. In the second tool, the system present the graphical models in a number of different ways, as well as access to graphics generated from a variety of commercial sketching tools. Although they do not use CBPM, they use a collaborative tool for create informal graphics, from which formal models are obtained. Main features of this tool are electronic & shared whiteboards, Microsoft PaintBrush, and a camera projection system, which allows participants writing on a tablet to be viewed on a large screen.

Dean, Orwing, and Vogel (2000) describe the creation and testing of meetings methods based on their previous work and compare the quality of the models and the productivity of the modelers for different approaches, one based on a traditional chauffeured approach supported by a single-user modeling tool, and the other based on EMS-IDEF0.

A methodology based on group support system (GSS) for structured modeling is presented by Walsh

and Dickey (2004) for system design. GSSs provide collaboration needed in structured modeling (development of models with well-defined components and rules for interconnecting them). The authors create a product design approach based on an information system design theory.

Framinan et al. (2005) present a guide for CBPM and propose a methodology to carry out BPM in a project with the objective to develop a reference model of determinate process. They use a standard BPM methodology and technique, and a commercial tool that provides certain collaborative features. In their work, a reference model for the same business process models may be developed by participants sited in different places.

The aforementioned references do not take into account the importance of Web support for modeling processes (with the exception of Framinan et al. 2005), and some references present tools developed for BPM that do not provide useful features for VE, like support to asynchronous or remote modeling.

MAIN CATEGORIES OF COLLABORATIVE TOOLS

Before analyzing CBPM tools, it is necessary to determine the requirements of these tools. These requirements may be classified according to when and where the interaction between modeling participants takes place. In VE, these requirements are the key to carry out BPM, but usually participants do not work in same place and time. This time/space classification is borrowed from Bafoutsou and Mentzas (2002). In their work, the horizontal dimension represents the location of participants; they can be either at the same place (also referred to as co-located) or at different places (remote). Similarly, the vertical dimension makes the distinction, whether the interaction happens at the same time (synchronous) or at different times (asynchronous).

The previous classification provides a framework to analyze collaborative tool features, as it serves to determine whether a tool covers these types of requisites, or not. According to this framework and after the revision of currently available tools, three main (not excluding) categories of CBPM tools have been identified:

- **Web support for modeling (WS).** This feature allows participants in different places to model

8 more pages are available in the full version of this document, which may be purchased using the "Add to Cart" button on the publisher's webpage: www.igi-global.com/chapter/tools-collaborative-business-process-modeling/17803

Related Content

Serious Games, Meditation, Brain-Computer Interfacing, and Virtual Reality (VR): Empowering Players to Discover Their Minds

Ryan Murdoch (2019). *Virtual and Augmented Reality in Mental Health Treatment* (pp. 32-50).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/serious-games-meditation-brain-computer-interfacing-and-virtual-reality-vr/215820

Hierarchy Similarity Analyser: An Approach to Securely Share Electronic Health Records

Shalini Bhartiya, Deepti Mehrotra and Anup Girdhar (2020). *Virtual and Mobile Healthcare: Breakthroughs in Research and Practice* (pp. 204-220).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/hierarchy-similarity-analyser/235313

Communities of Practice in the Workplace

Remberto Jimenez and Veronica E. O'Neill (2024). *Utilizing Virtual Communities in Professional Practice* (pp. 29-48).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/communities-of-practice-in-the-workplace/351790

Knowledge Creation and Student Engagement Within 3D Virtual Worlds

Brian G. Burton and Barbara Martin (2017). *International Journal of Virtual and Augmented Reality* (pp. 43-59).

www.irma-international.org/article/knowledge-creation-and-student-engagement-within-3d-virtual-worlds/169934

Virtual Communities and the Alignment of Web Ontologies

Krzysztof Juszczyszyn (2006). *Encyclopedia of Virtual Communities and Technologies* (pp. 497-499).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/virtual-communities-alignment-web-ontologies/18131