





## 

## A Benchmark for Evaluating Multimodal Foundation Models on Business Process Management Tasks

Michael Wornow, Avanika Narayan, Ben Viggiano, Ishan S. Khare, Tathagat Verma, Tibor Thompson, Miguel Angel Fuentes Hernandez, Sudharsan Sundar, Chloe Trujillo, Krrish Chawla, Rongfei Lu, Justin Shen, Divya Nagaraj, Joshua Martinez, Vardhan Agrawal, Althea Hudson, Nigam H. Shah, Christopher Ré

### NeurIPS 2024

Problem: People spend too much time on tedious workflows



92%

of jobs require digital skills

## 3 hrs/day

spent on repetitive tasks unrelated to core job

### Solution: Business Process Management (**BPM**)

## Solution: Business Process Management (**BPM**)



## Solution: Business Process Management (**BPM**)



## Solution: Business Process Management (**BPM**)



## Solution: Business Process Management (**BPM**)



Motivation Prior Work Benchmark Results Conclusion

Prior work focuses on only **one aspect** of BPM -- **automation** 



60%

of a typical BPM project is spent simply defining the workflow

Motivation Prior Work	Benchmark	Results	Conclusion
-----------------------	-----------	---------	------------

### Prior work focuses on only one aspect of BPM -- automation

Benchmark		Workflow	'S		Evaluat	tion			Huma	an Dem	onstration	ıs
	# Tasks	# Envs	Env Type	Auto	Doc	KT	Imp	Action	Video	SOP	Ranking	Demos/Task
AITW	30,378	357	М	V	_	_	_	~	~	_	_	23.5
Mind2Web	2,350	137	W	~	_	_	_	~	~	_	_	1
MoTIF	6,100	125	Μ	_	_	_	_	~	~	_	_	0.77
WebArena	812	4	W	V	-	_	_	~	~	_	—	0.22
OmniAct	9,802	65	D + W	V	_	_	_	~	_	_	_	1
WebShop	12,087	1	W	~	_	_	_	~	_	-	_	0.13
VWA	910	3	W	~	-	_	_	-	_	—	-	0
WorkArena	23,150	5	W	V	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	0
WebLINX	2,337	155	W	~	_	_	_	~	~	_	_	1
OSWorld	369	13	D + W	~	-	-	_	~	~	—	-	1

**Evaluations** ignore rest of BPM process

Data does not support BPM tasks

## Our work fills these gaps in the agentic workflow literature!

Benchmark		Workflow	'S	Evaluation			Human Demonstrations					
	# Tasks	# Envs	Env Type	Auto	Doc	KT	Imp	Action	Video	SOP	Ranking	Demos/Task
AITW	30,378	357	Μ	V	_	_	_	V	V	_	_	23.5
Mind2Web	2,350	137	W	~	_	_	_	V	V	_	_	1
MoTIF	6,100	125	Μ	_	_	_	_	V	V	_	_	0.77
WebArena	812	4	W	V	_	_	_	V	V	_	—	0.22
OmniAct	9,802	65	D + W	V	_	_	_	V	_	_	_	1
WebShop	12,087	1	W	V	_	_	_	V	_	_	_	0.13
VWA	910	3	W	~	_	_	_	_	_	—	—	0
WorkArena	23,150	5	W	V	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	0
WebLINX	2,337	155	W	V	_	_	_	V	V	_	_	1
OSWorld	369	13	D + W	V	-	-	-	V	~	—	-	1
🔶 Wonderbread	598	4	W	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	4.9

## WONDERBREAD A WOrkflow uNDERstanding BenchmaRk, EvAluation harness, and Dataset





## the workflow understanding capabilities of models

## **WONDERBREAD** is a **benchmark** and **dataset** for studying the **workflow understanding** capabilities of models



# **WONDERBREAD** is a **benchmark** and **dataset** for studying the **workflow understanding** capabilities of models





# **WONDERBREAD** is a **benchmark** and **dataset** for studying the **workflow understanding** capabilities of models

















MotivationPrior WorkBenchmarkResultsConclusionEach demonstrationcontains a full screen recording, extracted keyframes, an action log, and a Standard Operation Procedure (SOP)



MotivationPrior WorkBenchmarkResultsConclusionEach demonstrationcontains a full screen recording, extracted keyframes, an action log, and a Standard Operation Procedure (SOP)





## Task Group 1: Automatically **documenting** workflows







## Task Group 1: Automatically **documenting** workflows





## Task Group 2: Facilitating knowledge transfer







### Task Group 2: Facilitating knowledge transfer





Answers scored by LLM on a scale of 1 (bad) to 3 (good)...



#### Example questions

- "Explain what the most common failure modes might be for a user performing this task."
- "Here are two demonstrations, one of which is more efficient than the other. Please describe ways to improve the less optimal workflow."
- "What is the purpose of doing this workflow?"

Motivation	Prior Work	Benchmark	Results	Conclusi
------------	------------	-----------	---------	----------

### Task Group 3: Ranking and **improving** processes





## Task Group 3: Ranking and **improving** processes



	SOP Impro	ovement		
See paper for	Input	SOP (t)	Cutput	Evaluation

Model	Spearman $\rho$	Kendall $ au$
GPT-4	$0.07 \pm 0.58$	$0.06 \pm 0.49$
Claude3 Sonnet	$0.06 \pm 0.59$	$0.03 \pm 0.50$
Gemini Pro 1	$0.03 \pm 0.58$	$0.03 \pm 0.49$

## Future Work + Next Steps

There are many opportunities for future work!

### **Data Collection**

- Increasing task diversity + sourcing from real-world enterprise applications
- Automated annotation of screen recordings

### **Model Training**

- Fine-tuning AI agents on our dataset of 3k high-quality human demonstrations
- Improving human-model alignment of workflow preference

#### Inference

. . .

• Enhancing model **self-validation** to unlock **self-improvement** 

## Thank you!





Website: https://wonderbread.stanford.edu
Paper: https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.13264
Dataset: https://zenodo.org/records/12671568
Code: https://github.com/HazyResearch/wonderbread

#### Thanks to our amazing lab mates, advisors & collaborators!

Michael Wornow, Avanika Narayan, Ben Viggiano, Ishan S. Khare, Tathagat Verma, Tibor Thompson, Miguel Angel Fuentes Hernandez, Sudharsan Sundar, Chloe Trujillo, Krrish Chawla, Rongfei Lu, Justin Shen, Divya Nagaraj, Joshua Martinez, Vardhan Agrawal, Althea Hudson, Nigam H. Shah, Christopher Ré

Contact: mwornow@stanford.edu

