

WfMC Technical Meetings

Thursday 25 Sep. 08

Hosted by Fujitsu – Sunnyvale, CA

Attendees:

- Keith Swenson - Fujitsu
- Robert Shapiro – Global 360
- Ajay Khanna – Savvion
- Bob Puccinelli – DST Systems
- Kwang-Hoon Kim – BPM Korea Forum
- Kyoung-Rog Yi – Korea Institute for Electronic Commerce
- Hakeseong Kim – Dongham Health College, University of Kyonggi

Interface 4

Wf-XML 2.0

OGC demo of restful variant of Wf-XML – Fujitsu will participate. There will be a kick-off meeting in DC in October.

Prospective Team

- OGC Demo
- Fujitsu
- SunGuard
- TIBCO – not able to participate
- NASA
- Cordys?

Will have fixed process models, move between editors. XPDL between modelers and then feeding into engine. Interacting between engines.

Is date of demo set? There is a preparatory meeting in October to agree plan and set demo date. Participants would need to supply machine with their engine and implementation on internet. Participation advantage in front of DOD etc. Participant Fujitsu, Stevens Institute.

Proposal document is Wiki.

Protocol – XPDL part and Wf-XML part. – Split open to discussion and agreement. Interoperability aspect.

Previous version SOAP based. New version is REST based and is probably much easier to implement – 2 - 4 weeks of dedicated programmer involvement.

Is Savvion interested? Public demo in front of important potential customers.

What would this mean for a services customer? Demonstration of the protocol. Could implement over a partner engine.

Disaster Recovery, Business Continuity – ability to string these applications/engines together.

Does this fit into FSI/trading – not really that's more related to CEP.

New Wf-XML document on Wiki. Figure 1 describes components of protocol. However, really contains different aspects of reference model Interface 4 (interoperability), Interface 2 (Client interactions) and Interface 5 (Trace collection – BPAF).

It was suggested that this should split into multiple (2? Documents)

Interface 2

RSS based variant of specification

Current IF2 document is about 12 years old and is really an IDL description for C++ and Java.

RSS feeds – need to define additional aspects that not already covered?

Look at blog – RSS only provides description and not content

Would be separate RSS URL for everybody's worklist. Plug-in to reader and would appear there.

Working group needs to work out whether to use RSS or Adam Feed and what to do with each element. May want to invent own elements/extensions (e.g. due dates) which need to be optional and then come up with new spec.

Could pick up messages from multiple engines and come up with combined list. Would have something forward looking rather than being perceived as always looking into the past.

Kwang will come back with dates he and colleagues can achieve spec work.

Picking up worklist in standardized XML format so that reader could pickup worklist from multiple engines.

Interface 1

XPDL Validator – Robert

Global 360's XPDL Validator <http://76.12.62.147:8080/XpdValidator/index.jsp> is the temporary home for this. It will get moved to the WfMC web site. There is a set of instructions on the site to get the validator to work. Will be open to members until the launch on the WfMC site for trials and feedback.

Need new name for Interface 2 – RSS based worklist interface standard:

Suggestions –

- RSS-W
- Worklist Feed
- Shareable Worklist Object
- Worklist Stream
- Shareable Worklist Interchange Format – SWIF
- ShareableWorklist Access Format
- Shareable Worklist Feed
- WIF – Worklist Interchange Format
- Workcast/Workcasting
- Workcast Protocol
- Worklist Syndication Protocol
- WorkCast Protocol – WCP
- WorkCast Protocol - WP

Workcast Protocol – WP Chosen.

Need to update Reference Model to include.

XPDL Status

Inputs from people using new schema. TIBCO sent some yesterday. Will look like we need to update and release documentation and perhaps schema if necessary.

Some vendors updating their implementations to support XPDL 2.1

Conformance Model – Simple conformance model – not yet widely distributed. Concerned with portability of process models.

Want to be able to assure real ability to move process definitions. Define small subset (of BPMN) that is well defined. Be very precise about what the serialization of the subset should be.

Two conformance classifications suggested simple and standard. Simple – just drawing models but not adding implementation details.

Bruce Sliver and Robert devised classes.

Document created that put ideas together, defined simple subset with their graphical representation and includes snippets of schema to demonstrate.

Uses standard example from spec.

Classes of tools:

1. Import
2. Export
3. Import/Export

Talks about what WfMC will provide to assist.

Appendix - subset of schema

States what conformance checker looks for.

Should we make this available?

Tried to get done in a month and pushed hard to issue.

Several possible follow-ons – do one for standard model.

Another object- DODAF – Wisnowski 's program - what is subset of BPMN that is required to support DADAF's models?

Anticipated early August for DODAF (Michael) – described from van der Aalst pattern approach.

- Updated version of spec and schema for XPD 2.1 will be posted soon to address a problem found.
- 2. ITP Commerce and TIBCO are working on getting 2.1 implemented. Want it running in time for the BPM think-tank. TIBCO will be mid December.
- Portability efforts - a document published in May 2008 about conformance classes. "Simple" is a category that covers all the of cases where you want to draw a simple picture of a process, ignoring a lot of web service things.
- We have some criticisms of BPMN which have not been raised. Sub-process is an area where WfMC understands, but never really made it into BPMN. The BPMN concepts of a diagram did not really explain the connectors to other diagrams. If you get the idea that everything is a web services, then of course a sub-process can be a web service, but the concept of re-usable sub-process within the same diagram is not present. Other areas: Inclusive-OR logic and structure - upstream and downstream split and join. Michael
- Should this BPMN discussion be part of the XPD 2.1 discussion. Two separate groups make sense. The BPMN group would benefit from separation from XPD 2.1, because some people will discount XPD 2.1 oriented discussion as serving only the XPD 2.1 implementers.
- Compliance and Certification, still three levels of compliance. Or four. What is motivation? DOD might eventually come around, but not close to requiring interchange capability.

Interface 5

Robert gave his new Process Mining and BPAF presentation.

Process Mining and BPAF – presentation

Is a different take on analytics. Back to basics.

Presentation Standards

Recommend no slide building

Refer to “Death by Powerpoint” 😊