

CASE ID	AMBIGUITY TYPE IDENTIFIED BY AUTHORS	IDENTIFIED TYPE BY EXP1	IDENTIFIED TYPE BY EXP2	IDENTIFIED TYPE BY EXP3	IDENTIFIED TYPE BY EXP4
Text5	Inconsistent specifications	Inconsistent specifications	Inconsistent specifications	Inconsistent specifications	Inconsistent specifications
RTFMP	Imprecise information	Imprecise information	Imprecise information (10)	Imprecise information (10)	Missing data causing Imprecise information (7)
VDA51	Unclear relations	Underspecification (1)	Unclear relations	Unclear relations	No ambiguity (8)
Text20	Unclear references	Unclear references	Underspecification (3)	Underspecifications (4)	Unclear references
2080197990	Modelling fuzziness	Modelling fuzziness	Modelling fuzziness	Modelling fuzziness	Modelling fuzziness
2012BPIC	Missing data	Missing data	Missing data	Missing data (11)	Missing data
F426	Underspecifications	Underspecifications	Underspecifications	Underspecifications (12)	Underspecifications
Storage3	Multiplied data	Incorrect information (2)	Multiplied data	Incorrect information (5)	Multiplied data
3095760	Representational bias	Representational bias	Representational bias	Underspecifications (6)	Representational bias
Storage1	Incorrect information	Incorrect information	Incorrect information	Incorrect information	Unexpected information (9)
C8	Inadequate tools	Inadequate tools	Inadequate tools	Inadequate tools	Inadequate tools
Storage2	Irrelevant data	Irrelevant data	Irrelevant data	Irrelevant data (13)	Irrelevant data
Storage4	Unexpected information	Unexpected information	Unexpected information	Unexpected information	Unexpected information

#### LEGEND

Ambiguity types matching the authors' identified types are in black; mismatches are in red; for each mismatch, the explanation of the participant for the identified ambiguity type is referenced; additional comments are referenced as well.

#### EXPLANATIONS GIVEN BY PARTICIPANTS

- (1) The meaning of the term "and" is not specified, hence it is not clear whether it indicates a specific sequence, or parallel execution
- (2) The formal model used for the enactment and log generation has only one occurrence of the "Read color" activity, so it is impossible that it was executed twice
- (3) The Board is mentioned, but not further specified
- (4) The Board is mentioned, but not further specified; the term "again" makes it even more confusing because it implies that the Board has performed some other activity before
- (5) The model has only one occurrence of the Read color activity, so it is impossible that it is executed twice
- (6) EPCs were originally proposed with informal semantics (they were formalized later), hence the illustrated model is not a formal model but an informal specification
- (7) Some data is missing from the timestamp (hours, minutes, seconds, milliseconds are all set to "00" so this data is missing), which in turn causes imprecise information
- (8) Both activities are performed by the same actor, and the term "and" clearly indicates a sequence between these two activities
- (9) Because it is not impossible that an execution deviates in such a way from the model, it is an unexpected information rather than an incorrect information

#### ADDITIONAL COMMENTS BY PARTICIPANTS

- (10) If the timestamp is formed by distinct attributes for its elements (e.g., one for the hours, one for the minutes, etc.), then the ambiguity is missing data; however, here the timestamp is a single attribute
- (11) If the resource information is not needed, then it is irrelevant that there is missing data
- (12) Linguistic aspects may be the reason for the underspecification
- (13) There may be an unknown purpose for the presence of irrelevant data