

**B U S I N E S S P R O C E S S
M A N A G E M E N T I N I T I A T I V E**

Minutes

Member Meeting #12

**13-14, May 2004
London, UK**

MEETINGS KINDLY HOSTED BY:

Enix Consulting
at the Wreay Group Executive Offices
Sheraton House, London

PRESENT: MAY 13, 2004

BPMI.org
CSC European Group
Enix Consulting, Ltd
Fair Isaac
IBM Corporation
ILOG
Intalio, Inc.
Lombardi Software
MEGA International
MITRE Corporation
Pikos GmbH
Popkin Software
Sterling Commerce

Layna Fischer
Howard Smith
Derek Miers
Paul Vincent
Stephen White
Mari Georges
Ismael Ghalimi
Damion Heredia
Antoine Lonjon
James Manley
Kurt Wiener
Jog Raj
Jeanne Baker

AGENDA

BPMI.org Phase 2: Defining the Initiative's Future Role and Direction -

- Revisiting the Initiative's Mission Statement, Charter, and Organization
- Formal Adoption of BPEL4WS
- Introducing an integrated BPM Standard Stack
- Development Plans for BPML 2.0, BPSM, and BPQL

Governance & Industry Liaisons -

- Internal Processes, Procedures, and Policies
- Partnerships with OASIS, OMG, W3C, WfMC

Marketing & Membership -

- New Website
- Sponsor Membership Category Definition
- eBizQ.net & BPMInstitute.org webinars
- Training Program
- Certification Program
- Benchmarking Program

Special Presentation: 11:00 – 11:30 am Friday 14.

James Manley, Principal Enterprise Architect

MITRE Corp, San Diego, CA
(MITRE is a Federally Funded Research and Development Center)

AMCET: Advanced Military Process Management Capabilities and Exploitation Team.

This presentation will discuss how BPM techniques are being developed and applied to Defense related needs. Specific and notional task examples will be discussed as well as perceived BPM related opportunities and requirements. Topics will be presented from a BPM consumer point of view.

Minutes: Member Meeting 12

Meeting commenced at 0930.

Introduction

All present introduced themselves, and Howard welcomed all with brief recap of progress to date. It was clear from BPM conference just finished this week showed intense interest in this space.

Howard explained that he and Ismael Ghalmi had got together a few weeks ago and set out a comprehensive list of BPM Phase 2 issues in a slide set as a submission to the group: Main objective is definition of Phase 2

Roundtable discussion followed from what each person feels is important to the org

Layna Fischer/BPMI.org: Relevance within the industry, & therefore value proposition to the members.

Jog Rag/Popkin: Relationship with BPEL

Jeanne Baker/Sterling: agree with relevance and that org goes forward with a mission, not inertia.

Jim Manley/MITRE: rep the user community – start with underlying data being moved from one engine to another. If vendor community wants to address these issues within the govt, 2. Very interested in respositories & config aspects of process models. Code-generated capability. Don't have robust process models. Could revolutionize how govt does business.

Kurt Weiner/Pikos: What is next step? Customers don't see a difference between BPMI/BPMG/BPEL. Need to understand

Paul Vincent/Fair Isaac: We are not a traditional BPM tools vendor. Have interest in declarative rules of BP, important distinction, The relation of rules. Also relationship to BPM & modeling – more at definition end, not modeling side. OMG is starting to take an interest thru MDA. Technical integration issues, & BPEL. Is there a case for support of BPEL?

Antione Lonjon/MEGA International: Need consistency between the groups, OMG BP definition.

Mari Georges/ILOG: Share concerns about rules/processes. Customers still need to be educated about what is a BP. Involve business analysis vendors. Sarbox and other legislation issues. Enterprise modeling can take advantage. What are relationships with WfMC, OMG etc.?

Steve White/IBM: Don't see BPQL listed – could also be called BAML. (Under 2004 initiatives). Our relationship with other orgs. Don't want to fragment the market, don't overlap. Relevance.

Derek Miers/Enix. Image of BPMI – difficult to understand, what is relevance? Need to evangelize, the have succinct conversations with marketplace. Clear communications needed. Investment in comm. Materials. Governance is important to supporting this.

Roy Thompson/Casewise: We don't want proliferation of stds, We want sound, stable modeling tool. Concerns about the future – change from proprietary stds to open stds. Relationship with others.

Damion Heredia/Lombardi: Stds commoditize our offerings, enable us to compete more effectively.

Howard concluded the roundtable with the comment – no way that BPMI can try to own too much of all these concerns – we need to focus. Original mission to further the BP

Howard presented his draft slides and walked through the slides in succession generating lively discussion with the group.

Consensus was reached slowly ... as each slide was discussed and edited accordingly.

Lunch break at 11:55am: Pizza in the Park


Resumed at 13:00

Discussion resumed on slide 19 with amendments to board members & roles

Slide 24 – stuck on BPEL adopted by BPMI.org. At this point Ismael Ghalimi joined the meeting with apologies for late arrival.

Ismael offered the observations that BPEL that is already widely adopted / defacto execution standard. Eg Microsoft may bring out BPxL ie Business Process Design Language BPDFL.

Ismael produced the following diagram during much discussion.



This was dubbed the "hourglass" metaphor by the group.

BPMN meeting commenced after a short coffee break.

Steve presented the following agenda:

Topics of Discussion (were not necessarily addressed in this order):


- Feedback on BPMN 1.0 Specification (especially if it is not finished)
- Marketing of BPMN
- Identification of new issues
- BPMN metamodel? Relationship to OMG BPD metamodel.
- BPMN Primer
- Case Study
- Identify Schedule for Post-BPMN 1.0 Final
- BPMN 1.1 and maintenance releases
- BPMN implementations
- XML Schema for BPMN (layered above BPEL) or XMI?
- BPMN long-term roadmap
- Moving BPMN to the OMG
- Unification with UML Activity Diagrams

- A separate effort to standardize BPMN Artifacts--including for different vertical markets
- Mapping BPMN to:
- OMG Business Process Definition Metamodel
- UML Sequence Diagram (for choreographies)
- RAD diagrams
- WS-Chor
- ebXML

Antoine Lonjon requested a definition of BPMN and the group agreed upon the following:


BPMN 1.0 was created with "path to execution" as its primary focus and as such is a lower level representation of process models than the full spectrum of BPMN as expressed by future versions of BPMN

Howard presented the following slide which generated considerable discussion. It was agreed that BPMN should look at future work that addresses the needs of the Business Consultant.




Derek later created a new slide, based on this concept.

Reaction To BPMN




Further discussion - see diagram following created by Ismael & agreed upon by all present.




Action item:

Small group work tomorrow to articulate this diagram, with dialog with & approval by the members within two business weeks. Deadline May 30, 2004

Ismael presented a request from Proforma that MOF be used per the following illustration. Discussed followed re the metamodel.



After considerable discussion, the group agreed that the path would follow activity per the following diagram.




Proposal: When should BPMI develop ("own") this metamodel of the Process?

	Now	Wait
Lombardi - now	1	
CSC - now	1	
Intalio - now	1	
Popkin - now	1	
Sterling - wait and see		1
Jim Manley - wait & see - gov't position not clear on OMG		1
Pikos - wait & see		1
Fair Isaac - wait & see, rather reuse what coming out of OMG		1
MEGA - abstain	0	
ILOG - wait & see.		1
IBM - wait & see		1
Enix - don't have a problem if Big Boys own the semantic model only if its right. Tend toward 'now'	1	
Casewise - now	1	
	6	5

Discussion followed re the control of the metamodel - useability, expansion, supporting multiple platforms. Philosophic issues.

BPSM - Business Process Semantic Model



Steve summarized the discussion:

The BPMI.org would wait until OMG releases their deliverables to the RFP in June. In the meantime work will be performed to establish the requirements, and compare them with OMG's requirements and work from the facts at the time.


Moving along... Steve reported on proposed future schedule for BPMN which included a separate effort to standardize BPMN Artifacts--including for different vertical markets

Mapping BPMN to:


- UML Sequence Diagram (for choreographies)
- RAD diagrams
- WS-Chor
- ebXML /BPSS
- Links /Associations to org charts for example

IG suggested that a proof of concept be created with One Link before more work proceeds.

Discussion followed on the difference between the OMG stack and the approach followed by BPMI. Paul Vincent gave an overview of OMG's UML approach. IG summarized as following diagram. OMG at top, BPMI at bottom.



Further discussion:



In conclusion it was agreed that

1. The BPMN WG would follow through on the projects stated, and
2. A book on BPMN would be published in collaboration with BPMI.org by Future Strategies Inc (publishers of the Workflow Handbook and Excellence in Practice series) edited & produced by Layna Fischer. The editorial board would comprise Jan Popkin, Derek Miers and Steve White.

Action Item:

1. Jan Popkin to produce his "content matrix" for the book's organization of content
2. Layna to commence with Call for Abstracts in collaboration with the editorial board.

Proposed by Derek Miers, seconded by Jeanne Baker, the meeting closed at 17.30.

Day 2: Minutes BPMI.org Member meeting

Meeting commenced at 0930.

Present:

BPMI.org	Layna Fischer
CSC European Group	Howard Smith
Enix Consulting, Ltd	Derek Miers
Fair Isaac	Paul Vincent
IBM Corporation	Stephen White
ILOG	Mari Georges
Intalio, Inc.	Ismael Ghalimi
Lombardi Software	Damion Heredia
MITRE Corporation	James Manley
Popkin Software	Martin Owen
Popkin Software	Jog Raj
Sterling Commerce	Jeanne Baker

Discussion started with Slide 25: Industry situation:

- Process Orientation (PO) a major trend in business and technology
- Process Modeling versus Process Execution
- Middle-Out versus competing top down and bottom up methods
- Process Management versus Software Engineering
- Need for coexistence of Design-Driven (BPM) and Model-Driven (MDA) architectures
- BPMS the only practical vehicle for customers to integrate and utilize numerous WS-nnnnn standards

Need for BPQL from many technical communities

- BPM, BAM, Workflow, EAI, J2EE
- BAM and "world of data" to come into BPMS picture through BPQL

The group agreed that it was necessary to create a paper that illustrated the difference between MDA & process-driven architecture

Customer needs – HS explained his slide...

Customers will not invest in the "digitization" of end-to-end (collaborative) business processes without standards

Digitized "intellectual property" must employ a language that is

- Complete

- Open
- Formal
- Royalty Free
- Executable

After discussion the group added

- Reference body for the Third Wave of BPM
- Process Asset Management
- Design lifecycle, execution lifecycle

Discussion on slide 26

- Requirements for BP Standards
- Discussion revolved around the term "dead designs" and it was removed from the slide

Discussion on slide 27

Why BPMI.org Phase 2?

- Customer demand for BPMS requires innovation ahead of traditional standards ratification process
- BPM a significant long-term trend in business and IT
- The market needs clarity on the roadmap to BPMS 2.0
- BPM relies on an integrated and complete technology stack
- Systems Integrators need standards to deliver process-centric enterprise architecture populated with best-of-breed components
- Messaging, Web Services, Process Engine, Rules, Workflow, Ontology, J2EE, Portal, Dashboards etc
- BPM vendors need standards to create "complete" Business Process Management Systems leveraging OEM components
- Packaged Solution developers need standards to leverage Business Process Management Systems (BPMS)

Discussion focused on the phrase "The market needs clarity on the roadmap to BPMS 2.0" and suggested that "The market needs clarity on BPMS"

Jan Popkin joined the meeting at this point. 10.30am

Discussion on slide 27

Discussion was provoked by current limitations as perceived by HS.

- No standard way of sharing process diagrams
- No standard way of invoking business rules
- No standard way of managing workflow tasks

- No standard way of connecting to user interfaces
- No standard way of deploying processes
- No standard way of monitoring processes
- No standard way of analyzing processes
- Lots of work remains to be done...

We need a way of people being able to share their best practices, providing an environment for people to share best practices. A primer is required.

Suggestion: start a thread about best practices


Discussion on slide 29

- BPMN direction
- Support for BPMN strong


Some criticism of current BPMN 1.0 proposal

- Non-intuitive
- Long learning curve
- Does not support process discovery
- Limited applicability to process execution
- BPMN exists within the objectives and mission of BPMI.org
- Further explanation to the market required
- Further development envisaged


Jan Popkin pointed out that following recent meetings with customers, it was considered that BPMN was too detailed. Discussion reverted to BPMN Scope model per IG's flipchart, and formalized by HS in the slide below.



This was updated by HS as follows:



Bringing Jan Popkin up to date, Derek showed his slide version of IG's hourglass model.



Slide 31 (the others were skipped over)

Phase 2 Definition

- A bold new agenda
- A shift from a broad "BPM" and 1st generation BP standards to a specific "BPMS" and 2nd generation BP standards
- Integrated BP Stack
- Definition of BPMS 2.0
- Definition of Process Oriented and Process Driven Development
- Concurrency in modeling
- Process Query Languages (PQL)

Slide 32

Strategy

- Own the definition of BPMS 2.0 (agreed)
- Adopt standards where they exist
- Populating the BPMS reference model
- Develop specifications where they do not
- Implementation in lock-step
- Grow the category
- Core process semantics
- Reference architecture
- Standards definition


Discussion centered on relevance, risk analysis, secure BPMN, (Metamodel is a technical thing, could be a WG) innovative, making sure we fit in with other stds bodies (BPEL position).

Presentation by James Manley, Principal Enterprise Architect, MITRE Corp, San Diego, CA

This presentation discussed how BPM techniques are being developed and applied to Defense related needs. Members were extremely interested in his views and appreciated his efforts in sharing the work done by DOD.

Jim related his #1 intent on presenting his proposal was on needing help in bringing together the DoD visualizations. Needs a graphical visual interface between tools.

MSR Proposal: Model Driven C2 Requirements & Code Generation




Second request: Want to build on one slide how to fit all these bits together.

The group thought this was indeed possible & that feedback would be provided to him offline.

Broke for lunch at 12:05. Reconvened at 1.12.

On request by Mari, IG produced a list of BPMN adoption vendors.




Suggestion by JB: What's important to BPMI and what do we need to accomplish this mission. Expanded by Mari Georges:


- Secure BPMN as an asset in every sense
- Innovation on a key capabilities
- Clear message to confused public
- Being the Reference Body on BPM
- Expand our membership

BPM Stack

IG produced this list:




The group discussed the proposed stack as shown in HS slides:



Discussion:

- BPMI is in the business of clarifying the stack,
- How BPMI's works fits in with all the other stds bodies.
- Should ontology be included with BPSM layer
- Why are BPEL & Web Services stack on here?
- Things in grey are done by other people, blue is by BPMI.org

It was generally felt that the hour-glass figure was an excellent representation of how the stack could also be portrayed.



Relationships with other bodies:

- | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ WfMC <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Alliance based on shared vision/different needs ■ OASIS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Member ■ Adoption of BPEL ■ OMG <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Cooperation ■ Complementary to MDA ■ W3C <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Consume core standards ■ Make submissions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Principles <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Intellectual Property ■ Scope and Ownership ■ Submissions ■ Donations ■ Cooperation |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

It was agreed that negotiation with other stds bodies should be added to the task list. We have to know how we fit in with the community.

Considerable discussion on the issues of our relevance within the industry followed. It was agreed that we have to talk to other parties.

Mission statement discussion

Kicked off by Derek: Mission is to become the reference place for understanding the business process. Have a clear message about BPMS. Clarity rather than quantity.

Mari: Bring light to areas yet to be explored and find the path forward in the BP space. Processes are assets.

IG: Clearing house for BPM standards; a portal


Task list addition suggested by Derek – more webinars to educate members with leading users. Agreed.


Action item: Derek to lead a webinar series. Submit quote to BPMI for time to do this.

- Final mission statement
- Mission
- Values
- Vision (reference body on BPM)

Strategy

IG produced the following lists





Discussion:

Jan: Value = wide-spread adoption.

Mari: Use the hourglass as our metaphor; extend to areas that reduce risk to BPMI's existence & increase the probability of wide-spread adoption.

The group liked Jan comment, Mari's proposal and agreed with Jeanne's summary:

Create a Primer = simple slides: eg:

1. Hour glass
2. tech stack
3. text mission statement

There being no further time to discuss additional issues, the group agreed to review and follow through on the action items off-line and thus ended the meeting.

Proposed by Ismael Ghalimi and seconded by Derek Miers, the meeting closed at 15.05