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Abstract
Workflow management systems facilitate the everyday operation of business processes by taking care of the logistic control of work. In contrast to traditional information systems, they attempt to support frequent changes of the workflows at hand. Therefore, the need for analysis methods to verify the correctness of workflows is becoming more prominent. In this paper we present a method based on Petri nets. This analysis method exploits the structure of the Petri net to find potential errors in the design of the workflow. Moreover, the analysis method allows for the compositional verification of workflows.
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1 Introduction
Workflow management systems (WFMS) are used for the modeling, analysis, enactment, and coordination of structured business processes by groups of people. Business processes supported by a WFMS are case-driven, i.e., tasks are executed for specific cases. Approving loans, processing insurance claims, billing, processing tax declarations, handling traffic violations and mortgaging, are typical case-driven processes which are often supported by a WFMS. These case-driven processes, also called workflows, are marked by three dimensions: (1) the process dimension, (2) the resource dimension, and (3) the case dimension (see Figure 1). The process dimension is concerned with the partial ordering of tasks. The tasks which need to be executed are identified and the routing of cases along these tasks is determined. Conditional, sequential, parallel and iterative routing are typical structures specified in the process dimension. Tasks are executed by resources. Resources are human (e.g. employee) and/or non-human (e.g. device, software, hardware). In the resource dimension these resources are classified by identifying roles (resource classes based on functional characteristics) and organizational units (groups, teams or departments). Both the process dimension and the resource dimension are generic, i.e., they are not tailored towards a specific case. The third dimension of a workflow is concerned with individual cases which are executed according to the process definition (first dimension) by the proper resources (second dimension).
Managing workflows is not a new idea. Workflow control techniques have existed for decades and many management concepts originating from production and logistics are also applicable in a workflow context. However, just recently, commercially available generic WFMS's have become a reality. Although these systems have been applied successfully, contemporary WFMS's have at least two important drawbacks. First of all, today's systems do not scale well, have limited fault tolerance and are inflexible. Secondly, a solid theoretical foundation is missing. Most of the more than 250 commercially available WFMS's use a vendor-specific ad-hoc modeling technique to design workflows. In spite of the efforts of the Workflow Management Coalition ([20]), real standards are missing. The absence of formalized standards hinders the development of tool-independent analysis techniques. As a result, contemporary WFMS's do not facilitate advanced analysis methods to determine the correctness of a workflow.

As many researchers have indicated ([11, 16, 21]), Petri nets constitute a good starting point for a solid theoretical foundation of workflow management. In this paper we focus on the process dimension. We use Petri nets to specify the partial ordering of tasks. Based on a Petri-net-based representation of the workflow process, we tackle the problem of verification. We will provide techniques to verify the so-called soundness property introduced in [4]. A workflow process is sound if and only if, for any case, the process terminates properly, i.e., termination is guaranteed, there are no dangling references, and deadlock and livelock are absent.

This paper extends the results presented in [4]. We will show that in most of the situations encountered in practice, the soundness property can be checked in polynomial time. Moreover, we identify suspicious constructs which may endanger the correctness of a workflow process. We will also show that the approach presented in this paper allows for the compositional verification of workflow processes, i.e., the correctness of a process can be decided by partitioning it into sound subprocesses. To support the application of the results presented in this paper, we have developed a Petri-net-based workflow analyzer called Woflan ([5]). Woflan is a workflow management system independent analysis tool which inter-
faces with two of the leading products at the Dutch workflow market.

2 Petri nets

This section introduces the basic Petri net terminology and notations. Readers familiar with Petri nets can skip this section.¹

The classical Petri net is a directed bipartite graph with two node types called places and transitions. The nodes are connected via directed arcs. Connections between two nodes of the same type are not allowed. Places are represented by circles and transitions by rectangles.

Definition 1 (Petri net) A Petri net is a triple \((P, T, F)\):

- \(P\) is a finite set of places,
- \(T\) is a finite set of transitions \((P \cap T = \emptyset)\),
- \(F \subseteq (P \times T) \cup (T \times P)\) is a set of arcs (flow relation)

A place \(p\) is called an input place of a transition \(t\) iff there exists a directed arc from \(p\) to \(t\). Place \(p\) is called an output place of transition \(t\) iff there exists a directed arc from \(t\) to \(p\). We use \(\bullet t\) to denote the set of input places for a transition \(t\). The notations \(\bullet t\), \(\bullet p\) and \(p\) have similar meanings, e.g. \(p\) is the set of transitions sharing \(p\) as an input place. Note that we restrict ourselves to arcs with weight 1. In the context of workflow procedures it makes no sense to have other weights, because places correspond to conditions.

At any time a place contains zero or more tokens, drawn as black dots. The state, often referred to as marking, is the distribution of tokens over places, i.e., \(M \in P \rightarrow \mathbb{N}\). We will represent a state as follows: \(1p_1 + 2p_2 + 1p_3 + 0p_4\) is the state with one token in place \(p_1\), two tokens in \(p_2\), one token in \(p_3\) and no tokens in \(p_4\). We can also represent this state as follows: \(p_1 + 2p_2 + p_3\). To compare states we define a partial ordering. For any two states \(M_1\) and \(M_2\), \(M_1 \preceq M_2\) iff for all \(p \in P\): \(M_1(p) \leq M_2(p)\)

The number of tokens may change during the execution of the net. Transitions are the active components in a Petri net: they change the state of the net according to the following firing rule:

1. A transition \(t\) is said to be enabled iff each input place \(p\) of \(t\) contains at least one token.

2. An enabled transition may fire. If transition \(t\) fires, then \(t\) consumes one token from each input place \(p\) of \(t\) and produces one token for each output place \(p\) of \(t\).

Given a Petri net \((P, T, F)\) and a state \(M_1\), we have the following notations:

¹Note that states are represented by weighted sums and note the definition of (elementary) (conflict-free) paths.
- $M_1 \overset{t}{\rightarrow} M_2$: transition $t$ is enabled in state $M_1$ and firing $t$ in $M_1$ results in state $M_2$
- $M_1 \rightarrow M_2$: there is a transition $t$ such that $M_1 \overset{t}{\rightarrow} M_2$
- $M_1 \overset{\sigma}{\rightarrow} M_n$: the firing sequence $\sigma = t_1t_2t_3 \ldots t_{n-1}$ leads from state $M_1$ to state $M_n$,
  i.e., $M_1 \overset{t_1}{\rightarrow} M_2 \overset{t_2}{\rightarrow} \ldots \overset{t_{n-1}}{\rightarrow} M_n$

A state $M_n$ is called reachable from $M_1$ (notation $M_1 \rightarrow^* M_n$) iff there is a firing sequence
$\sigma = t_1t_2 \ldots t_{n-1}$ such that $M_1 \overset{t_1}{\rightarrow} M_2 \overset{t_2}{\rightarrow} \ldots \overset{t_{n-1}}{\rightarrow} M_n$. Note that the empty firing sequence
is also allowed, i.e., $M_1 \overset{\epsilon}{\rightarrow} M_1$.

We use $(PN, M)$ to denote a Petri net $PN$ with an initial state $M$. A state $M'$ is a reachable state of $(PN, M)$ iff $M \rightarrow M'$. Let us define some properties for Petri nets.

**Definition 2 (Live)** A Petri net $(PN, M)$ is live iff, for every reachable state $M'$ and every transition $t$ there is a state $M''$ reachable from $M'$ which enables $t$.

**Definition 3 (Bounded, safe)** A Petri net $(PN, M)$ is bounded iff, for every reachable state and every place $p$ the number of tokens in $p$ is bounded. The net is safe iff for each place the maximum number of tokens does not exceed 1.

**Definition 4 (Well-formed)** A Petri net $PN$ is well-formed iff there is a state $M$ such that $(PN, M)$ is live and bounded.

Paths connect nodes by a sequence of arcs.

**Definition 5 (Path, Elementary, Conflict-free)** Let $PN$ be a Petri net. A path $C$ from a node $n_i$ to a node $n_k$ is a sequence $(n_1, n_2, \ldots, n_k)$ such that $(n_i, n_{i+1}) \in F$ for $1 \leq i \leq k - 1$. $C$ is elementary iff, for any two nodes $n_i$ and $n_j$ on $C$, $i \neq j \Rightarrow n_i \neq n_j$. $C$ is conflict-free iff, for any place $n_j$ on $C$ and any transition $n_i$ on $C$, $j \neq i - 1 \Rightarrow n_j \notin \bullet n_i$.

For convenience, we introduce the alphabet operator $\alpha$ on paths. If $C = (n_1, n_2, \ldots, n_k)$, then $\alpha(C) = \{n_1, n_2, \ldots, n_k\}$.

**Definition 6 (Strongly connected)** A Petri net is strongly connected iff, for every pair of nodes (i.e. places and transitions) $x$ and $y$, there is a path leading from $x$ to $y$.

### 3 WF-nets

In Figure 1 we indicated that a workflow has (at least) three dimensions. The process dimension is the most prominent one, because the core of any workflow system is formed by the processes it supports. In the process dimension building blocks such as the AND-split, AND-join, OR-split, and OR-join are used to model sequential, conditional, parallel and iterative routing (WFMC [20]). Clearly, a Petri net can be used to specify the routing of cases. Tasks are modeled by transitions and causal dependencies are modeled by places. In fact, a place corresponds to a condition which can be used as pre- and/or post-conditions.
for tasks. An AND-split corresponds to a transition with two or more output places, and an AND-join corresponds to a transition with two or more input places. OR-splits/OR-joins correspond to places with multiple outgoing/ingoing arcs. Moreover, in [1, 3] it is shown that the Petri net approach also allows for useful routing constructs absent in many WFMS’s.

A Petri net which models the process dimension of a workflow, is called a WorkFlow net (WF-net). It should be noted that a WF-net specifies the dynamic behavior of a single case in isolation.

**Definition 7 (WF-net)** A Petri net $PN = (P, T, F)$ is a WF-net (Workflow net) if and only if:

(i) $PN$ has two special places: $i$ and $o$. Place $i$ is a source place: $\text{o}_i = 0$. Place $o$ is a sink place: $\text{o}_o = 0$.

(ii) If we add a transition $t^*$ to $PN$ which connects place $o$ with $i$ (i.e. $\text{t}_i^* = \{o\}$ and $t^*_o = \{i\}$), then the resulting Petri net is strongly connected.

A WF-net has one input place ($i$) and one output place ($o$) because any case handled by the procedure represented by the WF-net is created if it enters the WFMS and is deleted once it is completely handled by the WFMS, i.e., the WF-net specifies the life-cycle of a case. The second requirement in Definition 7 (the Petri net extended with $t^*$ should be strongly connected) states that for each transition $t$ (place $p$) there should be a path from place $i$ to $o$ via $t$ ($p$). This requirement has been added to avoid 'dangling tasks and/or conditions', i.e., tasks and conditions which do not contribute to the processing of cases.

![WF-net diagram](image)

**Figure 2:** A WF-net for the processing of complaints.

Figure 2 shows a WF-net which models the processing of complaints. First the complaint is registered (task *register*), then in parallel a questionnaire is sent to the complainant (task
send_questionnaire) and the complaint is evaluated (task evaluate). If the complainant returns the questionnaire within two weeks, the task process_questionnaire is executed. If the questionnaire is not returned within two weeks, the result of the questionnaire is discarded (task time_out). Based on the result of the evaluation, the complaint is processed or not. The actual processing of the complaint (task process_complaint) is delayed until condition c5 is satisfied, i.e., the questionnaire is processed or a time-out has occurred. The processing of the complaint is checked via task check_processing. Finally, task archive is executed. Note that sequential, conditional, parallel and iterative routing are present in this example.

The WF-net shown in Figure 2 clearly illustrates that we focus on the process dimension. We abstract from resources, applications and technical platforms. Moreover, we also abstract from case variables and triggers. Case variables are used to resolve choices (OR-split), i.e., the choice between processing_required and no_processing is (partially) based on case variables set during the execution of task evaluate. The choice between processing_OK and processing_NOK is resolved by testing case variables set by check_processing. In the WF-net we abstract from case variables by introducing non-deterministic choices in the Petri-net. If we don't abstract from this information, we would have to model the (unknown) behavior of the applications used in each of the tasks and analysis would become intractable. In Figure 2 we have indicated that time_out and process_questionnaire require triggers. The clock symbol denotes a time trigger and the envelope symbol denotes an external trigger. Task time_out requires a time trigger ('two weeks have passed') and process_questionnaire requires a message trigger ('the questionnaire has been returned'). A trigger can be seen as an additional condition which needs to be satisfied. In the remainder of this paper we abstract from these trigger conditions. We assume that the environment behaves fairly, i.e., the liveness of a transition is not hindered by the continuous absence of a specific trigger. As a result, every trigger condition will be satisfied eventually (if needed).

4 Soundness

In this section we summarize some of the basic results for WF-nets presented in [4]. The remainder of this paper will build on these results.

The two requirements stated in Definition 7 can be verified statically, i.e., they only relate to the structure of the Petri net. However, there is another requirement which should be satisfied:

For any case, the procedure will terminate eventually and the moment the procedure terminates there is a token in place o and all the other places are empty.

Moreover, there should be no dead tasks, i.e., it should be possible to execute an arbitrary task by following the appropriate route though the WF-net. These two additional requirements correspond to the so-called soundness property.

Definition 8 (Sound) A procedure modeled by a WF-net PN = (P, T, F) is sound if and only if:

- Any case has a path to an accepting place.
- For any case, the procedure will terminate eventually and the moment the procedure terminates there is a token in place o and all the other places are empty.
- There are no dead tasks.
(i) For every state $M$ reachable from state $i$, there exists a firing sequence leading from state $M$ to state $o$. Formally:
\[
\forall M(i \rightarrow M) \implies (M \rightarrow o)
\]

(ii) State $o$ is the only state reachable from state $i$ with at least one token in place $o$. Formally:
\[
\forall M(i \rightarrow M \land M \geq o) \implies (M = o)
\]

(iii) There are no dead transitions in $(PN, i)$. Formally:
\[
\forall t \in T \exists M, M' i \rightarrow M \rightarrow M'
\]

Note that the soundness property relates to the dynamics of a WF-net. The first requirement in Definition 8 states that starting from the initial state (state $i$), it is always possible to reach the state with one token in place $o$ (state $o$). If we assume fairness (i.e., a transition that is enabled infinitely often will fire eventually), then the first requirement implies that eventually state $o$ will be reached. The fairness assumption is reasonable in the context of workflow management; all choices are made (implicitly or explicitly) by applications, humans or external actors. Clearly, they should not introduce an infinite loop. The second requirement states that the moment a token is put in place $o$, all the other places should be empty. Sometimes the term proper termination is used to describe the first two requirements [14]. The last requirement states that there are no dead transitions (tasks) in the initial state $i$.

![WF-net diagram](image)

Figure 3: Another WF-net for the processing of complaints.

Figure 3 shows a WF-net which is not sound. There are several deficiencies. If $time\_out\_1$ and $processing\_2$ fire or $time\_out\_2$ and $processing\_1$ fire, the WF-net will not terminate properly because a token gets stuck in $c4$ or $c5$. If $time\_out\_1$ and $time\_out\_2$ fire, then the task $processing\_NOK$ will be executed twice and because of the presence of two tokens in $o$ the moment of termination is not clear.

Given a WF-net $PN = (P, T, F)$, we want to decide whether $PN$ is sound. In [4] we

\(^2\)Note that there is an overloading of notation: the symbol $i$ is used to denote both the place $i$ and the state with only one token in place $i$ (see Section 2).
have shown that soundness corresponds to liveness and boundedness. To link soundness to liveness and boundedness, we define an extended net $PN = (P, T, F)$. $PN$ is the Petri net obtained by adding an extra transition $t^*$ which connects $o$ and $i$. The extended Petri net $PN = (P, T, F)$ is defined as follows: $P = P$, $T = T \cup \{t^*\}$, and $F = F \cup \{(o, t^*), (t^*, i)\}$. The extended net allows for the formulation of the following theorem.

**Theorem 1** A WF-net $PN$ is sound if and only if $(PN, i)$ is live and bounded.

**Proof.**
See [4] or [2].

This theorem shows that standard Petri-net-based analysis techniques can be used to verify soundness.

5 Structural characterization of soundness
Theorem 1 gives a useful characterization of the quality of a workflow process definition. However, there are a number of problems:

- For a complex WF-net it may be intractable to decide soundness. (For arbitrary WF-nets liveness and boundedness are decidable but also EXPSpace-hard, cf. Cheng, Esparza and Palsberg [8].)
- Soundness is a minimal requirement. Readability and maintainability issues are not addressed by Theorem 1.
- Theorem 1 does not show how a non-sound WF-net should be modified, i.e., it does not identify constructs which invalidate the soundness property.

These problems stem from the fact that the definition of soundness relates to the dynamics of a WF-net while the workflow designer is concerned with the static structure of the WF-net. Therefore, it is interesting to investigate structural characterizations of sound WF-nets. For this purpose we introduce three interesting subclasses of WF-nets: free-choice WF-nets, well-structured WF-nets, and $S$-coverable WF-nets.

5.1 Free-choice WF-nets
Most of the WFMS's available at the moment, abstract from states between tasks, i.e., states are not represented explicitly. These WFMS's use building blocks such as the AND-split, AND-join, OR-split and OR-join to specify workflow procedures. The AND-split and the AND-join are used for parallel routing. The OR-split and the OR-join are used for conditional routing. Because these systems abstract from states, every choice is made inside an OR-split building block. If we model an OR-split in terms of a Petri net, the OR-split corresponds to a number of transitions sharing the same set of input places. This means that for these WFMS's, a workflow procedure corresponds to a free-choice Petri net.

**Definition 9 (Free-choice)** A Petri net is a free-choice Petri net iff, for every two transitions $t_1$ and $t_2$, $\bullet t_1 \cap \bullet t_2 \neq \emptyset$ implies $\bullet t_1 = \bullet t_2$. 
It is easy to see that a process definition composed of AND-splits, AND-joins, OR-splits and OR-joins is free-choice. If two transitions \( t_1 \) and \( t_2 \) share an input place \( (\bullet_{t_1} \cap \bullet_{t_2} \neq \emptyset) \), then they are part of an OR-split, i.e., a "free choice" between a number of alternatives. Therefore, the sets of input places of \( t_1 \) and \( t_2 \) should match \( (\bullet_{t_1} = \bullet_{t_2}) \). Figure 3 shows a free-choice WF-net. The WF-net shown in Figure 2 is not free-choice; \textit{archive} and \textit{process_complaint} share an input place but the two corresponding input sets differ.

We have evaluated many WFMS's and just one of these systems (COSA [18]) allows for a construction which is comparable to a non-free choice WF-net. Therefore, it makes sense to consider free-choice Petri nets. Clearly, parallelism, sequential routing, conditional routing and iteration can be modeled without violating the free-choice property. Another reason for restricting WF-nets to free-choice Petri nets is the following. If we allow non-free-choice Petri nets, then the choice between conflicting tasks \textit{may} be influenced by the order in which the preceding tasks are executed. The routing of a case should be independent of the order in which tasks are executed. A situation where the free-choice property is violated is often a mixture of parallelism and choice. Figure 4 shows such a situation. Firing transition \( t_1 \) introduces parallelism. Although there is no real choice between \( t_2 \) and \( t_5 \) (\( t_5 \) is not enabled), the parallel execution of \( t_2 \) and \( t_3 \) results in a situation where \( t_5 \) is not allowed to occur. However, if the execution of \( t_2 \) is delayed until \( t_3 \) has been executed, then there is a real choice between \( t_2 \) and \( t_5 \). In our opinion parallelism itself should be separated from the choice between two or more alternatives. Therefore, we consider the non-free-choice construct shown in Figure 4 to be improper. In literature, the term \textit{confusion} is often used to refer to the situation shown in Figure 4.

![Figure 4: A non-free-choice WF-net containing a mixture of parallelism and choice.](image)

Free-choice Petri nets have been studied extensively (cf. Best [7], Desel and Esparza [10, 9, 12], Hack [15]) because they seem to be a good compromise between expressive power and analyzability. It is a class of Petri nets for which strong theoretical results and efficient analysis techniques exist. For example, the well-known Rank Theorem (Desel and Esparza [10]) enables us to formulate the following corollary.

\textbf{Corollary 1} \textit{The following problem can be solved in polynomial time. Given a free-choice WF-net, to decide if it is sound.}

\textbf{Proof.}
Let \( PN \) be a free-choice WF-net. The extended net \( \overline{PN} \) is also free-choice. Therefore, the problem of deciding whether \( (\overline{PN}, i) \) is live and bounded can be solved in polynomial
Corollary 1 shows that, for free-choice nets, there are efficient algorithms to decide soundness. Moreover, a sound free-choice WF-net is guaranteed to be safe.

**Lemma 1** A sound free-choice WF-net is safe.

**Proof.**
Let $PN$ be a sound free-choice WF-net. $PN$ is the Petri net $PN$ extended with a transition connecting $o$ and $i$. $PN$ is free-choice and well-formed. Hence, $PN$ is covered by state-machines (S-components, cf. [10]), i.e., each place is part of such a state-machine component. Clearly, $i$ and $o$ are nodes of any state-machine component. Hence, for each place $p$ there is a semi-positive invariant with weights 0 or 1 which assigns a positive weight to $p$, $i$ and $o$. Therefore, $PN$ is safe and so is $PN$.

Safeness is a desirable property, because it makes no sense to have multiple tokens in a place representing a condition. A condition is either true (1 token) or false (no tokens).

Although most WFMS's only allow for free-choice workflows, free-choice WF-nets are not a completely satisfactory structural characterization of 'good' workflows. On the one hand, there are non-free-choice WF-nets which correspond to sensible workflows (cf. Figure 2). On the other hand there are sound free-choice WF-nets which make no sense. Nevertheless, the free-choice property is a desirable property. If a workflow can be modeled as a free-choice WF-net, one should do so. A workflow specification based on a free-choice WF-net can be enacted by most workflow systems. Moreover, a free-choice WF-net allows for efficient analysis techniques and is easier to understand. Non-free-choice constructs such as the construct shown in Figure 4 are a potential source of anomalous behavior (e.g. deadlock) which is difficult to trace.

### 5.2 Well-structured WF-nets

Another approach to obtain a structural characterization of 'good' workflows, is to balance AND/OR-splits and AND/OR-joins. Clearly, two parallel flows initiated by an AND-split, should not be joined by an OR-join. Two alternative flows created via an OR-split, should not be synchronized by an AND-join. As shown in Figure 5, an AND-split should be complemented by an AND-join and an OR-split should be complemented by an OR-join.

One of the deficiencies of the WF-net shown in Figure 3 is the fact that the AND-split register is complemented by the OR-join $c3$ or the OR-join $o$. To formalize the concept illustrated in Figure 5 we give the following definition.

**Definition 10 (Well-handled)** A Petri net $PN$ is well-handled iff, for any pair of nodes $x$ and $y$ such that one of the nodes is a place and the other a transition and for any pair of elementary paths $C_1$ and $C_2$ leading from $x$ to $y$, $\alpha(C_1) \cap \alpha(C_2) = \{x, y\} \Rightarrow C_1 = C_2$.

Note that the WF-net shown in Figure 3 is not well-handled. A Petri net which is well-handled has a number of nice properties, e.g. strong connectedness and well-formedness.
Lemma 2 A strongly connected well-handled Petri net is well-formed.

Proof. Let $PN$ be a strongly connected well-handled Petri net. Clearly, there are no circuits that have PT-handles nor TP-handles ([13]). Therefore, the net is structurally bounded (See Theorem 3.1 in [13]) and structurally live (See Theorem 3.2 in [13]). Hence, $PN$ is well-formed.

Clearly, well-handledness is a desirable property for any WF-net $PN$. Moreover, we also require the extended $PN$ to be well-handled. We impose this additional requirement for the following reason. Suppose we want to use $PN$ as a part of a larger WF-net $PN'$. $PN'$ is the original WF-net extended with an 'undo-task'. See Figure 6. Transition undo corresponds to the undo-task, transitions $t_1$ and $t_2$ have been added to make $PN'$ a WF-net. It is undesirable that transition undo violates the well-handledness property of the original net. However, $PN'$ is well-handled iff $\overline{PN}$ is well-handled. Therefore, we require $\overline{PN}$ to be well-handled. We use the term well-structured to refer to WF-nets whose extension is well-handled.

$PN'$:

Definition 11 (Well-structured) A WF-net $PN$ is well-structured iff $\overline{PN}$ is well-handled.

Well-structured WF-nets have a number of desirable properties. Soundness can be verified in polynomial time and a sound well-structured WF-net is safe. To prove these properties we use some of the results obtained for elementary extended non-self controlling nets.
Definition 12 (Elementary extended non-self controlling) A Petri net $PN$ is elementary extended non-self controlling (ENSC) iff. for every pair of transitions $t_1$ and $t_2$ such that $\bullet t_1 \cap \bullet t_2 \neq \emptyset$, there does not exist an elementary path $C$ leading from $t_1$ to $t_2$ such that $\bullet t_1 \cap \alpha(C) = \emptyset$.

Theorem 2 Let $PN$ be a WF-net. If $PN$ is well-structured, then $PN$ is elementary extended non-self controlling.

Proof. Assume that $PN$ is not elementary extended non-self controlling. This means that there is a pair of transitions $t_1$ and $t_k$ such that $\bullet t_1 \cap \bullet t_k \neq \emptyset$ and there exist an elementary path $C = \langle t_1, p_1, t_2, \ldots, p_{n-1}, t_n, t_k \rangle$ leading from $t_1$ to $t_k$ and $\bullet t_1 \cap \alpha(C) = \emptyset$. Let $p_1 \in \bullet t_1 \cap \bullet t_k$. $C_1 = \langle p_1, t_k \rangle$ and $C_2 = \langle p_1, t_1, p_2, t_2, \ldots, p_{n-1}, t_n, t_k \rangle$ are paths leading from $p_1$ to $t_k$. (Note that $C_2$ is the concatenation of $\langle p_1 \rangle$ and $C$.) Clearly, $C_1$ is elementary. We will also show that $C_2$ is elementary. $C$ is elementary, and $p_1 \notin \alpha(C)$ because $p_1 \in \bullet t_1$. Hence, $C_2$ is also elementary. Since $C_1$ and $C_2$ are both elementary paths, $C_1 \neq C_2$ and $\alpha(C_1) \cap \alpha(C_2) = \{ p_1, t_k \}$, we conclude that $PN$ is not well-handled.

Consider for example the WF-net shown in Figure 7. The WF-net is well-structured and, therefore, also elementary extended non-self controlling. However, the net is not free-choice. Nevertheless, it is possible to verify soundness for such a WF-net very efficiently.

Corollary 2 The following problem can be solved in polynomial time.

Given a well-structured WF-net, to decide if it is sound.

Proof. Let $PN$ be a well-structured WF-net. The extended net $\overline{PN}$ is elementary extended non-self controlling (Theorem 2) and structurally bounded (see proof of Lemma 2). For bounded elementary extended non-self controlling nets the problem of deciding whether a given marking is live, can be solved in polynomial time (See [6]). Therefore, the problem of deciding whether $(\overline{PN}, i)$ is live and bounded can be solved in polynomial time. By Theorem 1, this corresponds to soundness.

Lemma 3 A sound well-structured WF-net is safe.
Proof. Let $\overline{PN}$ be the net $PN$ extended with a transition connecting $o$ and $i$. $\overline{PN}$ is extended non-self controlling. $\overline{PN}$ is covered by state-machines (S-components), see Corollary 5.3 in [6]. Hence, $\overline{PN}$ is safe and so is $PN$ (see proof of Lemma 1).

Well-structured WF-nets and free-choice WF-nets have similar properties. In both cases soundness can be verified very efficiently and soundness implies safeness. In spite of these similarities, there are sound well-structured WF-nets which are not free-choice (Figure 7) and there are sound free-choice WF-nets which are not well-structured. In fact, it is possible to have a sound WF-net which is neither free-choice nor well-structured (Figures 2 and 4).

5.3 S-coverable WF-nets

What about the sound WF-nets shown in Figure 2 and Figure 4? The WF-net shown in Figure 4 can be transformed into a free-choice well-structured WF-net by separating choice and parallelism. The WF-net shown in Figure 2 cannot be transformed into a free-choice or well-structured WF-net without yielding a much more complex WF-net. Place $c5$ acts as some kind of milestone which is tested by the task process_complaint. Traditional workflow management systems which do not make the state of the case explicit, are not able to handle the workflow specified by Figure 2. Only workflow management systems such as COSA ([18]) have the capability to enact such a state-based workflow. Nevertheless, it is interesting to consider generalizations of free-choice and well-structured WF-nets: S-coverable WF-nets can be seen as such a generalization.

Definition 13 (S-coverable) A WF-net $PN$ is S-coverable iff the extended net $\overline{PN} = (\overline{P}, \overline{T}, \overline{F})$ satisfies the following property. For each place $p$ there is subnet $PN_p = (P_p, T_p, F_p)$ such that: $p \in P_p$, $P_p \subseteq \overline{P}$, $T_p \subseteq \overline{T}$, $F_p \subseteq \overline{F}$; $PN_p$ is strongly connected, $PN_p$ is a state machine (i.e. each transition in $PN_p$ has one input and one output place), and for every $q \in P_p$ and $t \in T$: $(q, t) \in F \Rightarrow (q, t) \in F_p$ and $(t, q) \in F \Rightarrow (t, q) \in F_p$.

This definition corresponds to the definition given in [10]. A subnet $PN_p$ which satisfies the requirements stated in Definition 13 is called an S-component. $PN_p$ is a strongly connected state machine such that for every place $q$: if $q$ is an input (output) place of a transition $t$ in $PN$, then $q$ is also an input (output) place of $t$ in $PN_p$.

The WF-nets shown in Figure 2 and Figure 4 are S-coverable. The WF-net shown in Figure 3 is not S-coverable. The following two corollaries show that S-coverability is a generalization of the free-choice property and well-structuredness.

Corollary 3 A sound free-choice WF-net is S-coverable.

Proof. The extended net $\overline{PN}$ is free-choice and well-formed. Hence, $\overline{PN}$ is S-coverable (cf. [10]).

Corollary 4 A sound well-structured WF-net is S-coverable.
Proof.
\( \overline{PN} \) is extended non-self controlling (Theorem 2). Hence, \( \overline{PN} \) is S-coverable (cf. Corollary 5.3 in [6]).

All the sound WF-nets presented in this paper are S-coverable. Every S-coverable WF-net is safe. The only WF-net which is not sound, i.e. the WF-net shown in Figure 3, is not S-coverable. These and other examples indicate that there is a high correlation between S-coverability and soundness. It seems that S-coverability is one of the basic requirements any workflow process definition should satisfy. From a formal point of view, it is possible to construct WF-nets which are sound but not S-coverable. Typically, these nets contain places which do not restrict the firing of a transition, but which are not in any S-component. (See for example Figure 65 in [17].) From a practical point of view, these WF-nets are to be avoided. WF-nets which are not S-coverable are difficult to interpret because the structural and dynamical properties do not match. For example, these nets can be live and bounded but not structurally bounded. There is no practical need for using constructs which violate the S-coverability property. Therefore, we consider S-coverability to be a basic requirement any WF-net should satisfy.

S-coverability can be verified in polynomial time. Unfortunately, in general it is not possible to verify soundness of an S-coverable WF-net in polynomial time. The problem of deciding soundness for an S-coverable WF-net is PSPACE-complete. For most applications this is not a real problem. In most cases the number of tasks in one workflow process definition is less than 100 and the number of states is less than 200,000. Tools using standard techniques such as the construction of the coverability graph have no problems in coping with these workflow process definitions.

The three structural characterizations (free-choice, well-structured and S-coverable) turn out to be very useful for the analysis of workflow process definitions. S-coverability is a desirable property any workflow definition should satisfy. Constructs violating S-coverability can be detected easily and tools can be build to help the designer to construct an S-coverable WF-net. S-coverability is a generalization of well-structuredness and the free-choice property (Corollary 3 and 4). Both well-structuredness and the free-choice property also correspond to desirable properties of a workflow. A WF-net satisfying at least one of these two properties can be analyzed very efficiently. However, we have shown that there are workflows that are not free-choice and not well-structured. Consider for example Figure 2. The fact that task \texttt{process.complaint} tests whether there is a token in \( c_5 \), prevents the WF-net from being free-choice or well-structured. Although this is a very sensible workflow, most workflow management systems do not support such an advanced routing construct. Even if one is able to use state-based workflows (e.g. COSA) allowing for constructs which violate well-structuredness and the free-choice property, then the structural characterizations are still useful. If a WF-net is not free-choice or not well-structured, one should locate the source which violates one of these properties and check whether it is really necessary to use a non-free-choice or a non-well-structured construct. If the non-free-choice or non-well-structured construct is really necessary, then the correctness of the construct should be double-checked, because it is a potential source of errors.
6 Composition of WF-nets

The WF-nets in this paper are very simple compared to the workflows encountered in practice. For example, in the Dutch Customs Department there are workflows consisting of more than 80 tasks with a very complex interaction structure (cf. [3]). For the designer of such a workflow the complexity is overwhelming and communication with end-users using one huge diagram is difficult. In most cases hierarchical (de)composition is used to tackle this problem. A complex workflow is decomposed into subflows and each of the subflows is decomposed into smaller subflows until the desired level of detail is reached. Many WFMS’s allow for such a hierarchical decomposition. In addition, this mechanism can be utilized for the reuse of existing workflows. Consider for example multiple workflows sharing a generic subflow. Some WFMS-vendors also supply reference models which correspond to typical workflow processes in insurance, banking, finance, marketing, purchase, procurement, logistics and manufacturing.

Reference models, reuse and the structuring of complex workflows require a hierarchy concept. The most common hierarchy concept supported by many WFMS’s is task refinement, i.e., a task can be refined into a subflow. This concept is illustrated in Figure 8. The WF-net $PN_1$ contains a task $t'$ which is refined by another WF-net $PN_2$, i.e., $t'$ is no longer a task but a reference to a subflow. A WF-net which represents a subflow should satisfy the same requirements as an ordinary WF-net (see Definition 7). The semantics of the hierarchy concept are straightforward; simply replace the refined transition by the corresponding subnet. Figure 8 shows that the refinement of $t'$ in $PN_1$ by $PN_2$ yields a WF-net $PN_3$.

The hierarchy concept can be exploited to establish the correctness of a workflow. Given a complex hierarchical workflow model, it is possible to verify soundness by analyzing each of the subflows separately. The following theorem shows that the soundness property defined in this paper allows for modular analysis.

**Theorem 3 (Compositionality)** Let $PN_1 = (P_1, T_1, F_1)$ and $PN_2 = (P_2, T_2, F_2)$ be
two WF-nets such that $T_1 \cap T_2 = \emptyset$, $P_1 \cap P_2 = \{i, o\}$ and $t^+ \in T_1$. $PN_3 = (P_3, T_3, F_3)$ is the WF-net obtained by replacing transition $t^+$ in $PN_1$ by $PN_2$, i.e., $P_3 = P_1 \cup P_2$, $T_3 = (T_1 \setminus \{t^+\}) \cup T_2$ and

$$F_3 = \{(x, y) \in F_1 \mid x \neq t^+ \land y \neq t^+\} \cup \{(x, y) \in F_2 \mid \{x, y\} \cap \{i, o\} = \emptyset\} \cup \{(x, y) \in P_1 \times T_2 \mid (x, t^+) \in F_1 \land (i, y) \in F_2\} \cup \{(x, y) \in T_2 \times P_1 \mid (t^+, y) \in F_1 \land (x, o) \in F_2\}.$$ 

For $PN_1$, $PN_2$ and $PN_3$ the following statements hold:

1. If $PN_3$ is free-choice, then $PN_1$ and $PN_2$ are free-choice.
2. If $PN_3$ is well-structured, then $PN_1$ and $PN_2$ are well-structured.
3. If $(PN_1, i)$ is safe and $PN_1$ and $PN_2$ are sound, then $PN_3$ is sound.
4. $(PN_1, i)$ and $(PN_2, i)$ are safe and sound iff $(PN_3, i)$ is safe and sound.
5. $PN_1$ and $PN_2$ are free-choice and sound iff $PN_3$ is free-choice and sound.
6. If $PN_3$ is well-structured and sound, then $PN_1$ and $PN_2$ are well-structured and sound.
7. If $t^+$ and $t^\bullet$ are both singletons, then $PN_1$ and $PN_2$ are well-structured and sound iff $PN_3$ is well-structured and sound.

Proof.

1. The only transitions that may violate the free-choice property are $t^+$ (in $PN_1$) and $\{t \in T_2 \mid (t, i) \in F_2\}$ (in $PN_2$). Transition $t^+$ has the same input set as any of the transitions $\{t \in T_3 \mid (t, i) \in F_3\}$ in $PN_3$ if we only consider the places in $P_3 \cap P_1$. Hence, $t^+$ does not violate the free-choice property in $PN_1$. All transitions $t$ in $PN_2$ such that $(i, t) \in F_2$ respect the free-choice property; the input places in $P_3 \setminus P_2$ are replaced by $i$.

2. $PN_1(PN_2)$ is well-handled because any elementary path in $PN_1(PN_2)$ corresponds to a path in $PN_3$.

3. Let $(PN_1, i)$ be safe and let $PN_1$ and $PN_2$ be sound. We need to prove that $(PN_3, i)$ is live and bounded. The subnet in $PN_3$ which corresponds to $t^+$ behaves like a transition which may postpone the production of tokens for $t^\bullet$. It is essential that the input places of $t^+$ in $(PN_3, i)$ are safe. This way it is guaranteed that the states of the subnet correspond to the states of $(PN_2, i)$. Hence, the transitions in $T_3 \cap T_2$ are live ($t^+$ is live) and the places in $P_3 \setminus P_1$ are bounded. Since the subnet behaves like $t^+$, the transitions in $T_3 \cap (T_1 \setminus \{t^+\})$ are live and the places in $P_3 \cap P_1$ are bounded. Hence, $PN_3$ is sound.

4. Let $(PN_1, i)$ and $(PN_2, i)$ be safe and sound. Clearly, $PN_3$ is sound (see proof of 3). $(PN_3, i)$ is also safe because every reachable state corresponds to a combination of a safe state of $(PN_1, i)$ and a safe state of $(PN_3, i)$. 
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Let \((PN_3, i)\) be safe and sound. Consider the subnet in \(PN_3\) which corresponds to \(t^+\). \(X\) is the set of transitions in \(T_3 \cap T_2\) consuming from \(\bullet t^+\) and \(Y\) is the set of transitions in \(T_3 \cap T_2\) producing tokens for \(t^+\). If a transition in \(X\) fires, then it should be possible to fire a transition in \(Y\) because of the liveness of the original net. If a transition in \(Y\) fires, the subnet should become empty. If the subnet is not empty after firing a transition in \(Y\), then there are two possibilities: (1) it is possible to move the subnet to a state such that a transition in \(Y\) can fire (without firing transitions in \(T_3 \cap T_2\)) or (2) it is not possible to move to such a state. In the first case, the places \(t^+\) in \(PN_3\) are not safe. In the second case, a token is trapped in the subnet or the subnet is not safe the moment a transition in \(X\) fires. \((PN_2, i)\) corresponds to the subnet bordered by \(X\) and \(Y\) and is, as we have just shown, sound and safe. It remains to prove that \((PN_1, i)\) is safe and sound. Since the subnet which corresponds to \(t^+\) behaves like a transition which may postpone the production of tokens, we can replace the subnet by \(t^+\) without changing dynamic properties such as safeness and soundness.

5. Let \(PN_1\) and \(PN_2\) be free-choice and sound. Since \((PN_1, i)\) is safe (see Lemma 1), \(PN_3\) is sound (see proof of 3.). It remains to prove that \(PN_3\) is free-choice. The only transitions in \(PN_3\) which may violate the free-choice property are the transitions in \(T_3 \cap T_2\) consuming tokens from \(\bullet t^+\). Because \(PN_2\) is sound, these transitions need to have an input set identical to \(t^+\) in \(PN_1\) (if this is not the case at least one of the transitions is dead). Since \(PN_1\) is free-choice, \(PN_3\) is also free-choice.

Let \(PN_3\) be free-choice and sound. \(PN_1\) and \(PN_2\) are also free-choice (see proof of 1.). Since \((PN_3, i)\) is safe (see Lemma 1), \(PN_1\) and \(PN_2\) are sound (see proof of 4.).

6. Let \(PN_3\) be well-structured and sound. \(PN_1\) and \(PN_2\) are also well-structured (see proof of 2.). Since \((PN_3, i)\) is safe (see Lemma 3), \(PN_1\) and \(PN_2\) are sound (see proof of 4.).

7. It remains to prove that if \(PN_1\) and \(PN_2\) are well-structured, then \(PN_3\) is also well-structured. Suppose that \(PN_3\) is not well-structured. There are two disjunct elementary paths leading from \(x\) to \(y\) in \(PN_3\). Since \(PN_1\) is well-structured, at least one of these paths is enabled via the refinement of \(t^+\). However, because \(t^+\) has precisely one input and one output place and \(PN_2\) is also well-structured, this is not possible.

Theorem 3 is a generalization of Theorem 3 in [19]. It extends the concept of a block with multiple entry and exit transitions and gives stronger results for specific subclasses.

Figure 9 shows a hierarchical WF-net. Both of the subflows (handle questionnaire and processing) and the main flow are safe and sound. Therefore, the overall workflow represented by the hierarchical WF-net is also safe and sound. Moreover, the free-choice property and well-structuredness are also preserved by the hierarchical composition. Theorem 3 is of particular importance for the reuse of subflows. For the analysis of a complex
Figure 9: A hierarchical WF-net for the processing of complaints.

workflow, every safe and sound subflow can be considered to be a single task. This allows for an efficient modular analysis of the soundness property. Moreover, the statements embedded in Theorem 3 can help a workflow designer to construct correct workflow process definitions.

7 Woflan

To allow users of today's workflow management systems to benefit from the results presented in this paper we have developed Woflan, a tool which analyzes workflow process definitions specified in terms of Petri nets. Woflan (WOrkFLow ANalyzer) has been designed to verify process definitions which are downloaded from a workflow management system ([5]). Clearly, there is a need for such a verification tool, because today's workflow management systems do not support advanced techniques to verify the correctness of workflow process definitions. These systems typically restrict themselves to a number of (trivial) syntactical checks. Therefore, serious errors such as deadlocks and livelocks may remain undetected. This means that an erroneous workflow may go into production, thus causing dramatic problems for the organization. An erroneous workflow may lead to extra work, legal problems, angry customers, managerial problems, and ill-motivated employees. Therefore, it is important to verify the correctness of a workflow process definition before it becomes operational.
At the moment there are two workflow tools which can interface with Woflan: COSA (COSA Solutions/Software-Ley, Pullheim, Germany) and Protos (Pallas Athena, Plasmolen, The Netherlands). COSA (COSA Solutions) is one of the leading products in the Dutch workflow market. COSA allows for the modeling and enactment of complex workflow processes which use advanced routing constructs. However, COSA does not support verification. Fortunately, Woflan can analyze any workflow process definition constructed by using CONE (COSA Network Editor), the design tool of the COSA system. Woflan can also import process definitions made with Protos. Protos (Pallas Athena) is a so-called BPR-tool. Protos supports Business Process Reengineering (BPR) efforts and can be used to model and analyze business processes. The tool is very easy to use and is based on Petri nets. To facilitate the modeling of simple workflows by users not familiar with Petri nets, it is possible to abstract from states. However, Protos cannot detect subtle design flaws which may result in deadlocks or livelocks. Therefore, it is useful to download workflows specified with Protos and analyze them with Woflan.

![Figure 10: An alternative WF-net for the processing of complaints.](image)

If the workflow process definition is not sound, Woflan guides the user in finding and correcting the error. Since a detailed description of the functionality of Woflan is beyond the scope of this paper, we will use the example shown in Figure 10 to illustrate the features of Woflan. For this particular workflow net, Woflan gives the following diagnostics:

- Woflan points out the fact that place c10 is not bounded in the net extended with transition t' which connects the output place ready with the input place start. This means that it is possible to terminate and leave a token in c10 (i.e., a dangling reference).

- The OR-split c3 is complemented by the AND-join archive, i.e., there are two disjunct paths (one via c10) leading from place c3 to transition archive. Such a construct may lead to a potential deadlock. In this case it does!
• Woflan reports that the workflow net is not covered by state machines (S-components) i.e., the net is not S-coverable. In fact, Woflan indicates that c10 is the only place not in any S-component.

• The fact that something is wrong with c10 is also highlighted by the fact that place c10 is not in the support of any of the semi-positive place invariants generated by Woflan.

The above diagnostics clearly show that the optional synchronization of the two parallel flows via place c10 is the source of the error. Removing c10 or replacing c10 by the construct shown in Figure 2 solves this problem and results in a sound workflow process definition. For a small workflow with only 8 tasks these results may seem trivial. However, workflows encountered in practice may have up to a 100 tasks. Experience shows that for workflows with more than 20 tasks it is not easy to locate the source of the error if the workflow net is not sound. Therefore, the support offered by Woflan is of utmost importance for the verification of workflow process definitions.

To assist the user in repairing the error, Woflan offers an on-line help facility. The on-line help is based on a step-wise approach to locate and remove constructs which violate the soundness property. This enables users without a background in Petri nets to operate the tool and repair an erroneous workflow process definition.

8 Conclusion

In this paper we have investigated a basic property that any workflow process definition should satisfy: the soundness property. For WF-nets, this property coincides with liveness and boundedness. In our quest for a structural characterization of WF-nets satisfying the soundness property, we have identified three important subclasses: free-choice, well-structured, and S-coverable WF-nets. The identification of these subclasses is useful for the detection of design errors.

If a workflow process is specified by a hierarchical WF-net, then modular analysis of the soundness property is often possible. A workflow composed of correct subflows can be verified without incorporating the specification of each subflow.

The results presented in this paper give workflow designers a handle to construct correct workflows. Although it is possible to use standard Petri-net-based analysis tools, we have developed a workflow analyzer which can be used by people not familiar with Petri-net theory. This workflow analyzer interfaces with existing workflow products such as COSA and Protos.
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