

Workshop Proceedings

Workshop on  
**Algorithms & Theories for the  
Analysis of Event Data (ATAED'2019)**

Aachen, Germany, June 25, 2019

Satellite event of the conferences

**19th International Conference on Application of  
Concurrency to System Design (ACSD 2019)**

**40th International Conference on Application and Theory  
of Petri Nets and Concurrency (PN 2019)**

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

Copyright © 2019 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. From there on, the workshop moved to Toruń (2016), Zaragoza (2017) and Bratislava (2018). 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’2019 workshop took place in Aachen on June 25, 2019 and was a satellite event of both the 40th International Conference on Application and Theory of Petri Nets and Concurrency (Petri Nets 2019) and the 19th International Conference on Application of Concurrency to System Design (ACSD 2019). This year, the workshop is also co-located with the 1st International Conference on Process Mining (ICPM 2019).

Papers related to process mining, region theory and other synthesis techniques were presented at ATAED’2019. These techniques have in common that “lower level” behavioral descriptions (event logs, partial languages, transition sys-

tems, 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, six papers were accepted for the workshop. We thank the reviewers for providing the authors with valuable and constructive feedback. Moreover, we were honored that *Wolfgang Reisig* was willing to give an invited talk on “*How to analyze BIG systems?*”. We thank Wolfgang, the authors, and the presenters for their wonderful contributions.

Enjoy reading the proceedings!

Wil van der Aalst, Robin Bergenthum, and Josep Carmona  
June 2019

#### **Program committee of ATAED’2019**

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  
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  
Jochen De Weerd, KU Leuven, Belgium  
Lijie Wen, Tsinghua University, China  
Moe Wynn, Queensland University of Technology, Australia  
Alex Yakovlev, Newcastle University, GB

## Table of Contents

Raymond Devillers, Evgeny Erofeev, Thomas Hujsa <i>Synthesis of Weighted Marked Graphs from Circular Labelled Transition Systems</i>	6 - 22
Jörg Desel <i>Can a Single Transition Stop an Entire Net?</i>	23 - 35
Federica Adobbati, Carlo Ferigato, Stefano Gandelli, Adrián Puerto Aubel <i>Two Operations for Stable Structures of Elementary Regions</i>	36 - 53
Nassim Laga, Marwa Elleuch, Walid Gaaloul, Oumaima Alaoui Ismaili <i>Emails Analysis for Business Process Discovery</i>	54 - 70
Ronny Tredup, Christian Rosenke <i>On the Hardness of Synthesizing Boolean Nets</i>	71 - 86
Alessandro Berti, Wil van der Aalst <i>Reviving Token-based Replay: Increasing Speed While Improving Diagnostics</i>	87 - 103