

Evaluation of the business proces

Business



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

Up to now, process enchaining has mainly been a manual process; the approach described and empirically evaluated In this paper partially automates the time-consuming and costly process analyses while introducing imperfectability regarding varying terminology, level of abstraction and modeling no-taxation. Also, overviews of literature relevant to the field of Green Semanticist and commonly applied metrics in a Green BPML context are given.

Keywords: Semantic Process Management, Anthologies, Sustainability, Agreeableness Process Management, Benchmarking Introduction Over the last two decades, many research efforts aimed at developing more unreflective technologies, alternative energy sources and ecological end-of-life for prod-cuts. We consider these efforts to be highly relevant and desirable in mitigating recollecting impact on theenvironment, however, the possibilities offered by impressionistic operational practices are often Ignored.

Business Process Management(PM) offers an Integrated, holistic approach to the management of sustalnabliltychange [1], which Is needed to change these practices efficiently. By looking at decrement state of an organization's business processes (BP) as well as Seibel IM-proponents through comparison with other organizations' BP or reference proprietresses by researchers, considerable improvements can be implemented. Business Process Benchmarking is commonly used to identify areas in consuming, manual process performed by domain experts.

Therefore, as Drew pointed out minion, " ways must be found for doing [benchmarking] faster, more effectively monotonically, without sacrificing rigor [sic] or integrity of approach [sic]" [3]. Benchmarking primarily suffers from two difficulties that need to be overcome: There are many different modeling notations for BSP (e. . Event-Driven Processing (EPIC) [4], Business Process Model and Notation (BPML) [5]), which cannot simply be compared because of syntactic incompatibility and varying contradictoriness.

Even if a process or a process step describes the same chain of activities in different models, in the same language and perspective, the terminology and semantics of the models may differ, which prohibits a direct comparison [6]. This stems from the fact that process models can be created from various perspectives at different levels of abstraction [7], because models are created for various purposes, to all of them requiring indication of each atomic activity, and different organizational entities use different terminology for describing the same domain.

With the help of semantic BPML, researchers try to overcome several issues with BPML (e. G. Work done by domain experts, mostly interpreting unstructured information) providing a common terminological reference point [8-9]. Up to now, there is no generally acknowledged meta-model covering all aspects of process models [7]. In this paper, we follow the suggestion to annotate BSP with waste), which are Cumae-related along the process flow [6], [10-13].

Using this approach, two or more (sub-)processes can be benchmarked to find ways to improve efficiency. The proposed approach must not be confused

with life cycle assessment (LLC) [14], as it sibs no means intended to replace but supplement LLC. During the course of our re-search, we acquired practical examples of BSP in different modeling notations, ann.-dated them with semantic information and demonstrated how process benchmarking be performed semi-automatically with only a small degree of manual modified-actions using the software package SENATE.

To achieve the necessary degree of rigor, we started with a systematic literature review [1 5] to identify the current state of Se-mantic and Green BPML and also appropriate metrics applicable to Green BPML. Toothache ourgoals, we laid out a research agenda with the following research sues-actions: RSI: What is the current status quo of Semantic and Green BPML? What metrics are applied to Green BPML? Does SENATE support Green BPML by assisting queries?

We read title and abstract of each paper and deter-mined whether it was relevant for our research or not (I. E. At least two of the following's criteria have to be met). We also conducted a forward and backward search standpoint more relevant literature. Table 1 summarizes the subset of results we considered be relevant. In total, we identified 31 papers relevant to our research. The promo-nonce of a certain topic is indicated by the number of asterisks, tit a maximum of three asterisks. If a topic is not focused in a publication, it is denoted with a minus.

The topics used for comparison to our approach are: Business Processes (BP): Does the paper focus on business processes? Benchmarking (Ben): individual process models efficiently and effectively? Ecological and/or Social

Sustainability (Just): Does the paper focus on ecological/or social sustainability? Semantic Approach (AS): Does the paper employ a semantic approach to analyticities processes? Research Agenda (RA): Does the paper propose a research agenda or directions forfeiture research? Evaluation Approach (EAI): Do the authors present an evaluation approach?

Focuses on... : On which problem domain does the study focus? The results of the literature review are displayed in table 1 . The results were electrolyte's by the focused topics; due to the different dimensions examined in the re-view, a distinct clustering was neither possible nor desirable. As can be seen from realization review, the combination of research topics (I. E. BPML, Benchmarking, Green'S and the Semantic Web) is largely unexplored, which necessitates this combination. Three of the papers found in