# **AVOCADO** ::

# The Streaming Process Mining Challenge

Christian Imenkamp<sup>1</sup>, Andrea Maldonado<sup>2</sup>, Hendrik Reiter<sup>3</sup>, Martin Werner<sup>2</sup>, Wilhelm Hasselbring<sup>3</sup>, Agnes Koschmider<sup>1</sup>, and Andrea Burattin<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University of Bayreuth, Bayreuth, Germany {christian.imenkamp,agnes.koschmider}@uni-bayreuth.de

<sup>2</sup> School of Engineering and Design, Technical University of Munich, Germany {andrea.maldonado martin.werner}@tum.de

<sup>3</sup> Christian-Albrechts-University Kiel, Kiel, Germany {hendrik.reiter,hasselbring}@email.uni-kiel.de

<sup>4</sup> DTU Compute, Technical University of Denmark, Kongens Lyngby, Denmark

andbur@dtu.dk

Abstract. Streaming process mining deals with the real-time analysis of streaming data. Event streams require algorithms capable of processing data incrementally. To systematically address the complexities of this domain, we propose AVOCADO, a standardized challenge framework that provides clear structural divisions: separating the concept and instantiation layers of challenges in streaming process mining for algorithm evaluation. The AVOCADO evaluates algorithms on streaming-specific metrics like accuracy, Mean Absolute Error (MAE), Root Mean Square Error (RMSE), Processing Latency, and robustness. This initiative seeks to foster innovation and community-driven discussions to advance the field of streaming process mining. We present this framework as a foundation and invite the community to contribute to its evolution by suggesting new challenges, such as integrating metrics for system throughput and memory consumption, and expanding the scope to address real-world stream complexities like out-of-order event arrival.

**Keywords:** Streaming Process Mining  $\cdot$  Streaming Conformance  $\cdot$  Concept Drifts  $\cdot$  Streaming Challenge.


## 1 Introduction

Traditionally, process mining focuses on process discovery, the task of extracting process models from event data. These event logs, typically represent finite sets of recorded activities, often used to model the flow of a business process. While event logs provide a detailed record of past events, they are finite and often limited in the scope they capture, which can restrict the ability of process mining techniques to generalize. In recent years, the need to extend process mining techniques to handle event streams has grown and thus to efficiently handle

continuous, potentially infinite sequences of events. Event streams better reflect real-time, dynamic business processes and offer a richer, more comprehensive data source for analysis.

The shift from event logs to event streams in process mining introduces several challenges that challenge process mining. While event logs consist of finite, static data representing past activities, event streams are continuous and real-time, requiring algorithms to process data as it arrives. This real-time processing demands algorithms that can incrementally update process models without access to the entire dataset at once, placing constraints on both memory and computational resources. Beyond the new challenges, the real-time environment also introduces new opportunities for process mining. In offline processing, the discovery of process models from complete historical data is central. Conversely, real-time environments can emphasize tasks more suited to immediate actionability. In particular, real-time discovery offers limited practical value, as practitioners typically do not benefit from observing an evolving process model live. Conversely, streaming conformance checking becomes significantly more valuable in real-time scenarios. A low conformance score indicates an immediate deviation from expected behavior during the current process execution.

To address these challenges, we propose AVOCADO , which is designed to evaluate process mining algorithms specifically for event streams. In particular, AVOCADO will focus on streaming conformance algorithms. It provides a standardized framework for assessing algorithms on their ability to process continuous event data while balancing accuracy and performance under drifting real-time conditions. By using synthetic event data generated from complex process models, AVOCADO offers clear, objectified evaluation criteria that reflect the challenges inherent in working with event streams. This challenge advances the state of process mining by driving the development of algorithms that can learn the expected behavior from event streams, while meeting the system and resource constraints typical of real-time, large-scale environments. Ultimately, AVOCADO of aims to foster process mining techniques allowing organizations to gain insights into their business processes in real-time, improving decision-making and operational efficiency.



**Fig. 1.** AVOCADO **②**: Unveiling the problem's 'pulp' to expose the solution set 'seed', conceived in the formalization of SPM and embodied in this challenge.

The conceptual framework guiding our work is visually depicted in Figure 1. This AVOCADO • representation structures the Streaming Process Mining domain into distinct layers. At the conceptual level, it differentiates between the problem layer and the solution layer. The instantiation of these concepts progresses from Streaming Process Mining Methods to Streaming Process Mining Algorithms, and the Conceptualization of Streaming Process Mining and culminating in our Streaming Process Mining Challenge. This layered model illustrates how the proposed challenge serves as a concrete instantiation for evaluating algorithms within the broader context of streaming process mining.

### 2 Related Work

This section discusses related work in terms of our addressed problem (see Section 2.1) and the related literature to our solution (see Section 2.2).

#### 2.1 Problem Layer

**Process Discovery Contest** The Process Discovery Contest (PDC), hosted annually at the International Conference on Process Mining (ICPM), serves as a prominent platform for evaluating the effectiveness and efficiency of process discovery algorithms. Historically, the contest has been structured around the offline batch processing of static event logs [32]. The traditional PDC format, as outlined by [32] and the ICPM 2025 contest descriptions<sup>5</sup>, involves:

- Static Event Logs: Participants receive pre-generated, finite event logs (e.g., XES files) as input, clearly indicating the beginning and end of the data available for model discovery.
- Batch Processing: Algorithms are expected to process the entire log to produce a single, complete process model (e.g., in PNML or BPMN format).
- Offline Evaluation: Evaluation metrics such as fitness, precision, generalization, and simplicity are computed on the discovered model against a "ground truth" model derived from the static log. This process does not impose real-time constraints on continuous updates or performance.
- Focus on Overfitting/Underfitting: The primary objective is to achieve an optimal balance between overfitting (generating overly restrictive models) and underfitting (producing overly general models) to the provided log.

The traditional focus of process mining lies in analyzing historical static event logs for process discovery, monitoring, and improvement. However, the increasing availability of real-time event data from various IT systems has driven a paradigm shift towards streaming process mining. This emerging field addresses the unique challenges posed by unbounded, continuous streams of events, which are not present in conventional offline analysis. The fundamental objective of

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> ICPM Process Discovery Contest 2025: https://icpmconference.org/2025/process-discovery-contest/

#### 4 C. Imenkamp et al.

streaming process discovery is to incrementally generate a sequence of process models, where each model is intended to reflect process behavior observed within a recent window of events, drawn from an infinite event stream. This inherent need for continuous model generation and adaptation fundamentally distinguishes streaming process mining from its offline counterparts, introducing the following requirements for a challenge.

- Evaluation in Incomplete Information: Streaming event logs are inherently incomplete, as traces are ongoing and future behavior is unknown, complicating discovery. Furthermore, they often contain noisy data due to errors or system glitches, which algorithms must robustly manage alongside concept drift, where process behavior changes over time [33]. Additionally, processing events incrementally, often one by one, imposes strict resource constraints and unawareness of future events [34].
- Handling of Concept Drifts: The underlying process may evolve over time. This means that the mined models must adapt to such changes, balancing the ingestion of new behavior to avoid quick fluctuations due to shortterm changes [43].
- Online Evaluation: Unlike batch-based evaluation using complete logs for a single final model, online evaluation in streaming process mining demands metrics for a sequence of evolving models. This is compounded by inherently incomplete trace information, complicating discovery and quality assessment of dynamic process behavior. [35]
- Significance of Ground Truth in an Online Scenario: In an online scenario, the concept of a static "ground truth" model for evaluation becomes ambiguous due to continuous process evolution (concept drift). Evaluation must thus assess how well models generalize from partial and dynamic behavior, potentially against an evolving reference or based on real-time deviation detection.

#### 2.2 Solution Layer

Various research efforts have addressed streaming process mining, each with distinct capabilities and limitations, highlighting open research avenues.

Algorithms for Concept Drift and Non-Stationary Processes. Batyuk and Voityshyn [36,33] proposed streaming discovery methods within Lambda architectures. In particular, it emphasizes operational support and recent event prioritization, but lacks explicit drift detection or noise management. Potoniec et al. [38] developed an Online Miner for rapid drift response in causal nets, without fully addressing noise resilience or efficiency. Zellner et al. [43] improved drift detection precision via dynamic outlier aggregation but offered limited adaptive modeling. Colombo Tosatto et al. [45] tackled out-of-order events in compliance monitoring through reliable prefix identification and confidence scores, critical for robust analyses. While effective individually, these approaches often isolate drift and noise handling from core discovery processes.

Declarative and Low-Level Event Data Approaches. Burattin et al. [22,24] explored declarative online discovery and change detection using DCR graphs, yet neglected computational efficiency and explicit noise strategies. Lefebure et al. [37] focused on deriving high-level attributes from technical event streams to handle frequency and asynchrony, though impacts on model quality remain unclear. These approaches broaden streaming discovery scope but incompletely address practical implementation challenges.

Online Conformance Checking. Online conformance checking methods provide real-time process assessments. Van Zelst et al. [48] introduced incremental prefix-alignments balancing memory and approximation accuracy. Burattin et al. [47] presented an in-vivo deviation detection framework without predefined case start points. Nagy and Werner-Stark [49] extended alignment techniques with data perspectives for incomplete executions. Lee et al. [50] developed an HMM-based approach ensuring constant-time event orientation. Practical implementations, such as CCaaS [46], demonstrate operational viability. Yet, comprehensive metrics and optimal resource-accuracy trade-offs remain open challenges.

Despite advances, current streaming process discovery approaches primarily address individual challenges like scalability or basic drift handling in isolation. Integrative solutions combining adaptive modeling, resource efficiency, diverse drift management, and resilience to incomplete or noisy data remain crucial.

## 3 Conceptualization of Streaming Process Mining

Streaming process mining, focuses on the analysis and discovery of process models from *event streams* (i.e., unbounded, real-time sequences of events). Unlike traditional process mining, which operates on static, finite, and complete event logs, streaming process mining processes data incrementally and continuously, often under constraints related to memory, latency, and computational resources.

Formally, let  $S = \langle \dots, e_1, e_2, e_3, \dots \rangle$  denote an infinite stream of events, where each  $e_i = (a, c)$  contains at least an activity label a and a case id c – also accessible via projection operators, i.e.,  $\pi_a(e_i) = a$  and  $\pi_c(e_i) = c$ . Then the goal of streaming process discovery is to incrementally generate a sequence of process models  $\langle M_1, M_2, \dots \rangle$  such that each model  $M_t$ , discovered after the event with index t, reflects the behavior observed in the stream S over the latest  $\delta$  events, i.e.,  $S_{[t-\delta,t]}$ .

In traditional process mining, the "rediscovery problem" [51] refers to whether a control-flow discovery algorithm can discover a model M that exactly reflects the behavior observed in a log L from which it was derived. In the streaming context, considering the challenges mentioned above, this becomes more complex. The objective shifts from whether the evolving model correctly generalizes from partial and evolving behavior. Furthermore, unlike incremental process mining [52], which updates models from growing logs, streaming process mining must update the model often, discarding earlier data due to memory constraints and changes becoming more relevant.




Fig. 2. Conceptualization of the "rediscovery problem" in the context of Streaming Process Mining.

A graphical representation of the "rediscovery problem" is shown in Figure 2. Here, there are two models generating events. These two models follow one another with only a partial overlap. The events being generated into the "stream of events" refer to either one or the other. Each event is mined, and a corresponding model is discovered. Then, each discovered model must be compared to the original model from which the event was generated. In the picture, the result of such a comparison generates a stream of comparison values.

As we aim for a modeling language-agnostic approach, the conceptualization of our rediscovery problem should not be bound to any fixed formalism (e.g., Petri net). Therefore, to accomplish this, rather than comparing the mined models with the original one, we decided to compute the conformance measure between the mined models and a log comprising the behavior of the reference model. It becomes clear that this evaluation simultaneously addresses two intertwined dimensions: the quality of the discovered model and the reliability of the conformance assessment itself. However, in the streaming context, conformance is not a straightforward measure, and it must be interpreted alongside other critical dimensions such as *confidence* and *completeness*. This, however, enables us to adopt a *language-agnostic* approach.

Furthermore, we address the internal procedure and process of the challenge and the tests. For this, we provide Algorithm 1: First (lines 1-4), two process models (i.e., p and k) are constructed. While p is fully random, k contains at least 85% of the same activities as k (k.a indicates the set of activities of k). Furthermore, p and k have entirely distinct directly-follow relations (k.df indicates the set of directly-follow relations of k), i.e., k is a reordering of p. The union of p and k is called w (i.e., a driving log). While S denotes the stream in general,  $S_{train}$  can be used by the algorithms to learn the behavior of the stream. Furthermore,  $S_{val}$  is the subset of the stream to evaluate the algorithm.  $S_{train}$  is constructed using a play-out of p, and is used for the warm-up phase where the algorithms can learn the behavior of the stream (lines 7-9). Next (lines 5-6), is the generation of the event stream for validation by construction of a drifting stream with  $p \to w \to k$ . Then, the ground truth (gt) is constructed: Let denote

 $e \in S_{val}$  and gt(e) the ground truth conformance of event e:

$$gt(e) = \sum_{e \in S_{\text{val}}} \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } e \in p \\ 0.5 & \text{if } e \in w \\ 0 & \text{if } e \in k \end{cases}$$

After that (line 10-13), is the main challenge, where the participant's algorithm gets each event using the conformance method. The calculated conformance (i.e., the user prediction if the event is from p or k) is stored and compared against the ground truth (line 14).  $E_{global}$  is the average distance between the calculated conformance and the ground truth.

```
Algorithm 1 Algorithm Evaluation Procedure
```

```
1: p \leftarrow \operatorname{GetRandomProcess}()
2: k \leftarrow \operatorname{GetRandomProcess}() with \frac{|k.a \cap p.a|}{|k.a|} \ge 85\% \land k.df \ne p.df
3: w \leftarrow p \cup k
4: S_{\operatorname{train}} \leftarrow \operatorname{GenerateStream}(p)
5: S_{\operatorname{val}} \leftarrow \operatorname{GenerateStream}(p, 100) \parallel \operatorname{GenerateStream}(w, 50) \parallel \operatorname{GenerateStream}(k, 100)
6: \operatorname{\mathbf{gt}} \leftarrow \underbrace{[1, \dots, 1, 0.5, \dots, 0.5, 0, \dots, 0]}_{100}
7: \operatorname{\mathbf{for}} \operatorname{\mathbf{all}} e \in S_{\operatorname{train}} \operatorname{\mathbf{do}}
8: a.\operatorname{learn}(e)
9: \operatorname{\mathbf{end}} \operatorname{\mathbf{for}}
10: \operatorname{\mathbf{c}} \leftarrow []
11: \operatorname{\mathbf{for}} \operatorname{\mathbf{all}} e \in S_{\operatorname{val}} \operatorname{\mathbf{do}}
12: Append(a.\operatorname{conformance}(e)) to \operatorname{\mathbf{c}}
13: \operatorname{\mathbf{end}} \operatorname{\mathbf{for}}
```

#### 4 Streaming Process Mining Challenge

We now turn the discussion to AVOCADO ②. Our repository is publicly available<sup>6</sup> and the challenge can be accessed online.<sup>7</sup> First, we address the requirements and general design of the algorithms in Section 4.1. Next, in Section 4.2, we present the underlying pipeline and the steps required to participate in the challenge. Finally, we discuss the parameters, metrics, and the structure of the event stream in Section 4.3.

 $<sup>^6</sup>$  https://github.com/chimenkamp/Streaming-Process-Mining-Challenge

https://streaming-process-mining-challenge.onrender.com/

#### 4.1 Algorithm Requirements

Participants must adhere to a few general guidelines when developing the conformance algorithm. This is necessary to ensure comparability, reproducibility, and successful execution during the challenge.

First, algorithms must include a main class that implements the provided interface (i.e., BaseAlgorithm). This is necessary to ensure that the required methods are implemented and aligned with the predefined structure. The interface includes two methods (learn and conformance). The learn method is responsible for the Warm-Up phase, where the algorithm has the opportunity to learn the behavior of the stream. The conformance method is called with each new event and should return the current conformance calculated by the algorithm.

Second, participants must include a clear and executable start script located in the root of the directory. This script should contain the main class that implements the interface and all the necessary configurations. Additionally, submissions must not contain any top-level code that is executed by just loading the script (e.g., if \_\_name\_\_ == "\_\_main\_\_"). Moreover, algorithms must be capable of running solely on the CPU. We are explicitly excluding GPU support for the challenge. Although participants may utilize machine learning techniques, any required computation must occur within the CPU.

Finally, participants must explicitly specify any external Python dependencies in a requirements.txt file located in the root directory. Dependencies will be installed using the standard Python package manager (PIP) prior to the algorithm evaluation.

#### 4.2 Participation

The challenge itself is web-based and can be accessed online<sup>8</sup>. To simplify participation in the challenge, we now address the necessary steps to submit an algorithm (see Figure 3). The participation steps are detailed below:

**Implement Your Algorithm**. The implementation of the algorithm should adhere to the requirements outlined in Section 4.1

Understand Event Structure. Events are provided as dictionaries containing standard fields: case:concept:name (case identifier), concept:name (activity name), time:timestamp (event timestamp). Furthermore, in test streams, an additional field concept:origin (origin log for concept drifts) is provided.

Upload Your Algorithm. Participants navigate to the **Test & Submit** tab in the user interface. It is possible to upload a single Python file or a ZIP archive containing all required files (including the requirements.txt). The platform will automatically detect the class that implements the interface.

Configure and Run Test. After the upload, participants can run tests before submitting to the challenge. In particular, they can select different test streams and review the results. The results contain a conformance plot, performance metrics, and a baseline comparison (see Section 4.3 for more details).

<sup>8</sup> https://streaming-process-mining-challenge.onrender.com/

**Submit To Challenge**. Post-testing participants submit their algorithm using the **Submit to Challenge** button. They must fill out a submission form, including team name, contract email, algorithm name, and a brief description of their algorithm.

Submissions' statuses and histories can be reviewed under the **My Submissions** tab. Additionally, the **Leaderboard** tab provides real-time rankings and performance comparisons among all participating teams.



Fig. 3. High-Level overview of the steps required to participate in the challenge

#### 4.3 Parameters and Metrics

Following, we address the evaluation metrics and parameters provided by the challenge:

Accuracy The percentage of predictions within 10% of the ground truth conformance score. Mean Absolute Error (MAE) Average absolute distance between the algorithm conformance scores and the baseline scores. Root Mean Square Error (RMSE) Squared root of the mean squared difference between the algorithm and the ground truth conformance scores. Processing Latency Normalized metric based on average processing time per event, favoring lower times. Robustness Score Reflects the number of major errors (difference greater than 30% from the ground truth).

These metrics are combined into the score displayed on the leaderboard. The score is calculated by:

$$score = (0.3 \times accuracy) + (0.25 \times MAE) + (0.2 \times RMSE) + (0.15 \times latency) + (0.1 \times robustness)$$

The corresponding weights are open for discussion and may be adjusted on the basis of feedback from the community.

Furthermore, the platform includes several parameters for testing purposes. Participants can configure: **Test Stream Selection**: Choose from predefined streams (e.g., "Sudden", "Gradual", "Incremental", "Recurring"), each described by drift characteristics and baseline behavior. **Number of Cases**: Specify the event stream size by cases.

## 5 Assessment of Requirements

We evaluate how the proposed AVOCADO ② addresses the requirements identified for streaming process mining (see Section 2.1). In particular, we introduce a simple baseline algorithm as a test case to assess the requirements. It is called the Frequency-Based Conformance Algorithm and learns frequencies of activities and directly follows relations during the learning phase. More frequent activities or transitions are considered to be more conformant. Figure 4 shows the web interface on the Test & Submit page.



**Evaluation in Incomplete Information** The AVOCADO • addresses this by requiring algorithms to incrementally update their results when a new event arrives at the system. The stream is non-deterministic, and therefore future events are impossible to know. Thus, the challenge explicitly evaluates the robustness of the model to incomplete traces.

Handling of Concept Drifts The generation of event streams directly addresses this requirement (see Algorithm 1). In particular, by constructing validation streams with controlled concept drift scenarios (i.e., sudden, recurring, gradual, incremental) the challenge allows a detailed assessment of algorithms. Furthermore, algorithms are assessed on their ability to learn the behavior (i.e., conformance) of the stream and are evaluated based on the expected drop in conformance after the stream. Hence, algorithms aren't expected to show robustness against concept drifts.

Online Evaluation AVOCADO • implements an online evaluation framework. For that, it continuously evaluates algorithms with metrics that reflect their real-time performance. The adaptability and accuracy are continuously monitored using metrics such as accuracy, MAE, RMSE, and robustness. This ensures a realistic evaluation of algorithm performance in dynamic environments.

Significance of Ground Truth in an Online Scenario In streaming contexts, defining and maintaining ground truth is challenging. AVOCADO addresses this by reducing the complexity and defining the simplest possible ground truth. If the new event is from the process before the drift, we expect a conformance of one after a conformance of zero.

#### 6 Conclusion

In this paper, we have addressed the emerging challenges of streaming process mining. In particular, the relevance of conformance in real-time environments. We have outlined the significant differences and new quality dimensions introduced by streaming data (i.e., including handling incomplete information, concept drift, real-time evaluation, and ambiguity of ground truth). To foster advancements in this area, we proposed the AVOCADO , based on the process discovery contest, offering a standardized web-based platform to assess algorithms' performance. For that, we consider metrics like accuracy, MAE, RMSE, Processing Latency, and robustness.

This paper, however, does not propose a definitive or prescriptive solution. Instead, it is intended as an invitation for discourse and collaboration, specially about parameters, evaluation metrics, and their weights in our score. Recognizing the complexity and novelty of streaming process mining, our proposed challenge framework and evaluation criteria are meant as a foundation for further discussion. We acknowledge that our approach and selected metrics might not capture all nuances relevant for streaming settings. Thus, we explicitly invite researchers and practitioners to critique, refine, and expand upon our concepts and evaluation methods. By embracing a community-based approach, we believe we can collectively establish a more robust, comprehensive understanding of streaming process mining and continuously improve the challenge design.

#### References

- 1. Mostafa Mirzaie, Behshid Behkamal, Mohammad Allahbakhsh, Samad Paydar, and Elisa Bertino. State of the art on quality control for data streams: A systematic literature review. *Computer Science Review*, 48:100554, May 2023.
- Masafumi Oyamada, Hideyuki Kawashima, and Hiroyuki Kitagawa. Data stream processing with concurrency control. SIGAPP Appl. Comput. Rev., 13(2):54–65, Jun 2013.
- 3. Lukasz Golab, Kumar Gaurav Bijay, and M. Tamer Özsu. On concurrency control in sliding window queries over data streams. In *Advances in Database Technology EDBT 2006*, pages 608–626. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2006.
- 4. S. Stuijk and T. Basten. Analyzing concurrency in streaming applications. *Journal of Systems Architecture*, 54(1):124–144, 2008.
- Rosane M.M. Vallim and Rodrigo F. de Mello. Proposal of a new stability concept to detect changes in unsupervised data streams. Expert Systems with Applications, 41(16):7350-7360, 2014.

- Fausto G. da Costa, Felipe S.L.G. Duarte, Rosane M.M. Vallim, and Rodrigo F. de Mello. Multidimensional surrogate stability to detect data stream concept drift. Expert Systems with Applications, 87:15–29, 2017.
- Uri Verner, Assaf Schuster, and Mark Silberstein. Processing data streams with hard real-time constraints on heterogeneous systems. In *Proceedings of the Inter*national Conference on Supercomputing, ICS '11, pages 120–129. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2011.
- 8. Pranay Chaudhuri. An adaptive parallel algorithm for analyzing activity networks. *Operations Research Letters*, 9(1):31–34, 1990.
- 9. Tiziano De Matteis and Gabriele Mencagli. Parallel patterns for window-based stateful operators on data streams: An algorithmic skeleton approach. *International Journal of Parallel Programming*, 45(2):382–401, Apr 2017.
- Weihe Li and Paul Patras. Stable-sketch: A versatile sketch for accurate, fast, web-scale data stream processing. In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2024*, WWW '24, pages 4227–4238. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2024.
- Dawei Sun and Rui Huang. A stable online scheduling strategy for real-time stream computing over fluctuating big data streams. IEEE Access, 4:8593-8607, 2016.
- 12. Tobi Ajila and Shikaresh Majumdar. Data driven priority scheduling on spark based stream processing. In 2018 IEEE/ACM 5th International Conference on Big Data Computing Applications and Technologies (BDCAT), pages 208–210, 2018.
- 13. Sylvia E. C. B. H. Victor, Silvio B. Melo, and Bruno I. F. Maciel. An optimized training dynamic for data streams. In 2021 IEEE Symposium Series on Computational Intelligence (SSCI), pages 1–8, 2021.
- Paolo Bellavista, Antonio Corradi, Andrea Reale, and Nicola Ticca. Priority-based resource scheduling in distributed stream processing systems for big data applications. In 2014 IEEE/ACM 7th International Conference on Utility and Cloud Computing, pages 363–370, 2014.
- Tim Oates and Paul R. Cohen. Searching for structure in multiple streams of data. In Proceedings of the Thirteenth International Conference on International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML'96, pages 346–354. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc., San Francisco, CA, USA, 1996.
- 16. Tim Oates, Matthew D. Schmill, Dawn E. Gregory, and Paul R. Cohen. Detecting complex dependencies in categorical data. In Doug Fisher and Hans-J. Lenz, editors, Learning from Data: Artificial Intelligence and Statistics V, pages 185–195. Springer New York, New York, NY, 1996.
- Manel Charfi, Yann Gripay, and Jean-Marc Petit. Spatio-temporal functional dependencies for sensor data streams. In Advances in Spatial and Temporal Databases, pages 182–199. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2017.
- 18. Indrăź Liobaităź, Albert Bifet, Jesse Read, Bernhard Pfahringer, and Geoff Holmes. Evaluation methods and decision theory for classification of streaming data with temporal dependence. *Mach. Learn.*, 98(3):455–482, Mar 2015.
- 19. Yiliao Song, Jie Lu, Haiyan Lu, and Guangquan Zhang. Learning data streams with changing distributions and temporal dependency. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, 34(8):3952–3965, 2023.
- Sungbo Seo, Jaewoo Kang, and Keun Ho Ryu. Multivariable stream data classification using motifs and their temporal relations. *Information Sciences*, 179(20):3489– 3504, 2009.
- Andrea Burattin, Alessandro Sperduti, and Wil M. P. van der Aalst. Heuristics miners for streaming event data. In 2014 IEEE Congress on Evolutionary Computation (CEC), pages 2420–2427, 2014.

- Andrea Burattin, Marta Cimitile, Fabrizio M. Maggi, and Alessandro Sperduti.
   Online discovery of declarative process models from event streams. *IEEE Transactions on Services Computing*, 8(6):833–846, Nov 2015.
- Andrea Burattin, Alessandro Sperduti, and Wil M. P. van der Aalst. Heuristics miners for streaming event data. In 2014 IEEE Congress on Evolutionary Computation (CEC), pages 2420–2427. arXiv, Jul 2014.
- 24. Andrea Burattin, Hugo A. López, and Lasse Starklit. Uncovering change: A streaming approach for declarative processes: 4th international conference on process mining. *Proceedings of Process Mining Workshops*, 468:158–170, 2023.
- 25. Adriano Augusto, Raffaele Conforti, Marlon Dumas, Marcello La Rosa, and Artem Polyvyanyy. Split miner: automated discovery of accurate and simple business process models from event logs. *Knowledge and Information Systems*, 59(2):251–284, May 2019.
- Boudewijn van Dongen. Bpi challenge 2012. Eindhoven University of Technology, 2012.
- Felix Mannhardt. Hospital billing event log. Eindhoven University of Technology, 2017.
- Felix Mannhardt. Sepsis cases event log. Eindhoven University of Technology, 2016.
- Ahmed Awad, Matthias Weidlich, and Sherif Sakr. Process mining over unordered event streams. In 2020 2nd International Conference on Process Mining (ICPM), pages 81–88, 2020.
- Andrea Maldonado, Christian M. M. Frey, Gabriel Marques Tavares, Nikolina Rehwald, and Thomas Seidl. Gedi: Generating event data with intentional features for benchmarking process mining. In *Business Process Management*, pages 221–237. Springer Nature Switzerland, Cham, 2024.
- 31. Hendrik Reiter, Christian Imenkamp, Agnes Koschmider, and Wilhelm Hasselbring. Distributed event factory: A tool for generating event streams on distributed data sources. (n.d.).
- 32. Josep Carmona, Massimiliano de Leoni, Benoît Depaire, and Toon Jouck. Summary of the process discovery contest 2016. Springer International Publishing, 2017.
- 33. Anatoliy Batyuk and Volodymyr Voityshyn. Streaming process discovery method for semi-structured business processes. In , pages 444–448, Aug 2020.
- 34. Sebastiaan J. van Zelst, Boudewijn F. van Dongen, and Wil M. P. van der Aalst. Event stream-based process discovery using abstract representations. *Knowledge and Information Systems*, 54(2):407–435, Feb 2018.
- 35. Andrea Burattin. Streaming process discovery and conformance checking. In *Encyclopedia of Big Data Technologies*, pages 1–8. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2018.
- 36. Anatoliy Batyuk and Volodymyr Voityshyn. Streaming process discovery for lambda architecture-based process monitoring platform. In , volume 1, pages 298–301, Sep 2018.
- 37. Franck Lefebure, Cecile Thuault, and Stephane Cholet. Real-world streaming process discovery from low-level event data. In *Learning and Intelligent Optimization*, pages 150–164. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2023.
- 38. Jedrzej Potoniec, Daniel Sroka, and Tomasz P. Pawlak. Continuous discovery of causal nets for non-stationary business processes using the online miner. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 303(3):1304–1320, Dec 2022.
- 39. Marwan Hassani, Sergio Siccha, Florian Richter, and Thomas Seidl. Efficient process discovery from event streams using sequential pattern mining. In 2015 IEEE Symposium Series on Computational Intelligence, pages 1366–1373, 2015.

- Control-flow discovery from event streams | ieee conference publication | ieee xplore. (n.d.).
- 41. Wenan Tan, Li Huang, Tengteng Shen, and Anqiong Tang. Hybrid heuristics miner based on time series prediction for streaming process mining. In 2016 IEEE 20th International Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work in Design (CSCWD), pages 251–256, 2016.
- 42. Joerg Evermann, Jana-Rebecca Rehse, and Peter Fettke. Process discovery from event stream data in the cloud a scalable, distributed implementation of the flexible heuristics miner on the amazon kinesis cloud infrastructure. In 2016 IEEE International Conference on Cloud Computing Technology and Science (CloudCom), pages 645–652, 2016.
- 43. Ludwig Zellner, Florian Richter, Janina Sontheim, Andrea Maldonado, and Thomas Seidl. Concept drift detection on streaming data with dynamic outlier aggregation. In Sander Leemans and Henrik Leopold, editors, *Process Mining Workshops*, pages 206–217. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2021.
- 44. Rony Zaman, Mhd. Irfan Hassani, and B.F. van Dongen. A framework for efficient memory utilization in online conformance checking. arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.13640, 2021.
- Simone Colombo Tosatto, Hajo Burke, Nicky R. T. P. van Beest, and Hella Groefsema. Managing and anticipating out-of-order events in online compliance monitoring. In Advanced Information Systems Engineering, pages 151–166. Springer Nature Switzerland, 2025.
- 46. Ingo Weber, Andreas Rogge-Solti, Cong Li, and Jan Mendling. Ccaas: Online conformance checking as a service. (n.d.).
- 47. Andrea Burattin, S. J. van Zelst, Alex Armas-Cervantes, B. F. van Dongen, and J. Carmona. Online conformance checking using behavioural patterns. In *Business Process Management*, pages 250–267. Springer International Publishing, 2018.
- 48. S. J. van Zelst, A. Bolt, M. Hassani, B. F. van Dongen, and W. M. P. van der Aalst. Online conformance checking: relating event streams to process models using prefix-alignments. *International Journal of Data Science and Analytics*, 8(3):269– 284, 2019.
- Zoltán Nagy and Anna Werner-Stark. An alignment-based multi-perspective online conformance checking technique. Acta Polytechnica Hungarica, 19(4):105–127, 2022.
- 50. Wing Lam J. Lee, Andrea Burattin, Jorge Munoz-Gama, and María Sepúlveda. Orientation and conformance: A hmm-based approach to online conformance checking. *Information Systems*, 102:101674, 2021.
- 51. Sander J. J. Leemans, Dirk Fahland, and Wil M. P. van der Aalst. Discovering block-structured process models from incomplete event logs. In Gianfranco Ciardo and Ekkart Kindler, editors, *Application and Theory of Petri Nets and Concurrency*, pages 91–110. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2014.
- 52. Massimiliano Cattafi, Evelina Lamma, Fabrizio Riguzzi, and Sergio Storari. Incremental declarative process mining. In Edward Szczerbicki and Ngoc Thanh Nguyen, editors, Smart Information and Knowledge Management: Advances, Challenges, and Critical Issues, pages 103–127. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2010.