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A growing number of business process management systems is under development both in academia and in practice. These systems typically are based on modern system engineering principles, such as service oriented architecture. At the same time, the advent of big data analytics has changed the scope of such systems, including functionality such as data mining. However, existing reference architectures for business process management systems date back 20 years and, consequently, are not up to date with these modern developments. To fill the gap, this paper proposes an up-to-date reference architecture, called BPMS-RA, for modern business process management systems. BPMS-RA is based on analysis of recent literature and of existing commercial implementations. This reference architecture aims to provide a guideline template for the development of modern-day business process management systems, by specifying functions and interfaces that need to be provided by such systems as well as a set of quality criteria that they need to meet.

1. INTRODUCTION

Business Process Management (BPM) is a discipline that aims at overseeing the activities performed in an organization to ensure the quality of outcomes and to discover improvement opportunities [Dumas et al. 2013]. Business process management systems (BPMS) are information systems that interpret business processes to ensure that the activities specified therein are properly executed and monitored [Baumgrass et al. 2015a].

The architecture of BPMSs has been a subject of research since the 1990s. However, apart from the long-established Workflow Reference Model (1995) [Hollingsworth 1995] and the Mercurius reference architecture (1998) [Grefen and Remmerts de Vries 1998], there is a general lack of modern reference architectures for BPMSs. In particular, the existing reference architectures were developed before the shift towards Service Oriented Architectures, and before the rise of Business Process Analytics and Process Mining. Therefore, a revision of existing reference architectures is due, which considers at least these functions. This paper fills that gap by proposing a reference architecture for BPMSs, called BPMS-RA, which emerges from both research in the BPM community and from existing BPMS architectures from practice. An implementation of the proposed architecture has already been developed in the ‘GET Service’ platform [GET Service Consortium 2013; Baumgrass et al. 2015b], as discussed in the evaluation section of this paper.

We define a BPMS reference architecture as a predefined guideline for the architecture of a BPM system, where the structures, elements and the relationships among the elements provide a template for concrete architectures [Bachmann et al. 2011]. This template must be defined in such a way that concrete architectures can be instantiated from a reference architecture, by implementing and modifying it according to the specific context of that concrete architecture. Accordingly, the development process of a reference architecture is categorized into two groups [Grefen 2015]. On the one hand, the design principles that are provided by a reference architecture can be mined from best practices in a specific domain, in which case the resulting reference architecture is practice-driven. On the other hand, a reference architecture can be designed before the existence of such practical best practices.
and be inspired by existing research, which results in a research-driven reference architecture. As an example, the Workflow reference model was designed according to the practice-driven approach whereas the Mercurius reference architecture was designed according to the research-driven approach.

Using a design science methodology [Hevner et al. 2004], we combine both the research and practice-driven approach, to design the BPMS-RA. Figure 1 illustrates our approach. It illustrates that the designed artifact is the BPMS Reference Architecture, which is designed in four steps. The literature that is used to shape the artifact, represents the ‘rigor’ dimension of the methodology, while the existing concrete architectures that are used to represent the ‘relevance’ dimension.

In the first step, we introduce a BPMS component classification by combining (i) the phases that constitute the BPM life-cycle [van der Aalst et al. 2007] and (ii) the components that are identified in the Workflow reference model [Hollingsworth 1995]. We employ the BPM life-cycle, because it provides a deeper insight into the phases, activities and, consequently, the functions that need to be supported by BPMS-RA. Indeed, many reference architectures already originated from the life-cycles of their target systems (e.g., eSRA [Norta et al. 2014]). Similarly, we use the Workflow reference model, because it has been used as a blueprint template in developing many BPMS architectures (e.g., SWfMS [Lin et al. 2009]). In the second step, we use component classification to categorize functions of existing BPMS architectures both from research and from industry. This leads to an overview of the functions that are provided by these existing architectures. In the third and fourth step, we select and apply a set of architecture quality attributes to arrange the functions that the concrete architectures provide, into a set of components that constitute the BPMS Reference Architecture.

The remainder of this paper is structured according to the research approach that is outlined in Figure 1. Section 2 presents the component classes (Step 1). Section 3 presents the classification of functions from existing architectures according to these component classes (Step 2). Section 4 discusses the selection of quality attributes that must be met in BPMS-RA (Step 3). Section 5 and 6 discuss the design of the BPMS-RA at two levels of detail (Step 4). Section 7 discusses the relevance of BPMS-RA by comparing it with three concrete architectures from practice. This section also discusses the impact that the quality attributes had on the design of BPMS-RA. Finally, Section 8 concludes the paper.

Fig. 1. BPMS-RA’s Design Approach with Produced Artifacts
2. BPMS COMPONENT CLASSIFICATION FRAMEWORK

This section presents the component classification framework that we use to categorize the components from existing BPMS architectures. This framework consists of six BPMS component classes deduced by integrating (i) the phases distinguished in the BPM life-cycle; and (ii) the components presented in the Workflow reference model.

Figure 2 shows the component classes in which the old components from the Workflow reference model are depicted by white and the modified components are depicted by gray. Firstly, we explain the component classes in this figure and, then, we describe the rules that we used to deduce this framework.

The Process Definition Tools component class is used to design business process definitions in digitally processable formats which include all the required information regarding business processes in order to realize business goals. The Workflow Enactment Service component class, which includes one (or in some cases multiple) so-called process engine(s), provides a runtime environment to operationalize designed process models by generating executable instances of them. The Workflow Client Applications component class enables the interaction of BPMSs' end users with target BPMSs. The External Services component class enables the inter-operation of running process instances with external services. The Administration Tools component class provides user/role-based functions for target BPMSs. Finally, the Monitoring & Control Tools component class provides the ability to track and to control the status of process instances during their executions.

We now describe the approach that we used to deduce the BPMS component classes. To this end, we used the mapping between the components of the Workflow reference model and the phases of the BPM life-cycle as shown in Fig. 3.

In order to establish whether the Workflow reference model's components can be used as component classes in the framework, we evaluated them based on two rules:

1. if a component is mapped to one or more consecutive phases of the BPM life-cycle, we will consider this component as a component class in our classification; and
(2) if a component is mapped to two or more separated phases of the BPM life-cycle, we will decompose it into sub-components until the rule (1) is satisfied.

The arrows in Fig. 3 illustrate the applied rules on the mapping between the components and the phases. Each color represents a component class in Fig. 2.

Since two distinct phases relate to the Administration & Monitoring Tools component, we decomposed this component into two sub-components: Administration Tools and Monitoring & Control Tools. The first sub-component is mapped to the configuration phases while the second component is mapped to the control and diagnosis phases.

Additionally, since the other Workflow Enactment Services component and the Invoked Applications component relate to the same phase, we have merged these two components of the Workflow reference model into one component class in our framework. In the Workflow reference model, the former component allows multiple workflow systems to pass work items between one another, and the latter component facilitates the invocation of all the potential applications which might exist in a heterogeneous environment. However, nowadays these interfaces are not usually considered separately.

3. BPMS COMPONENT CLASSIFICATION

This section presents the results of using the proposed classification framework from the previous section to categorize a set of existing BPMS architectures. In total, we captured 438 components from 41 primary studies in the academic literature, using a systematic literature review as elaborated in [Pourmirza et al. 2017]. Moreover, we selected 33 existing industry-strength BPMSs. However, since a reliable source for all existing industry-strength BPMSs is not available, we did not use a structured approach to retrieve these systems, but a simple Google search. This presents a limitation, because it means that the list of industry-strength BPMSs may not be complete and therefore the functionality that is identified based on industry-strength BPMSs may not be complete.

The classification of the functionality from the existing systems is done according to a protocol in order to avoid subjectiveness as much as possible. Two of the authors read the available literature on the existing architectures [Pourmirza et al. 2017], extracted the functionality, classified that functionality, and discussed the classification in order to reach a joint classification. Subsequently, the classification was checked by the other two authors. Differences were discussed with the entire team and processed.

In the remainder of this section, we discuss the decomposition granularity and the functionality that is provided by the existing architectures. We discuss the functionality per class of the classification framework from section 2.

3.1. Decomposition Granularity of Components

We discuss the levels of detail according to which the existing BPMS architectures are described, according to the concepts of Commercial off-the-shelf (COTS) components and Software Suites. COTS components refer to softwares module that can be readily acquired in the market and, subsequently, they can be integrated into a software system [Land et al. 2008]. A set of COTS components that are bundled and, which thus, can be acquired in one package altogether [Sobel et al. 2005] is usually called a software suite. Accordingly, an architecture at the L1 level of detail presents a set of components each of which can be obtained as a software suite and at the L2 level of detail presents a set of components each of which can be obtained as a COTS component. Subsequently, an architecture at L3 level of detail illustrates the functional sub-components of a BPMS and at L4 level of detail it presents the...
refinement of sub-components. Moreover, $L0$ refers to a system presented as a black box. Based on these levels of detail, Table I provides the detailed results for the classification of the captured components from the research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component Class</th>
<th>Level of Details</th>
<th># of Components</th>
<th>Component Class</th>
<th>Level of Details</th>
<th># of Components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workflow Enactment Service</td>
<td>$L0$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Workflow Client Applications</td>
<td>$L0$</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$L1$</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td>$L1$</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$L2$</td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
<td>$L2$</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$L3$</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td>$L3$</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$L4$</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>$L4$</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>252</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Definition Tools</td>
<td>$L0$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Administration Tools</td>
<td>$L0$</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$L1$</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>$L1$</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$L2$</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td>$L2$</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$L3$</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>$L3$</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$L4$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$L4$</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring &amp; Control Tools</td>
<td>$L0$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>External Services</td>
<td>$L0$</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$L1$</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>$L1$</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$L2$</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>$L2$</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$L3$</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>$L3$</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$L4$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$L4$</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on this table, we argue that by far the greatest number of components in the selected BPMS architectures are positioned at the $L1$ and the $L2$ level of details. In the same way, the BPMS-RA will be mainly designed according to these two levels.

Fig. 4 depicts the categorization of the functions that are deduced from the captured components on the basis of BPMS component classification. The numbers on each functionality correspond to the frequency of that functionality among the components.

In addition to the 41 BPMS-related primary studies in the literature, we have analyzed 33 industry-strength systems as presented in Table IV. However, since the detailed architectures of these systems are not easily accessible, we only analyzed them at the level of the BPMS component classes (i.e., not at the level of provided functions for each component class). Fig. 5 illustrates the number of existing COTS components within the selected industry-strength systems that support the BPMS component classes. As expected, by far the greatest number of COTS components are positioned at the Workflow Enactment Services and Process Definition Tools component classes. However, surprisingly, the External Services component class has received the lowest attention in the selected systems.

3.2. Functions of Process Definition Tools
We identified 82 components that are positioned in the Process Definition Tools component class. We specify five groups of functions for the Process Definition Tools component, which are: (i) business process modeling, (ii) business process repository provisioning, (iii) business process validation and verification, (iv) business process simulation and optimization, and (v) offering ontology-based knowledge management for business processes.
The first functionality, modeling business processes, has been mentioned by 50 components in the selected architectures. A business process model contains a set of activities and a set of relationships among the activities. These relationships can be derived from a set of constraints and business rules that relate activities to each other.

The second functionality, business process repository, has been pointed out by 11 components in the selected architectures. The business process repository provisioning functionality enables the storage and retrieval of business process models.

The third functionality, validating and verifying business processes, has been suggested by 9 components in the selected architectures. These components evaluate designed business processes mainly in terms of syntax validity but also in terms of semantic validity.
The fourth functionality, simulation and optimization of business processes, has been proposed by 6 components in the selected architectures. The simulation and optimization functionality can help process designers and managers in making decisions by detecting bottlenecks and weaknesses in the designed processes before they are actually operationalized.

Finally, the role of ontologies and knowledge management in modeling business processes has received attention across the primary studies since 6 components in the selected architectures have been devoted to these issues. Ontologies are defined as a formal and shared representation model of knowledge in a specific domain [Gruber 1995]. These components provide process designers and domain experts with ontological models which can be used in the modeling procedure of business processes. Using this functionality promotes common understanding and the re-usability of developed business process models.

3.3. Functions of Workflow Enactment Services

We identified 252 components that are positioned in the Workflow Enactment Service component class. We specify six groups of functions for the Workflow Enactment Services component class, which are: (i) business process deployment and parser, (ii) runtime activity manager, (iii) runtime optimization and decision making, (iv) logging execution data, (v) exception handling, and finally (vi) service manager and invocation.

The business process deployment and parser functionality, mentioned by 27 components, is the first action that has to be performed by the target component. Once a business process model is deployed to a process engine, it will be parsed by the engine and, subsequently, all the activities therein will be detected by the process engine. Then, this engine can instantiate so-called process instances from the deployed process models and schedule the activities therein. Henceforth, the process engine controls the states of the generated processes' instances as well as the state of the inner activities.

The second functionality, runtime activity manager, has the highest frequency with 134 components among the components in the target component class. Having instantiated a process instance, the process engine is responsible for controlling the states of activity instances in addition to the process instance [Baumgrass et al. 2015c].

The third functionality, runtime optimization and decision making, has been pointed out by 43 components. This functionality provides process engines with optimization and decision making capabilities by using business intelligence and analytics' methods.

The fourth functionality, logging of execution data, has been mentioned by 17 components in the selected architectures. All the information that are produced during the execution of process instances must be recorded by process engines.

The fifth functionality, exception handling, has been suggested by only 3 components in the selected architectures. However, we can argue that most of the BPMSs implicitly considered this functionality, but they did not explicitly depict a functional component for this issue due to the amount of details that their target architectures.

Finally, the sixth functionality, service manager and invocation, has been recognized by 28 components in the Engine components of the selected architectures. This functionality provides a process engine with an ability to invoke external services and consume them by interpreting their response values.

3.4. Functions of External Services

We identified 21 components that are positioned in the External Services component class. We specify three groups of functions for this class, which are: (i) service manager and invocation, (ii) service repository and registry, and (iii) service security issue.
The first functionality, service manager and invocation, addressed by the 14 components within the External Services component class, is the same functionality as mentioned in Section 3.3 which aims at providing a service invocation environment by connecting, mediating, and managing interactions between services and BPMSs. Most particularly, it enables service invocation across heterogeneous software platforms and other BPMSs. The main reason that this functionality is common across these two can be explain by the fact that in many architectures there is no explicit component for handling external services (as it has been considered as part of their process engine) while in others explicit components referring to the external services have been suggested. Consequently, this functionality has been appeared in both classes.

The second functionality, service repository and registry, has been offered by 5 components within the External Services component class. This functionality is responsible for providing a catalog of available and known services, which can be also used by process designers to pick out target services in designing process models.

Finally, the third functionality, service security and trust, has been addressed by only 2 components. A BPMS can only use external services if they are trusted and, therefore, this functionality provides a trust mechanism by offering features such as message encryption, signature verification, authentication and access assessment.

3.5. Functions of Workflow Client Applications

We identified 27 components that are positioned in the Client Application component class. We specify two groups of functions for this component class which are: (i) process execution-related client applications, and (ii) management-related client applications.

The first functionality, process execution-related client applications, mentioned by 16 components, is used to facilitate end users to perform a set of activities that are available to them. The second functionality, management-related client applications, suggested by 11 components, is mainly employed by managers to gain an insight into the execution of their process, which may include a set of dashboards to show the performance of the processes. It should be noted that, in some of the primary studies, this functionality has also been considered as part of the Monitoring Tools class.

3.6. Functions of Administration Tools

We identified 23 components that are classified into the Administration Tools component class. We specify two groups of functions for this component class: (i) business process resource management, and (ii) user access control management.

The first functionality, business process resource management, provided by 18 components, is used to specify resources that can perform activities in business processes. Note that some of the selected architectures have suggested advanced automated techniques for allocating resources to activities in a process model (e.g. [Senkul and Toroslu 2005]).

The second functionality, user access control management, mentioned by 5 components, aims at validating and verifying resources before allowing them to perform specific tasks with BPM systems.

3.7. Functions Monitoring & Control Tools

We identified 33 components that are classified into the Monitoring & Control Tools component class. We distinguish three groups of functions for this class, which are: (i) runtime monitoring, (ii) execution data post-processing, (iii) runtime control.

The first functionality, runtime monitoring, addressed by 17 components, aims at precisely tracking and accurately recording statuses of process instances. This information is of great importance in providing insights into current statuses of running process instances.
The second functionality, execution data post-processing, identified by 9 components, provides qualitative and quantitative information about the execution of business processes. For example, it can produce valuable insights regarding the duration, costs, and quality of previously executed process instances by using some KPIs. In more sophisticated systems, various so-called process mining techniques have been employed which aim at extracting knowledge from the execution data.

The final functionality, runtime control, provided by 7 components, aims to control the executions of currently running process instance by employing various business process intelligence techniques. Unlike the previous functionality, the runtime control functionality is classified as a-priority analysis techniques. As an example, in the architecture presented in [Kashlev and Lu 2014], a component, called Runtime Behavior Analytics, has been proposed that employs runtime execution data to predict and control the upcoming activities for the currently running business processes.

4. BPMS ARCHITECTURE QUALITY ATTRIBUTES

To design a quality reference architecture, quality attributes should be considered. We consider the classification of quality attributes that is proposed by Bass et al. [Bass et al. 2013], because it can be considered seminal work, judging by the number of citations that it has received. The quality attributes are shown in Table II. It should be noted that in the classification by Bass et al. [Bass et al. 2013], other quality attributes are considered sub-classes of the main attributes from Table II. For example, scalability is an important attribute, but is captured under ‘modifying system capacity’ (i.e., modifiability).

In previous work [Angelov et al. 2012], we presented a classification of different types of reference architectures and their properties. These properties determine the quality attributes that are important. In particular, we can characterize BPMS-RA as a Type III reference architecture, which is defined as: “a classical reference architecture, designed by an independent organization to facilitate the design of concrete architectures of multiple other organizations” [Angelov et al. 2012].

Below, we discuss each of the quality attributes in more detail. We discuss their importance against the background of BPMS-RA as a Type III reference architecture and we explain how they influenced the design approach that we used to arrive at BPMS-RA in Section 5 and 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table II. Quality Attributes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design-Time Quality Attributes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simplicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Runtime Quality Attributes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Automation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.1. Design-time Quality Attributes

*Simplicity* is the degree to which a system has a straightforward and easy to understand design, implementation and deployment [IEEE 2010]. *Modifiability* is the degree to which a change can be made to a system and the degree to which the system can adapt to changes [IEEE 2010]. *Integrability* is the degree to which separately developed modules and components can correctly integrate. To achieve seamless integration among the interfaces of multiple components, their interface protocols should be compatible. *Portability* is the degree to which a system can be
transferred from one platform to another [IEEE 2010]. This requires an architecture to be technology-agnostic. **Completeness** is the degree to which a reference architecture covers the required functions for concrete architectures and **feasibility** is the degree to which a reference architecture is implementable in a timely manner.

Each of these quality attributes should be taken into account in the design of BPMS-RA. Considering that BPMS-RA is a Type III reference architecture, modifiability, integrability, portability, completeness, and feasibility are especially important. The importance of integrability, portability, and completeness follows from the property of a Type III reference architecture as an architecture for multiple organizations. As multiple organizations may be implementing different components of the architecture, it is important that these components can integrate and that they are portable. We also consider completeness important, in order to facilitate any organization that operates in the BPMS area. The importance of feasibility follows from the Type III reference architecture property that the architecture was developed by an independent organization. It mitigates the risk that an independent organization develops an infeasible reference architecture.

The design-time quality attributes determined the design approach that we use to develop BPMS-RA in Section 5 and 6 as follows. Simplicity and modifiability are considered by designing BPMS-RA in a modular manner on two levels of abstraction. Simplicity can be induced by applying the principle of modularity on the basis of functional separation of concerns [Fielding 2000], thus making individual components considerably less complex and, subsequently, easier to understand and implement. Similarly, the modularity principle supports modifiability of individual loosely coupled functional components. Integrability is considered by identifying interfaces at which the various components interact. While we leave the detailed definition of these interfaces abstract at this point, they can be specified in detail in future work. Portability is considered by leaving choices with respect to technology abstract. Completeness and feasibility are considered by basing BPMS-RA on existing concrete architectures, thus ensuring that it is complete with respect to these architectures and that it is feasible to implement BPMS-RA. In this manner the design-time quality attributes lead to the design principles of modularity, abstraction, and concrete architecture mapping that are the basis for the design of BPMS-RA in Section 5 and 6.

### 4.2. Runtime Quality Attributes

**High automation** is the degree to which functions can be automated; in the case of BPMSs this applies to the automation of business processes [van der Aalst 2013], which facilitate the automated selection of the right tasks to perform. **System security** is the degree to which a system resists against illegal usage while still providing its services to rightful users [Bass et al. 2013]. **Interoperability** is the degree to which multiple information systems can exchange and use information [IEEE 2010]. **Usability** is the degree to which the end users of a system acquire enough knowledge and skills to comfortably perform, to insert inputs to, and interpret outputs from the system [IEEE 2010]. **Performance** is the degree to which a system accomplishes its designated functions within given constraints, such as response time, computation power and memory usage [IEEE 2010]. **Availability** is the degree to which a system is operational and accessible when required [IEEE 2010].

Runtime quality attributes are the primary concern of concrete architectures, because they can only be implemented and tested in concrete systems. Therefore, the consideration of the runtime attributes is not part of our design approach. However, we do provide ‘hooks’ in the architecture, where the various runtime quality attributes can be considered by concrete architectures, as we will discuss in Section 7.2.
5. BPMS-RA AT THE L1 LEVEL

We develop the BPMS-RA by modularizing the BPMS functions that were identified in Section 3. Modularization is done according to a protocol in order to avoid subjectiveness as much as possible. First, two of the authors conducted the modularization. While doing so, they respected the mapping onto the existing classification, described in Section 3, and left implementation choices abstract, thus observing the quality attributes as described in Section 4. Subsequently, the modularization was checked by a third author. Differences were discussed and the reference architecture was modified according to the discussion. A more detailed discussion on how the quality attributes influenced the modularization is given in Section 7.2.

The resulting first-level (L1) modularization of the functionality is illustrated in Fig. 6. The BPMS-RA at this level consists of three components. As L1 is defined as the ‘tool suite’ level, the modules at this level are derived from existing tool suites. In existing architectures, three types of tool suites can be recognized:

1. Workflow Management System (WfMS) suites (e.g., Imixs Workflow),
2. Service Oriented Architecture (SOA) suites (e.g., Oracle SOA suite), and
3. Business Process Intelligence & Analytics (BPI&BPA) suites (e.g., SAS suite).

Since the core components of the WfMS suites and SOA suites contain common BPMS functionality, we merge these two suites. Accordingly, a component is suggested for the BPMS-RA at the L1 level which is called the SOA-Based Workflow Management System Suite (SOA-WfMS). The commonalities between the functionality of BPI&BPA suites and the other two suites are limited to monitoring functionality and security functionality. For that reason, we modularize security functionality into a third component, called Authentication, Authorization & Accountability (AAA). The commonality with respect to monitoring functionality will be discussed and solved in the level 2 decomposition.

Interfaces are required to allow each of the three components to interact with the others. The first interface, IF1.1, facilitates the data exchange between the SOA-WfMS and the BPI&BPA. The other two interfaces, IF1.2 and IF1.3, integrate the mentioned two components, respectively, with the (centralized) AAA component.

6. BPMS-RA AT THE L2 LEVEL

In this section, we present the BPMS-RA at the L2 level of modularization. This architecture consist of a set of components that are at the same level as the refined COTS component. To define these components, firstly, we evaluate whether we can find COTS components in the market that provide the same functions as those we derived
from the captured components in Fig. 4. Subsequently, we place these components into the components composed the BPMS-RA at the L1 level.

Note that, we only zoom in to the two main components of BPMS-RA at the L1 level, namely the SOA-WfMS component and BPI&BPA component, because the architectures that we studied did not provide a more detailed decomposition of their security components and functionality. Fig. 7 illustrates the BPMS-RA at the L2 level.

![Fig. 7. BPMS-RA at the L2 Level](image)

The SOA-WfMS component is composed of five inner components: Process Definition Tools, Business Process Execution Engine, Service Manager, BP Client Manager Tools and BP Resource Manager Tools. The Process Definition Tools component provides a business process modeling environment, a model repository, a model validation and verification, and a simulation and optimization functions. The Business Process Execution Engine component provides a process deployment and parser, a runtime activity manager environment, a logging and an exception handling functions. The Service Manager component provides a service manager and invocation and a service repository. The BP Client Manager Tools component supports a process execution-related and a management-related client applications. Finally, the BP Resource Manager Tools provides a process resource management functionality.

The BPI&BPA component comprises four inner components: Data Ingestion Tools, Information Repository, Data Management Tools and Data Analysis Tools. The Data Ingestion Tools component facilitates the extraction of data from various heterogeneous data sources, transforms them into comprehensible formats and loads them into another component of the BPI&BPA, namely the Information Repository component in the architecture. The Data Management Tools component, enables the handling of imported information, (e.g. by enriching and correlating the information). Lastly, the Data Analysis component provides both post- and runtime information processing functions, that can be used to improve and control BPMS-RA-compliant systems by provisioning the decision making capability.

In the rest of this section, we further explain the BPMS-RA at the L2 level.
6.1. Inner Components of the SOA-WfMS

6.1.1. Derived Component from Process Definition Class. There are some COTS components in the market that provide the required functions for the Process Definition Tools class. For example, Signavio Process Editor is a standalone Web-based modeling environment for designing BPMN process models. Consequently, we suggest a component, called Process Definition Tools, for the BPMS-RA at the L2 level. This component, as shown in Fig. 8, must ideally support the first four identified functions. Moreover, the PR_REPO_OUT interface and PR_REPO_IN interfaces are defined for uploading and downloading business process models from the repository and the EVT_DEF_IN interface can be used mainly by process designers to model the business processes according to the external events that may be received.

A BPMS-RA-compliant system must provide the business process modeling functionality. To this end, it allows end users to design business processes which include multiple types of activities and relationships among them.

A full-fledged Process Definition Tools component must contain its own business process repository. A well-known example of such a repository is the SAP reference model which includes over 600 process models. Regarding academic initiatives, an advanced business process model repository, called APROMORE, has been proposed [La Rosa et al. 2011].

A BPMS-RA-compliant system must support the validation and verification functionality. For example, ADONIS provides a feature for validating the syntactical correctness of business processes. Additionally, many academic initiatives, such as WoPed [Freytag 2005], offer syntactical and semantical validation of process models.

A complete Process Definition Tools component must include the business process simulation and optimization functionality. Considering the industrial solutions, many process modelers such as Bizagi Process Modeler and Tibco have a feature that supports the process simulation. Considering the academic initiatives, a notable example is CPN Tools [Jensen et al. 2007] for simulating and analyzing Petri Nets.

Although the ontology-based modeling functionality has been deduced from the academic studies, it has a very limited support among industrial solutions. This functionality aims at providing some learned knowledge for the process designer and, therefore, it is shifted to the BPI&BPA component.

6.1.2. Derived Component from Workflow Enactment Services Class. All the WfMS and SOA suites include COTS components that provide the main functions for the Workflow Enactment Services component class. For example, Camunda and Activiti contain the Camunda Process Engine and the Activiti Process Engine that are responsible for executing business process models. Consequently, we suggest a component, called Business Process Execution Engine, as shown in Fig. 9, for the BPMS-RA at the L2 level. Moreover, the Business Process Execution Engine interacts with the Process Definition Component via the PR_DPL_OUT and PR_DPL_IN interfaces. A business process model can be deployed to the execution engine both automatically using the PR_REPO_IN interface or manually using the PR_REPO_OUT interface. Also, the BP Execution Engine interacts with the BPI&BPA component by receiving runtime events from (via the RT_EVT_IN interface) and providing execution data to this component (via the
A BPMS-RA compliant system provide business process deployment and parser functionality which produces process instances from the deployed process model. A process instance can be at different states (i.e., initialized, running, terminated, completed and suspended) and, therefore, the Business Process Execution Engine must support the transition among these states.

Having instantiated a process instance, the process engine must support the runtime activity manager functionality, which can be seen as the core feature of a BPMS-RA compliant system. In particular, this functionality enables a BPMS-RA compliant to categorize the activities in a process instance have with different states (i.e., scheduled, (re-)assigned, accepted, rejected, skipped, enabled, running and completed) and also it enables the transitions among these states.

A full-fledged BPMS-RA compliant system must be able to support logging execution data functionality by providing an interface in which execution logs can be exchanged. Therefore, the BPI&BPA component can exploit the execution data for provisioning more accurate information.

A BPMS-RA compliant system must support exception handling functionality by identifying potential exceptions (using execution monitoring) and, subsequently, by exception recovery (using some techniques that are bundled in the BPI&BPA component). This functionality has been considered as an explicit functionality in BPM systems. However, according to the usability runtime quality attribute, it seems to be logical to highlight the exception handling functionality in designing the BPMS-RA architecture.

The other two functionality of the Workflow Enactment Services component class will be positioned at other components in BPMS-RA. Considering the architecture of the BPMS-RA at the L1, we shift the runtime optimization and decision making to the BPI&BPA component. The reason for this shift is coupling together all the functions that use business intelligence and analytics techniques, so that they can be carried out by the BPI&BPA component. Having shifted this functionality, we promote the principle of separation of concerns and, thus, we further boost the modularity principle in our design. Consequently, the IF1.1 interface between the SOA-WfMS component and the BPI&BPA component, as shown in Fig. 8, must provide the business process execution engine component with runtime information provisioned by the runtime optimization and decision making functionality. Also, we merge the service manager and invocation functionality in this component class with the same functionality in the External Services component class. The main reason for this design decision is the principle of separation of concerns as the main concern for the process engines is to interpret the business process models and provide a runtime environment to operationalize them while the major concern of the captured components in the external services is to employ external services to feed required input data into the process engines.
6.1.3. Derived Components from External Services Class. Many WfMS and almost all SOA suites in the market include COTS components that provide the required functions for the External Services component class (e.g., Oracle SOA Suite). Accordingly, we suggest a component, called Service Manager, for the BPMS-RA at the L2 level. This component, as shown in Figure 10, provides a service invocation environment for the consumer of this functionality (via the SERV_DATA_INVC interface). Moreover, the Service Manager component ideally contains a repository and/or a registry for services which can be reachable via SRV_REPO_OUT and SRV_REPO_IN interfaces. Finally, in collaboration with the AAA component the Service Manager component can certify the validity of services through the AAA_API_IN interface.

As discussed before, a BPMS-RA compliant systems must support the service manager and invocation functionality through the Service Manager component. For example, in [Hu and Grefen 2003] the authors has proposed an architecture for the service mediating workflow management systems. Also, a notable example of a COTS component is the Oracle SOA Suite which includes the Oracle Service Bus.

An ideal BPMS-RA compliant service must include the service repository and registry functionality. An example of available COTS component that provides such a functionality is the Anypoint Service Registry that has been offered by MuleSoft. Another well-known example of this functionality is the WebSphere Service Registry and Repository from IBM.

Although the service security has been deduced form the selected architecture, considering the separation of concern, we shift it toward the AAA component in the BPMS-RA at the L1 level.

6.1.4. Derived Component from Workflow Client Applications Class. Almost all WfMS suites in the market include COTS components that support the functions for the Client Applications component class. For example, the Activiti BPM Platform has a dedicated component, called Activiti Explorer, providing end users with a Web-based interface. Also, Microsoft Outlook has been employed as a client application for many BPMSs, such as the Together Workflow Server. Accordingly, we suggest a component, called Business Process Client Manager Tools, for the BPMS-RA at L2 level. This component, as shown in Figure 11, must support the process execution-related client applications and the process management-related client applications functions.

For this purpose, the PRCS_EXEC and DATA_DASHBOARD interfaces are designed to consume data from and visualize required features for the process execution-related functionality (e.g., activity list) and the management-related functionality (e.g., performance dashboard), respectively. However, an ideal client manager tool includes a set of pluggable applications such as business processes modeler which can be realized via the PRCS_DSG_VIS interface. Another example for such interfaces is an application for managing users’ profiles that can be implemented through the USER_PROF interface.
Therefore, end users can ideally customize their own client application based on their preferred tools according to their authorization level. Nevertheless, end users need to be granted an access from the AAA component and, thus, the IF1.2 interface between the SOA-WfMS and the AAA component needs to be implemented in a way that the BP Client Manager Tools’ end users are authenticated and authorized via the AAA component. This functionality can be realized through the AAA_API_IN interface.

6.1.5. Derived Component from Administration Tools Class. A great number of WfMS and a lesser number of SOA suites include COTS components that support the required functions for the Administration Tools component class (e.g., Oracle Role Manager and Metastorm BPM User Management). Accordingly, we suggest a component, called Business Process Resource Manager Tools, for the BPMS-RA at the L2 level. We have used the term, resources, as it has been predominantly used by the BPM community. This component, as shown in Fig. 12, manages all the potential resources that can be employed to perform business processes by providing an interface (i.e., ORG_RSC_OUT) to the other components of a BPMS-RA compliant system.

Note that, due to the separation of concern design principle, the user access control management functionality is handled by the AAA component and, thus, the AAA_API_IN interface is foreseen to enable this interaction.

6.1.6. SOA-WfMS Component at the L2 Level. Altogether, these suggested components result in the SOA-WfMS component at the L2 level as illustrated in Fig. 13.

We employ black arrows if a component provides/uses an internal interface and colorful arrows if a component provides/uses an external interface through the designed ports which are distinguished according to their concerns.

The concern of the purple port is business process models. This port contains a set of CRUD functions for an external process definition tool and also a deployment functionality to directly deploy a business process model into the Execution Engine. The concern of the dark gray port is services. This port enables external service managers to interact with the internal service repository of the target BPMS. The
concern of the green port is execution-related activities. This port provides a set of functions to enable users to interact with running process instances. The concern of the orange port is events. This port establishes an interaction between the SOA-WfMS component and the BPI&BPA component. Finally, the concern of the navy port is security. This port consumes a set of authentication, authorization and accounting services that are provided by the AAA component.

6.2. Inner Components of the BPI&BPA

Considering the BPI&BPA, we suggest inner components stem from the Monitoring & Control component class, to provide the three main functions: (i) runtime monitoring, (ii) execution data post-processing, and (iii) runtime control.

The runtime monitoring functionality observes the execution of business process instances by producing a set of events (i.e., execution data). There are some COTS components, such as Oracle Business Activity Monitoring (BAM), or IBM Business Monitor in the market for monitoring these events.

The recorded execution data can be further exploited to provide organizations with better understandings as to how their process instances are actually executed. These kind of techniques align well with the execution data post-processing functionality for which we found a great number of COTS components such as ProM and Disco.

The runtime control functionality controls the behavior of currently running process instances by enabling decision making. Having exploit the past and current execution data, this functionality forecasts and further predicts the future events that may influence the running instances. This functionality has been supported by many COTS components (e.g., SAS Business Intelligence & Analytics and IBM Cognos Analytics).

Accordingly, we design the inner architecture of the BPI&BPA component based on the introduced COTS components. The first common action among these COTS components is the ETL [Vassiliadis 2009] procedure, which extracts data from various heterogeneous data sources, transforms them into comprehensible formats and, finally, loads them into an information repository. The BPI&BPA component must enable the import of all types of data (i.e., batches or streams). Since the ETL techniques are mainly designed to support the batch mode, a new method has been suggested, called Data Ingestion [Grover and Carey 2015], covering both types offered by many COTS components such as Apache Chukwa and Gobblin. Consequently, the BPI&BPA component contains two components components: (1) a Data Ingestion Tools component which imports and formats both batches and streams of data, and (2) an Information Repository component which provides a storage for the formatted data.

Additionally, the BPI&BPA must be able to manage imported data in such a way that when new data come into the information repository they must provide some added value to the already existing information. Many data management challenges are proposed in the literature. For example, the data enrichment challenge in [Chaudhuri 2012] and the data retention challenge in [Tene and Polonetsky 2012] have been suggested. There are some COTS components fulfilling these challenges, such as SAS Data Management Software which provides the data enrichment functionality. Therefore, the BPI&BPA component must include a Data Management Tools component, which resolves data management challenges.

Finally, the imported data must be analyzed. The input for post-processing analysis techniques are often batches of execution data and for runtime control techniques can be both batches and streams of data. Therefore, the BPI&BPA component includes a Data Analysis Tools component supporting both set of batch data analysis and stream data analysis techniques. Considering the batch data analysis, one of the well-known methods is OLAP, for which many systems are available as COTS component (e.g., SAS OLAP Server and Oracle OLAP). Another example for supporting batch processing is...
Apache Hadoop, which provides a distributed computing framework to process large amounts of data in parallel. Considering the stream data analysis, a well-known methods is Complex Event Processing (CEP), provided by existing COTS components, such as jBoss Drools Fusion, Oracle Complex Event Processing, and Esper.

Altogether, these suggested components constitute the BPI&BPA component at the L2 level as illustrated in Fig. 14 illustrates the detailed view of this component.

This architecture contains three providing internal interfaces and three ports. The D_REC interface, provided by the Data Ingestion Tools, receives data from various data sources. The D_IMP port is connected to this interface which can be linked to the EVT_OUT interface to establish an interaction between the SOA-WfMS and the BPI&BPA component for transferring the execution data. The D_REPO interface, provided by the Information Repository, offers a set of required CRUD functions used by the other components. The D_QUERY port, connected to the D_REPO interface, can be linked to the EVT_IN interface to also establish an interaction between the SOA-WfMS and the BPI&BPA component for asynchronously transferring post-processed improvements. The DCS_REP interface, provided by the Data Analysis Tools, is also connected to the D_QUERY. However, the DCS_REP interface synchronously invokes consumers using different mechanisms such as triggers. Finally, the AAA_SRV port is responsible for consuming a set of authentication, authorization and accounting services that are provided by the AAA component.

7. EVALUATION AND DISCUSSION

This section provides a discussion on the architecture that is described in the previous two sections along two lines. First, it compares the reference architecture to three concrete BPM system architectures that are applied in practice. Second, it discusses how the quality attributes that were discussed in section 4 have impacted the reference architecture.

7.1. Relation to Concrete Architectures

To evaluate the practical relevance of BPMS-RA, we compared its components to the components of three concrete BPMS architectures that are used in practice. Table III shows the results of this effort.

All of the BPMSs provide design, execution and monitoring capabilities for BPMN 2.0 business processes. As shown in the table, the Process Definition Tools component of BPMS-RA is realized in Activiti by two components: Activiti Modeler, which is a web-based business process development environment; and Activiti Designer, which
Table III. Mapping Concrete Architectures to BPMS-RA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BPMS-RA (L1)</th>
<th>BPMS-RA (L2)</th>
<th>Alfresco Activiti</th>
<th>Bizagi</th>
<th>GET Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BP Execution Engine</td>
<td>Activiti Engine</td>
<td>Bizagi Engine</td>
<td>Bizagi Work Portal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP Client Manager Tools</td>
<td>Activiti Explorer</td>
<td>Bizagi Work Portal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP Resource Manager Tools</td>
<td>Activiti Admin</td>
<td>Workload Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Manager</td>
<td>Activiti REST</td>
<td>Application Integration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOA-WfMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Analysis Tools Data Management Tools</td>
<td>Activity Analytics App</td>
<td>Reports and Process Analytics</td>
<td>Event Correlator/ Aggregator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Ingestion Tools Information Repository</td>
<td>Data Model Component</td>
<td>EntityManager</td>
<td>Event Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alfresco ETL Connector</td>
<td>Out-of-the-box connectors</td>
<td>Event Channel/ Subscription Store</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activiti Datasource (ADS)</td>
<td>Operational Data Store (ODS)</td>
<td>Information Store</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPI&amp;BPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAA</td>
<td>AAA</td>
<td>Identity Management</td>
<td>Work Portal Security</td>
<td>Community Passport Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

provides an Eclipse-based plugin with the same purpose. Bizagi and GET Service support this component with the Bizagi Process Modeler and the Process Development Environment, respectively. The mapping of concrete components to the BP Execution Engine, the BP Client Manager, and the BP Resource Manager is straightforward. Regarding the Service Manager, the three systems provide RESTful service integration capabilities, that allow both internal and external services to be stored, managed and exploited.

While all the components of the SOA-WfMS part of BPMS-RA are fully supported by the three systems, there is far less support for the BPI&BPA components. The Data Analysis component is supported by the event correlator and event aggregator components of GET Service. However, this component received less attention in Activiti and Bizagi. Both system have an application for producing reports and for analyzing past executions of the business processes. However, they do not support the prediction of future executions based on the past events. The Data Ingestion Tools component is supported by GET Service and Activiti, and in the new release of Bizagi there are some out-of-the-box components to ingest data from specific systems such as SAP. The functions that are provided by the Data Management Tools component and the Information Repository component are linked with the functions that are provided by the relevant components as shown in Table III. Consequently, it is possible to claim that these two components are supported by all three systems.

The functions of the AAA component are also covered by all three systems. Activiti by default supports basic authentication, while Bizagi provides different options for authentication, including default Windows authentication, Active Directory authentication, as well as federated authentication. GET Service provides an OAuth 2.0 authentication procedure.

7.2. Impact of Quality Attributes
The quality attributes have impacted the reference architecture as follows.
— Simplicity has been considered by creating a two-level decomposition of the architecture into a relatively small number of components that have clearly identifiable functionality.
— Modifiability has been considered by creating loosely coupled component that can be modified relatively independently of each other.
— Integrability has been considered by identifying the interfaces at which the components must interact. It can be further considered in future work by standardizing the interaction at these interfaces.
— Portability has been considered by abstracting from implementation choices. It can be further considered in future work by considering the way in which the various components must be deployed.
— Completeness has been considered by using a systematic literature review that aims to identify all existing BPMSs [Pourmirza et al. 2017].
— Feasibility has been achieved by considering BPMSs that have been implemented, showing that the reference architecture can indeed be implemented as discussed in detail in Section 7.1.
— High-automation has been considered in the communication between the BP Execution Engine (from SOA-WfMS) and Data Analysis Tools (from BPI&BPA). The latter component exploits the historical execution logs from the former component (through the \texttt{EVT\_OUT} interface) and feeds the former component with the predicted future execution paths automatically (through the \texttt{EVT\_IN} interface).
— Security has been considered by introducing a dedicated component that must ensure security.
— Interoperability is achieved by introducing dedicated components that are responsible for interoperability, in particular the Service Manager component through its \texttt{SR\_INVC} interface and the Data Ingestion Tools through the \texttt{D\_IMP} interface.
— Usability quality must be considered in future work in the BP Client Manager Tools and Process Definition Tools as these two components are used by the end-user of a BPMS-RA compliant system. It must also be considered in the BP Execution Engine and in particular through the Exception Handling functionality, since the BPMS-RA must support exception detection and recovery.

In the design of BPMS-RA we considered a trade-off between the following quality attributes.

— Simplicity versus modifiability: although the former facilitates BPMS-RA-compliant systems to be realized and deployed easily, the latter prevents the systems getting stuck forever with the original deployment. Therefore, we paid more attention to the modifiability than to simplicity.
— Simplicity versus completeness: a more complete system may result into a more complex one. We tried to mitigate this issue by modularizing the functionality, that we consider complete in light of the literature study that we conducted.
— Simplicity versus high automation and interoperability: a more automated and inter-operable system may result into a more complex one. We tried to mitigate this issue by proposing the definition of standard interfaces.
— Feasibility versus modifiability, integrability and portability: although developing a more modifiable, integrable and portable system requires more implementation efforts during the first development cycle, we believe that these quality attributes will eventually result into less implementation effort during the life-cycle of a BPMS-RA compliant system. Therefore, we paid more attention to these quality attribute than to feasibility.
— Security versus integrability and interoperability: the security of a system may degrade as a system will be integrated with new components. Considering this trade-off, we did not consider security beyond the introduction of a AAA component that primarily implements authorization and authentication.

— Modularity versus performance: a less modular decomposition may result in a better performing system since all the required resources are accessible with less latency. However, BPMS-RA has been designed primarily based on the principle of modular decomposition.

8. CONCLUSION

This paper presents a reference architecture for Business Process Management Systems, called BPMS-RA. BPMS-RA provides a guideline for the development of concrete BPM systems. In addition, it offers a common understanding of the provided functionalities and interfaces of such systems. Finally, it can be employed as a standard for evaluating the completeness of existing BPMS architectures and systems.

BPMS-RA was developed both based on concrete BPMSs from the research community (using a research-driven approach) and based on concrete BPM systems from industry (using a practice-driven approach).

Fig. 15 presents a condensed view of BPMS-RA. Shared borders between components in this figure represent interfaces between these components. At the highest level of abstraction, BPMS-RA consists of three main components. The SOA-WfMS component, which offers functions such as business process modeling and execution. The BPI&BPA component, which is responsible for monitoring and controlling BPMS-RA compliant systems. Finally, the AAA component, which secures BPMSs by providing functions for authentication, authorization and accounting. At lower levels of abstraction, BPMS-RA is refined into components and lists the functionality that is provided by these components.

By providing a reference architecture that is based on recent concrete architectures, the contribution of BPMS-RA is an update - after twenty years - of existing reference architectures (i.e. [Hollingsworth 1995; Grefen and Remmerts de Vries 1998]) with the latest developments from both research and practice. Thus, BPMS-RA takes functionality into account that is provided by traditional workflow systems as well as functionality that is provided by modern-day business process intelligence systems. When comparing the existing reference architectures to BPMS-RA, the most striking improvements of BPMS-RA are the integration of components for real-time business process analysis and the shift to a service-oriented paradigm, which is related to the end of a distinction between ‘client applications’ and ‘other workflow enactment services’.

BPMS-RA is meant to facilitate the design of concrete architectures by researchers and practitioners. As a ‘facilitation’ reference architecture, it provides guidelines and inspiration for the design of concrete architectures [Angelov et al. 2012]. In particular,
it gives a complete overview of the functionality that is provided by modern-day BPMSs. This overview can serve as an inspiration for the functions that a researcher or practitioner may want to implement. The reference architecture also suggests a system structure that organizes these functions, including the interfaces that facilitate the interaction between the functions. This structure can serve as a guideline for concrete BPMSs. It must be noted that the interfaces themselves are not standardized in this paper. In that respect BPMS-RA is a ‘facilitation’ rather than a ‘standardization’ architecture [Angelov et al. 2012], which is something that it has in common with the existing reference architectures [Hollingsworth 1995; Grefen and Remmers de Vries 1998] on which it is inspired. However, the mere identification of interfaces is a guideline in itself and shows where standardization efforts are necessary. Indeed, the Workflow Reference Model also had that goal [Hollingsworth 1995] and has (indirectly) inspired standards such as the BPMN Interchange Format [Object Management Group 2011], which partly standardizes the exchange of process models between a process definition tool and an execution engine. Along the same lines, BPMS-RA is related to the XES standard [IEEE 2016], which partly standardizes the data exchange between an execution engine and data analysis tools.
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The electronic appendix for this article can be accessed in the ACM Digital Library. This appendix presents the results that were obtained from using the BPMS classification framework for categorizing the 33 industry-strength systems. Table IV illustrates the results, in which:

- the 'product Name' column shows the name of each the systems,
- the 'Website' column provides references to the web locations of the systems,
- the 'WES' column refers to the Workflow Enactment Services component class,
- the 'PDT' column refers to the Process Definition Tools component class,
- the 'MCT' column refers to the Monitoring & Control Tools component class,
- the 'ES' column refers to the External Services component class,
- the 'WCA' column refers to the Workflow Client Applications component class, and
- the 'AT' column refers to the Administration Tools component class.

Table IV: Selected Industrial-Strength Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product Name</th>
<th>Website</th>
<th>WES</th>
<th>PDT</th>
<th>MCT</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>WCAT</th>
<th>AT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active VOS</td>
<td><a href="http://activevos.com">http://activevos.com</a></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activiti</td>
<td><a href="http://activiti.org">http://activiti.org</a></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADONIS</td>
<td><a href="http://uk.boc-group.com/">http://uk.boc-group.com/</a></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adempiere</td>
<td><a href="http://adempiere.com/">http://adempiere.com/</a></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apache ODE</td>
<td><a href="http://ode.apache.org">http://ode.apache.org</a></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AristaFlow</td>
<td><a href="http://aristalfow.com/">http://aristalfow.com/</a></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARXivar</td>
<td><a href="http://arxivir.eu/">http://arxivir.eu/</a></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bizagi Suite</td>
<td><a href="http://bizagi.com/">http://bizagi.com/</a></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BizArtifact</td>
<td><a href="https://sourceforge.net/p/bizartifact">https://sourceforge.net/p/bizartifact</a></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BizTalk Server</td>
<td><a href="https://microsoft.com/biztalk">https://microsoft.com/biztalk</a></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BonitaBPM</td>
<td><a href="http://bonitasoft.com">http://bonitasoft.com</a></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPEL Maestro</td>
<td><a href="https://parasoft.com/">https://parasoft.com/</a></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camunda BPM</td>
<td><a href="http://camunda.org">http://camunda.org</a></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signavio</td>
<td><a href="http://signavio.com">http://signavio.com</a></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Express BPEL</td>
<td><a href="http://codebrewtech.com">http://codebrewtech.com</a></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>glu Automation Platform</td>
<td><a href="https://github.com/pongasoft/glu">https://github.com/pongasoft/glu</a></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iFlow Engine</td>
<td><a href="http://iflowbpm.com">http://iflowbpm.com</a></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued on next page
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product Name</th>
<th>Website</th>
<th>WES</th>
<th>PDT</th>
<th>MCT</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>WCAT</th>
<th>AT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intalio</td>
<td><a href="http://intalio.com">http://intalio.com</a></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jBPM</td>
<td><a href="http://jboss.org/jbpm">http://jboss.org/jbpm</a></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joget Workflow</td>
<td><a href="http://joget.org">http://joget.org</a></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAP</td>
<td><a href="http://sap.com">http://sap.com</a></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open ESB</td>
<td><a href="http://open-esb.net">http://open-esb.net</a></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OW2 Orchestra</td>
<td><a href="http://orchestra.ow2.org">http://orchestra.ow2.org</a></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ProcessMaker</td>
<td><a href="http://processmaker.com">http://processmaker.com</a></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RunaWFE</td>
<td><a href="http://runawfe.org/">http://runawfe.org/</a></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oracle Suite</td>
<td><a href="http://oracle.com">http://oracle.com</a></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scalr Engine</td>
<td><a href="http://scalr.com/">http://scalr.com/</a></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIM Solution</td>
<td><a href="http://tim-solutions.de">http://tim-solutions.de</a></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toghether</td>
<td><a href="http://together.at/">http://together.at/</a></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uEngin BPM</td>
<td><a href="http://uengine.org/">http://uengine.org/</a></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WorkflowGen</td>
<td><a href="http://workflowgen.com">http://workflowgen.com</a></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASTRO</td>
<td><a href="http://astroproject.org">http://astroproject.org</a></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YAWL</td>
<td><a href="http://yawlfoundation.org">http://yawlfoundation.org</a></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZKActiviti</td>
<td><a href="http://zkabpm.sourceforge.net">http://zkabpm.sourceforge.net</a></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 31 31 20 12 22 24