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Luxembourg

- Small country and population
- One of the wealthiest in the world
- ICT security and reliability, a national research priority
- Priorities implemented as interdisciplinary centres
- International
- Three official languages: English, French, German
SnT Software Verification and Validation Lab

- SnT centre, Est. 2009: Interdisciplinary, ICT security-reliability-trust
- 180 scientists and Ph.D. candidates, 20 industry partners
- 15 scientists (Research scientists, associates, and PhD candidates)
- Industry-relevant research on system dependability: security, safety, reliability
- Four partners: Cetrel, CTIE, Delphi, SES, …
Research Paradigm

- Research informed by practice
- Well-defined problems in context
- Realistic evaluation
- Long term industrial collaborations
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“Model-based”?

- All engineering disciplines rely on abstraction and therefore models
- In most cases, it is the only way to effectively automate testing or verification
- Models have many other purposes: Communication, support requirements and design
- There are many ways to model systems and their environment
- In a given context, this choice is driven by the application domain, standards and practices, objectives, and skills
Models in Software Engineering

- **Model**: An abstract and analyzable description of software artifacts, created for a purpose.

- **Abstract**: Details are omitted. Partial representation. Much smaller and simpler than the artifact being modeled.

- **Analyzable**: Leads to task automation.
Talk Objectives

- Overview of several years of research
- Examples, at various levels of details
- Follows a research paradigm that is uncommon in software engineering research
- Conducted in collaboration with industry partners in many application domains: Automotive, energy, telecom …
- Lessons learned regarding scalability and cost-effectiveness
Objective Function

Search Space

Search Technique

Model: Guidance to worst case, high risk scenarios across space

Heuristics: Extensive empirical studies are required

- Search to optimize objective function: Complete or not, deterministic or partly random (stochastic)
- Metaheuristics, constraint solvers
- Scalability: A small part of the search space is traversed

Research Pattern: Models and Search Heuristics
Early Work: Search-Based Schedulability Analysis

Schedulability Theory

- Real-time scheduling theory
  - Given priorities, execution time, periods (periodic task), minimum inter-arrival times (aperiodic task), …
  - Is a group of (a)periodic tasks schedulable?
  - Theory to determine schedulability
    - Independent periodic tasks: Rate Monotonic Algorithm (RMA)
    - Aperiodic or dependent tasks: Generalized Completion Time Theorem (GCTT).
- GCTT assumes
  - aperiodic tasks equivalent to periodic tasks
    - periods = minimum inter-arrival times
  - aperiodic tasks ready to start at time zero
- Execution times are estimates
A Search-based Solution

- Goal: Make no assumptions and find near deadline misses as well, identify worst case scenarios
- Population-based metaheuristic: Genetic Algorithm
- To automate, based on the system task architecture (UML SPT, MARTE), the derivation of arrival times for task triggering events that maximize the chances of critical deadline misses.

![Diagram showing periodic and aperiodic tasks, system events, and genetic algorithm for arrival times.](image-url)
Model as Input

**UML-MARTE Model**
(Task architecture)

- Estimated execution time, Minimum inter-arrival time, ...
- Task priorities ...

**GA**
- Chromosome
- Fitness evaluation

**Scheduler**
(constraint solver)

- Start times, Pre-emption
- Arrival/seeding times
Objective Function

• Focus on one target task at a time
• Goal: Guide the search towards arrival times causing the greatest delays in the executions of the target task
• Properties:
  – Handle deadline misses
  – Consider all task executions, not just worst case execution
  – Reward task executions so that many good executions do not wind up overshadowing one bad execution
Objective Function II

\[ f(Ch) = \sum_{j=1}^{k_t} 2^{e_{t,j} - d_{t,j}} \]

- **t**: target task
- **\( k_t \)**: maximum number of executions of **t**
- **e**: estimated end time of execution **j** of target task as determined by scheduler
- **d**: deadline of execution **j** of target task
Case Study

- Software Engineering Institute (SEI), Naval Weapons Center and IBM’s Federal Sector Division
- Hard real-time, realistic avionics application model similar to existing U.S. Navy and Marine aircrafts
- Eight highest priority tasks deemed schedulable
- Our findings suggest three of eight tasks produce systematic deadline misses
## Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Number of Misses</th>
<th>Value of Misses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weapon Release</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapon Release Subtask</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radar Tracking Filter</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWR Contact Management</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Bus Poll Device</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapon Aiming</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radar Target Update</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17, 16, 10, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navigation Update</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1, 29, 23, 2, 28, 27, 32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions

• We devised a method to generate event seeding times for aperiodic tasks so as identifying deadline miss scenarios based on task design information
• Near deadline misses as well! (stress testing)
• Standard modeling notation (UML/SPT/MARTE)
• No dedicated, additional modeling compared to what is expected when defining a task architecture
• Scalability: GA runs lasted a few minutes on regular PC
• Default GA parameters, as recommended in literature, work well
• Large empirical studies to evaluate the approach (heuristics)

• Similar work with concurrency analysis: Deadlocks, data races, etc. (Shousha, Briand, Labiche, 2008-2012)
Testing Driven by Environment Modeling

Z. Iqbal, A. Arcuri, L. Briand, 2009-2012
• Three-year project with two industry partners
  – Soft real-time systems: deadlines in order of hundreds of milliseconds
    • Jitter of few milliseconds acceptable
  – Automation of test cases and oracle generation, environment simulation
Environment Modeling and Simulation

- Independent
  - Black-box
- Behavior driven by environment
  - Environment model
- Software engineers
- No use of Matlab/Simulink
- One model for
  - Environment simulator
  - Test cases and oracles
- UML profile (+ limited use of MARTE)
Domain Model
Behavior Model
Test Cases

- Test cases are defined by
  - Simulation configuration
  - Environment configuration
- Environment Configuration
  - Number of instances to be created for each component in the domain model (e.g., the number of sensors)
- Simulator Configuration
  - Setting of non-deterministic attribute values
- Test oracle: Environment model error states
  - A successful test case is one which leads the environment into an error state
Search Objectives and Heuristics

- Bring the system state to an error state by searching for appropriate values for non-deterministic environment attributes

- Search heuristics are based on fitness functions assessing how “close” is the current state to an error state

- Different metaheuristics: Genetic algorithm, (1+1) EA

- Defining the fitness function based on model information was highly complex: OCL constraints, combination of many heuristics

- Industrial case study and artificial examples showed the heuristic was effective
  - (1+1) EA better than GA
Basic Ideas about the Fitness Function

- Evaluates how “good” the simulator configurations are
- Can only be decided after the execution of a test case
- Decided based on heuristics: How close was the test case to ...

- **Approach Level**
  - reach an error state?
- **Branch Distance**
  - solve the guard on a branch leading to an error state?
  - defined search heuristics for OCL expressions*
- **Time Distance**
  - take a time transition that leads to an error state?

* S. Ali, M.Z. Iqbal, A. Arcuri, L. Briand, "Generating Test Data from OCL Constraints with Search Techniques", forthcoming in IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering
Constraint Optimization to Verify CPU Usage

System: fire/gas detection and emergency shutdown

- Control Modules
- Drivers (Software-Hardware Interface)
- Real Time Operating System
- Multicore Archt.
- Alarm Devices (Hardware)
Safety Drivers May Overload the CPU

• Drivers need to bridge the timing gaps between SW and HW
• SIL 3
• Drivers have flexible design
  • Parallel threads communicating in an asynchronous way
  • Period and watchdog threads
• Drivers are subject to real-time constraints to make sure they do not overuse the CPU time, e.g., “The processor spare-time should not be less than 80% at any time”
• Determine how many driver instances to deploy on a CPU
I/O Driver

Periodic

Pull Data

IODispatch

WatchDog

Periodic

Push Data

Small Delay ——> T2 consumes a lot of CPU time ——> CPU overload

Large Delay ——> T2 may block T1 and/or T3 ——> Deadline misses

Processing control data

Communication protocol with configurable parameters

Sending HW commands
Safety standards

IEC 61508 is a Safety Standard including guidelines for Performance Testing

To achieve SIL levels 3-4, Stress Testing is “Highly Recommended”
Search Objective

- **Stress test cases:** Values for *environment-dependent parameters* of the embedded software, e.g., the size of time *delays* used in software to synchronize with hardware devices or to receive feedback from the hardware devices.

- **Goal:** *select delays to* maximize the use of the CPU while satisfying design constraints.
General Approach: Modeling and Optimization

- **Modeling**
  - System design and platform Model (UML/MARTE)
  - Performance Requirements (objective functions)

- **Constraint Programming**
  - Constraint Program
  - CP Engine (COMET)

- **Input**
  - INPUT

- **Output**
  - OUTPUT
  - Stress Test Cases (Delay values leading to worst case CPU time usage)
Information Requirements

**Scheduler**
- preemptive : bool
- min duration(min_d) : int
- max duration(max_d) : int
- delay : int

**Processing Unit**
- number of cores : int

**Global Clock**
- time : int

**Activity**
- min duration(min_d) : int
- max duration(max_d) : int
- delay : int

**Thread**
- priority : int
- period (p) : int
- min inter-arrival time(min_ia) : int
- max inter-arrival time(max_ia) : int
- Start()
- Finish()
- Wait()
- Sleep()
- Resume()
- Trigger()

**Buffer**
- size : int
- access()

**Scheduling Policy**
- preemptive : bool

**Data dependency (\(d\))**

**Synch**

**Asynch**

**Computing Platform**
1 allocated *

**Embedded Software App**
MARTE: Augmented Sequence Diagrams

Some abstractions are design choices: delays, priorities...

Some others depend on the environment: arrival times...

deadline

duration

delay

Thread

Pull Data

IOTask

MailBox

Push Data

scan
**COMET input language**

Design properties include: threads, priorities, activities, durations…

Preemptions at regular time periods (quanta)

Assume negligible context switching time compared to time quantum

Platform and design properties are constants in our Constraint Program

---

**Platform and Design Properties modeled in UML are provided as input in our Constraint Program**

| // 1) Input: Time and Concurrency information |
| int c = ...; // #Cores |
| int n = ...; range J = 0..n-1; // #Threads |
| int priority[J] = ...; // Priorities |
| // ... |

| // 2) Output: Scheduling variables |
| dvar int arrival_time[a in A] in T; // Actual arrival times |
| dvar int start[a in A] in est[a]..lst[a]; // Actual start times |
| dvar int end[a in A] in eet[a]..let[a]; // Actual end times |
| // ... |

| // 3) Objective function: Performance Requirement |
| maximize |
| sum(a in A) (maxl(0, minl(1, deadline_miss[a]))); // Deadline misses function |

| // 4) Constraints: Scheduling policy |
| subject to { |
|   forall(a in A) { |
|     wf4: start[a] <= end[a]; |
|   // Threads should end after their start time |
|   // ... |
Threads Properties which can be tuned during testing are the output of our Constraint Program

Tunable Parameters may include design and real time properties

Tunable Parameters are variables in our Constraint Program

Some tunable parameters are the basis for the definition to stress test cases (e.g., delays), others are results from scheduling

// 1) Input: Time and Concurrency information
int c = ...; // #Cores
int n = ...; range J = 0..n-1; // #Threads
int priority[J] = ...; // Priorities
// ...

// 2) Output: Scheduling variables
dvar int arrival_time[a in A] in T; // Actual arrival times
dvar int start[a in A] in est[a]..lst[a]; // Actual start times
dvar int end[a in A] in eet[a]..let[a]; // Actual end times
// ...

// 3) Objective function: Performance Requirement
maximize
    sum(a in A)(maxl(0, minl(1, deadline_miss[a]))); // Deadline misses function

// 4) Constraints: Scheduling policy
subject to {
    forall(a in A) {
        wf4: start[a] <= end[a]; // Threads should end after their start time
    }
    // ...
}
The Performance Requirement is modeled as an objective function to maximize

We focus on objective functions for CPU Usage here

Each objective function models a specific performance requirement

Testing a different performance requirements only requires to change the objective function (constraints)
The Platform scheduler and properties are modeled through a set of constraints

Constraints express relationships between constants and variables

Constraints are independent and can be modified to fit different platforms, for example scheduling algorithm

```
// 1) Input: Time and Concurrency information
int c = ...; // #Cores
int n = ...; range J = 0..n-1; // #Threads
int priority[J] = ...; // Priorities
// ...

// 2) Output: Scheduling variables
dvar int arrival_time[a in A] in T;
    // Actual arrival times
dvar int start[a in A] in est[a]..lst[a];
    // Actual start times
dvar int end[a in A] in eet[a]..let[a];
    // Actual end times
// ...

// 3) Objective function: Performance Requirement
maximize
    sum(a in A)(maxl(0, minl(1,
    deadline_miss[a]))); // Deadline misses function

// 4) Constraints: Scheduling policy
subject to {
    forall(a in A) {
        wf4: start[a] <= end[a];
        // Threads should end after their start time
        // ...
    }
```
We run an experiment with real data and two different objective functions. But optimal solutions were found shortly after the search started, even if the search took a much more time to terminate. It took a significant amount of time for the search to terminate.

Case Study (Driver)

Max: 50% for CPU usage, 550 ms for makespan

40
Conclusions

• We re-express test case generation for CPU usage requirements as a constraint optimization problem

• Approach:
  – A conceptual model for time abstractions
  – Mapping to MARTE
  – A constraint optimization formulation of the problem
  – Application of the approach to a real case study (albeit small)

• Using a constraint solver does not seem to scale to large numbers of threads

• Currently continues this work with Delphi using metaheuristic search: 430 tasks, powertrain systems, AUTOSAR
Testing Closed Loop Controllers

Complexity and amount of software used on vehicles’ Electronic Control Units (ECUs) grow rapidly

**Comfort and variety**

- More functions
- Safety and reliability

**Faster time-to-market**

- Greenhouse gas emission laws
- Less fuel consumption
Three major software development stages in the automotive domain
Major Challenges in MiL-SiL-HiL Testing

- Manual test case generation
- Complex functions at MiL, and large and integrated software/embedded systems at HiL
- Lack of precise requirements and testing Objectives
- Hard to interpret the testing results
The ultimate goal of MiL testing is to ensure that individual functions behave correctly and timely on any hardware configuration.
Main differences between automotive function testing and general software testing

- Continuous behaviour
- Time matters a lot
- Several configurations
  - Huge number of detailed physical measures/ranges/thresholds captured by calibration values
A Taxonomy of Automotive Functions

Different testing strategies are required for different types of functions

- **Computation**
  - Transforming: unit converters
  - Calculating: calculating positions, duty cycles, etc

- **Controlling**
  - State-Based: State machine controllers
  - Continuous: Closed-loop controllers (PID)
Controller Plant Model and its Requirements

Desired value $\rightarrow$ Error $\rightarrow$ Controller (SUT) $\rightarrow$ Plant Model $\rightarrow$ System output

- Actual value

(a) Liveness $x$ $\approx 0$
(b) Smoothness $v \leq w$
(c) Responsiveness $y \geq z$

### Desired Value & Actual Value
- Desired Value
- Actual Value

Desired Value (Red) | Actual Value (Blue)
Types of Requirements

(1) functional/liveness
SBPC function shall guarantee that the flap will move to and will stabilize at its desired position within $xx$ ms. Further, the flap shall reach within $yy\%$ of its desired position within $zz$ ms. In addition, after reaching $vv\%$ close to the desired position, the flap shall not jump to a position more than $ww\%$ away from its desired position.

(2) responsiveness/performance

(3) smoothness/safety
Search Elements

- **Search:**
  - Inputs: Initial and desired values, configuration parameters
  - (1+1) EA

- **Search Objective:**
  - Example requirement that we want to test: liveness
    ✓ \(|\text{Desired} - \text{Actual(final)}|\) = 0

For each set of inputs, we evaluate the objective function over the resulting simulation graphs:

- **Result:**
  - worst case scenarios or values to the input variables that are more likely to break the requirement at MiL level
  - stress test cases based on actual hardware (HiL)
MiL-Testing of Continuous Controllers

Objective Functions + Controller-plant model → Exploration → Overview Diagram → Domain Expert → List of Regions → Local Search → Test Scenarios

Graph Builder
Final vs. Initial

Time
Initial Desired
Final Desired
Generated Heatmap Diagrams

(a) Liveness

(b) Smoothness

(c) Responsiveness
Random Search vs. \((1+1)\)EA
Example with Responsiveness Analysis

Random

\((1+1)\) EA
Conclusions

- We found much worse scenarios during MiL testing than our partner had found so far.
- They are running them at the HiL level, where testing is much more expensive: MiL results -> test selection for HiL.
- On average, the results of the single-state search showed significant improvements over the result of the exploration algorithm.
- Configuration parameters?
- Need more exploitative or explorative search algorithms in different subregions.

**Figure 9.** Diagrams representing the landscape for two representative HeatMap regions: (a) Landscape for the region in Figure 7(b). (b) Landscape for the region in Figure 7(a).

Our observations show that the regions surrounded mostly by dark shaded regions typically have a clear gradient between the initial point of the search and the worst case point (see e.g., Figure 9(a)). However, dark regions located in a generally light shaded area have a noisier shape with several local optimum (see e.g., Figure 9(b)). It is known that for regions like Figure 9(a), exploitative search works best, while for those like Figure 9(b), explorative search is most suitable [10]. This is confirmed in our work where for Figure 9(a), our exploitative search, i.e., (1+1) EA with $c = 0.01$, is faster and more effective than random search, whereas for Figure 9(b), our search is slower than random search. We applied a more explorative version of (1+1) EA where we let $c = 0.03$ to the region in Figure 9(b). The result (Figure 10) shows that the more explorative (1+1) EA is now both faster and more effective than random search. We conjecture that, from the HeatMap diagrams, we can predict which search algorithm to use for the single-state search step. Specifically, for dark regions surrounded by dark shaded areas, we suggest an exploitative (1+1) EA (e.g., $c = 0.01$), while for dark regions located in light shaded areas, we recommend a more explorative (1+1) EA (e.g., $c = 0.03$).
Minimizing CPU Time Shortage Risks in Integrated Embedded Software

S. Nejati, M. Adedjouma
L. Briand, T. Bruckmann, C. Poull, 2013
Today’s cars rely on integrated systems

- Modular and independent development
- Huge opportunities for division of labor and outsourcing
- Need for reliable and effective integration processes
An overview of an integration process in the automotive domain
AUTOSAR captures the timing properties of the Runnables and their data dependencies

Runnables Glue Code:

```c
Task_o1() { /* cycle_o1 = 5 ms */
    if ( (timer % r1.period) == 0 ) do /* timer mod 10 == 0 */
        execute runnable r1
    if ( (timer % r2.period) == 0 ) do /* timer mod 20 == 0 */
        execute runnable r2
    if ( (timer % r3.period) == 0 ) do /* timer mod 100 == 0 */
        execute runnable r3
    ...
}
Task_o2() {
    ...
}
```
CPU Time Shortage in Integrated Embedded Software

- **Challenge**
  - Many OS tasks and their many runnables run within a limited available CPU time
    - The execution time of the runnables may exceed the OS cycles

- **Our goal**
  - Reducing the maximum CPU time used per time slot to be able to
    - Minimize the hardware cost
    - Enable addition of new functions incrementally
    - Reduce the possibility of overloading the CPU in practice
We minimize the maximum CPU usage using runnables offsets (delay times)

Inserting runnables’ offsets

Offsets have to be chosen such that
- the maximum CPU usage per time slot is minimized, and further,
- the runnables respect their period
- the runnables respect the OS cycles
- the runnables satisfy their synchronization constraints
Meta heuristic search algorithms

- The objective function is the max CPU usage of a 2s-simulation of runnables
- The search modifies one offset at a time, and updates other offsets only if timing constraints are violated
- Single-state search algorithms for discrete spaces (HC, Tabu)
- Used restart option to make them more explorative

Case Study: an automotive software system with 430 runnables

Running the system without offsets

Our optimized offset assignment
Comparing different search algorithms

Best CPU usage

Time to find
Best CPU usage

[Box plots showing comparisons between different search algorithms]
Comparing our best search algorithm with Random search

(a) Lowest max CPU usage values computed by HC within 70 ms over 100 different runs

(b) Lowest max CPU usage values computed by Random within 70 ms over 100 different runs

(c) Comparing average behavior of Random and HC in computing lowest max CPU usage values within 70 s and over 100 different runs
Conclusions

- We developed a number of search algorithms to compute offset values that reduce the max CPU time needed.

- Our evaluation shows that our approach is able to generate reasonably good results for a large automotive system and in a small amount of time.

- Due to large number of runnables and the orders of magnitude difference in runnables periods and their execution times, we were not able to use constraint solvers.
## MDE Projects Overview (< 5 years)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Notation</th>
<th>Automation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABB</td>
<td>Robot controller</td>
<td>Testing</td>
<td>UML</td>
<td>Model traversal for coverage criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cisco</td>
<td>Video conference</td>
<td>Testing (robustness)</td>
<td>UML profile</td>
<td>Metaheuristic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kongsberg Maritime</td>
<td>Fire and gas safety control system</td>
<td>Certification</td>
<td>SysML + req traceability</td>
<td>Slicing algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kongsberg Maritime</td>
<td>Oil&amp;gas, safety critical drivers</td>
<td>CPU usage analysis</td>
<td>UML+MARTE</td>
<td>Constraint Solver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMC</td>
<td>Subsea system</td>
<td>Automated configuration</td>
<td>UML profile</td>
<td>Constraint solver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WesternGeco</td>
<td>Marine seismic acquisition</td>
<td>Testing</td>
<td>UML profile + MARTE</td>
<td>Metaheuristic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNV</td>
<td>Marine and Energy, certification body</td>
<td>Compliance with safety standards</td>
<td>UML profile</td>
<td>Constraint verification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>Satellite operator</td>
<td>Testing</td>
<td>UML profile</td>
<td>Metaheuristic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delphi</td>
<td>Automotive systems</td>
<td>Testing (safety +performance)</td>
<td>Matlab/Simulink</td>
<td>Metaheuristic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lux. Tax department</td>
<td>Legal &amp; financial</td>
<td>Legal Req. QA &amp; testing</td>
<td>Under investigation</td>
<td>Under investigation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions I

• Models
  – UML profiles, MARTE, SysML, Matlab/Simulink, AUTOSAR
  – Never UML only: always some tailoring required
  – Always a specific modeling methodology, i.e., how to use the notation => semantics
  – Driven by
    • Information that is needed to guide automation, e.g., search, optimization
    • Appropriate level of abstraction: scalability, cost-effectiveness
    • Test/Verification objectives
    • Current modeling practices and skills
    • Reliance on standards
  – Modeling requirements must be “reasonable”, achievable, cost-effective for engineers
Conclusions II

• Automation
  – Many testing and verification problems can be re-expressed as a search/optimization problem
  – Search-based software engineering: Enabling automation for hard problems
  – But limited, though changing, applications to model-driven engineering
  – Models are needed to guide search and optimization
  – Many search techniques: Search algorithm, fitness function …
  – It is not easy to choose which one to use for a given problem
  – Empirical studies
  – Promising results, scalability (incomplete search)
Discussions

• Constraint solvers (e.g., Comet, ILOG Cplex, SICStus)
  – Is there an efficient constraint model for the problem at hand?
  – Can effective heuristics be found to order the search be found?
  – Better if problem can match a known standard problem, e.g., job shop scheduling
  – Tend to be strongly affected by small changes in the problem, e.g., allowing task pre-emption

• Model checking
  – Detailed operational models (e.g., state models, CTL), involving temporal properties (e.g., CTL)
  – Enough details to analyze statically or execute symbolically
  – These modeling requirements are usually not realistic in actual system development
  – Originally designed for checking temporal properties, as opposed to explicit timing properties
Discussions II

• Metaheuristic search
  – Tends to be more versatile, tailorable to a new problem
  – Entail lower modeling requirements
  – Can provide responses at any time, without systematically and deterministically searching the same part of the space at every run
  – “best solution found within time constraints”, not a proof, no certainty
  – But in practice (complex) models are not fully correct, there is no certainty
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