IFIP WG 10.4 Winter Meeting, Rincon PR 30 Jan 2005

Automated Test Generation with sal-atg

John Rushby with Grégoire Hamon and Leonardo de Moura

> Computer Science Laboratory SRI International Menlo Park CA USA

John Rushby, SRI







Invisible Formal Methods

- Use the technology of formal methods
 - Theorem proving, constraint satisfaction, model checking, abstraction, symbolic evaluation
- To augment traditional methods and tools
 - Compilers, debuggers
- To automate traditional processes
 - Testing, reviews, debugging
- Or to create new capabilities
 - Strong static analyzers, autocode by constraint solving
- To do this, we must unobtrusively (i.e., invisibly) extract
 - A formal specification
 - A collection of properties
- And deliver a useful result in a familiar form

Invisible FM Example: Generating Unit Tests

- Necessity and costs of testing well understood
- Automation could be a huge win
- In model based development (MBD), we have an executable model of the system (e.g., in Simulink/Stateflow)
- Generate tests by structural coverage in the model
- Model also provides the oracle
- It is well known that model checkers can be used as test generators

Example: Stopwatch in Stateflow

Inputs: **START** and **LAP** buttons, and clock **TIC** event



Example test goals: generate input sequences to exercise Lap_stop to Lap transition, or to reach junction at bottom right

John Rushby, SRI

Generating Tests Using a Model Checker

- Add trap variables go TRUE when a test goal is satisfied
 - E.g., jabr that goes TRUE when junction at bottom right is reached
 - Trap variables can be inserted automatically during translation from the MBD language to the model checker (Our translator from Stateflow to SAL does this)
- Model check for "always not jabr"
- Counterexample will be desired test case
- Trap variables add negligible overhead ('cos no interactions)
- For finite cases (e.g., numerical variables range over bounded integers) any standard model checker will do
 - Although many pragmatic issues concerning symbolic vs.
 bounded vs. explicit vs... for this application
 - $\circ~$ Otherwise need infinite bounded model checker as in SAL



Problems Using OTS Model Checker as Test Generator

- Each test goal is treated separately: model checker is called repeatedly and performs much redundant work
- Test set has many short tests
 - Each incurs a startup cost during execution
 - Total length is large, so high execution cost
 - Much redundancy among the tests (wasteful)
 - Few long tests (so deep bugs undetected)
- Model checker may be unable to reach deep test goals

A Better Way

- Instead of starting each test from the the start state, we try to extend the test found so far
- Extending tests allows a bounded model checker to reach deep states at low cost
 - $\circ~$ 5 searches to depth 4 much easier than 1 to depth 20
- Could get stuck if we tackle the goals in a bad order
- So, simply try to reach any outstanding goal and let the model checker find a good order
 - Can slice the model after each goal is discharged
 - A virtuous circle: the model will get smaller as the remaining goals get harder
- Go back to the start (or another earlier state) when unable to extend current test



The SAL Automated Test Generator: sal-atg

- SAL is scriptable in Scheme
- sal-atg implements the method described in a few hundred lines of Scheme
 - (Re)starts use either symbolic or bounded model checking
 - * Parameterized choice and search depth
 - Extensions use bounded model checking
 - * Parameterized incremental search depth
 - Optional slicing after each extension or each restart
 - Customizable output to drive test harness

Example

- sal-atg stopwatch clock stopwatch_goals.scm -ed 5 --incremental In 5 seconds, generates single test case of length 17 that covers the states and transitions of the Statechart
- sal-atg stopwatch clock stopwatch_goals.scm -ed 5 -id 0 --incremental
 --smcinit
- Takes 106 seconds to cover flowchart as well: adds test of length 101 for middle junction and one of length 6,001 for jabr

Experimental Results

- Rockwell Collins has developed a series of flight guidance system (FGS) examples for NASA
- SAL translation of largest of these kindly provided by UMN
- Model has 490 variables (576 state bits), 196 reachable control states, and 313 transitions
 - Takes 61 seconds to generate single test case of length
 45 that covers all states
 - Takes 98 seconds to generate a single test of length 55 that covers all transitions
- Without extensions, get 73 tests to cover transitions: 1 of length 3, 9 of length 2, and the rest of length 1
 - Poor mutant detection
- We are in the process of testing our tests

Test Engineering with Automation

- Generating tests just to achieve structural coverage is a poor strategy
- Traditional test engineers develop tests to explore interesting cases, requirements, fault hypotheses
- We need to give them a way to do this using automation
- Specify the desired tests rather than constructing them
- Develop an observer module that sets a variable TRUE when a test has achieved some purpose
- Tell sal-atg to search for conjunction of each trap variable with the purpose
- In general, sal-atg can search for arbitrary conjunctions
 - E.g., product of structural coverage on control states and boundary coverage on some data structure



Shift Scheduler

- One input is the gear currently selected by the gearbox
- Tests often change this discontinuously (e.g., 1, 3, 4, 2)
- Can easily establish the test purpose to change only in single steps, and to change at every step

Please Try It Out

- Main FM tools home page: http://fm.csl.sri.com
- SAL home page: http://sal.csl.sri.com
- SAL-atg (next week): http://sal.csl.sri.com/pre-release