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**Abstract**— A quality-driven approach to software development and testing demands that, ultimately, the requirements of stakeholders be *validated* against the *actual behavior* of an implementation under test (IUT). Current approaches and tools for testing fall into one of two categories: code-centric or model-centric. In this paper we review typical tools offered in each of these two categories, in order to establish the ability of such tools to support validation against *actual behavior*. We postulate that such support requires that test cases be both a) traceable back to the requirements of stakeholders and b) executed using an actual IUT in order to determine their outcome based on the *actual behavior* of an IUT. We observe that, in general, code-based testing tools fail to offer traceability between stakeholders' requirements and test cases. In contrast, in model-based testing, tests are generated from and traceable back to models, but they are typically disconnected from an actual IUT. Thus, we argue that validation against *actual behavior* remains a challenge for most existing code-centric and model-centric testing tools. We conclude by suggesting some essential functionality for a testing tool that could support the validation of the requirements of stakeholders against the *actual behavior* of an IUT.
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I. INTRODUCTION

A quality-driven approach to software development and testing demands that, ultimately, the requirements of stakeholders be *validated* against the *actual behavior* of an implementation under test (IUT) [1]. More precisely, in this paper, we are concerned with a specific facet of validation, namely the *testing* (as opposed to the gathering or engineering) of stakeholders' requirements against the *actual behavior* of an IUT. (We will avoid calling such testing 'conformance testing' as that expression in fact can refer to several similar but distinct forms of testing.)

Testing constitutes one of the most expensive aspects of software development [1, 2, 3]: Due to the reduction of time and skilled personnel, software is often not tested as thoroughly as it should be. According to Grieskamp [2] from Microsoft Research, current testing practices are not only laborious and expensive but often unsystematic, lacking an engineering methodology and discipline and adequate tool support. In this paper, we will first review *some* of the existing tools for testing: section II will address code-centric ones, and section III, model-based ones. Throughout this review, our concern will be with the ability of an approach/tool to capture *and* test stakeholders' requirements against the actual behavior of an IUT. Then, in section IV, we will discuss two 'hybrid' approaches that appear to be promising but turn out to not be. We conclude by suggesting some essential functionality for a testing tool that could support the validation of such requirements against the *actual behavior* of an IUT.

Before proceeding with our review, it is important to remark that **modeling tools** are mainly used to create models of (some aspects of) an IUT. Examples of modeling tools include IBM Rational Rose [4], Borland Together [5], and Telelogic’s (now IBM) Tau [6], among many others. Such tools provide support for model specification, analysis, and maintenance. While requirements can be modeled within (e.g., as use cases in UML), and even possibly semantically linked to other models supported by such tools, the latter generally do *not* have the ability to generate test cases, let alone run and monitor them against an actual (even possibly generated) IUT. Consequently, they are not relevant here as they are not meant to address the problem at hand.

Similarly, a **test automation framework** (e.g., Rational Robot by IBM [7], SmarteScript [8], and HP’s Functional Testing Software [9]) does not support validation *per se*. Let us elaborate. Such a framework generally accepts tests that *already* have been manually created, automatically generated, or pre-recorded. Such test cases must be readily executable on the relevant IUT. The automation framework then executes the test sequences without human interaction. With respect to the problem at hand, that is, to the testing of stakeholders' requirements against the actual behavior of an IUT, such frameworks present at least two specific problems:
- Requirements are not captured anywhere (but instead embedded implicitly in test cases) and thus traceability between requirements and test cases is inexistent.

- Test cases in such frameworks are generally limited to unit testing (i.e., testing of procedures [3]) and very simple scenario testing [3] (e.g., exercising a graphical user interface). Semantically, the expression of requirements relevant to stakeholders is far more complex [2].

Consequently, we will not discuss further such frameworks.

Finally, we must emphasize that, in the context of this paper, testing notations in vacuo are of no interest here. For example, TTCN-3 (the Tree and Tabular Combined Notation) [10] is an international standard that is widely used to capture functional test cases. But its syntax and semantics are of little importance here: TTCN is purely descriptive and offers no operational semantics per se. It is only relevant here inasmuch as it used in some of the tools we will discuss later. Similarly, the UML's use cases and interaction diagrams [3, 11] and Message Sequence Charts [12] are modeling notations used to capture scenarios. Capturing a scenario can be semantically challenging [2] yet remains a much simpler task than building a tool capable of setting up this scenario in an IUT, monitoring its multiple (possibly concurrent) executions at run time, and reporting on the outcomes of the later [2, 3]. Consequently, our emphasis throughout the rest of this paper will be first and foremost on tools, as opposed to pencil and paper approaches to validation and testing.

II. CODE-BASED TESTING

Current approaches to validation and testing fall into two categories: code-centric and model-centric. A code-centric approach to validation and testing, such as Test-Driven Development (TDD) [13], typically uses test cases (as opposed to more abstract tests [3]) written at the implementation level in order to guide development. A TDD approach begins by creating a test case addressing one or more requirements of a software system being developed. The test case is executed against this system, usually resulting in a failure. Code is then added to the system until the test case succeeds. The process repeats until all relevant requirements have been satisfied, but there is little effort to scope and capture such requirements in a model! In other words, traceability between requirements and test cases (which is an essential facet of validation) is absent. Instead, test cases are purely implementation-driven and implementation-specific (as opposed to proceeding from the requirements of stakeholders).

Code-based testing tools (such Java's JUnit [14] and its several adaptations to different languages (e.g., [15]), and very recently AutoTest [2]) generally allow for unit tests (i.e., tests pertaining to a procedure) to be specified in, or automatically generated from, code. Thus, clearly such tests are implementation-specific and indeed difficult (nay impossible) to trace back to the requirements of stakeholders (which are typically implementation-independent).

FindBugs, from the University of Maryland, is a tool designed to look for bugs in Java programs [16]. Unlike traditional code-based testing tools, where tests are written in code, FindBugs uses the concept of bug patterns. A bug pattern is a code idiom that often translates into an error. Bug patterns look for difficult language features, misunderstood API methods, misunderstood invariants when code is modified, and regular mistakes such as typos and incorrect operator usage. FindBugs operates by using static analysis [3] to inspect Java byte code for the occurrence of a bug pattern. Once a bug pattern is found it is reported to the user. However, FindBugs generates a high degree of false positives (about 50% in the worst case). Similar tools such as FxCop [17] and PREFast for drivers [18], both by Microsoft, fall into the same category of code-based static analyzers. FxCop ensures that a given NET assembly is in conformance with the programming and design rules outlined in the Microsoft.NET Framework Design Guidelines. PREFast is a static analyzer for for C and C++ driver code. It performs checks for resource-object leaks, memory leaks, and stricter type checking than found in the C/C++ compiler. These tools use a pattern represented either in source code or low-level byte code and search for its existence (or absence) within the IUT. It is these patterns that represent the code model.

In the same vein, Splint (Secure Programming Lite) is a tool for statically checking C programs [19]. Checks include security vulnerabilities, coding mistakes, and Design-by-Contract constraints [20]. The specification of such checks is performed by annotating the source code using C style comments. Then the Splint tool evaluates the checks against the source code using a lightweight static analysis technique [21]. (Additional language-specific tools in the Lint family include JLint (Java), JsLint (JavaScript) and PyLint (Python)).

Static analyzers are not relevant to the testing of stakeholders' requirements against the actual behavior of an IUT simply because they are not concerned with such requirements.

Tools like JUnit, FindBugs, and Splint are only a few of the many types of code-based tools. Additional code-based tools include (non-exhaustively): design-by-contract [20] ones (such as Jcontract [22] and Pex with Microsoft code contracts [23]); comprehensive ones such as LDRA Testbed [24] and CodeSWAT products [25] (which tackle most aspects of testing); Axivion Bauhaus Suite [26] (for software erosion); ClockSharp [27] (for enforcing programming rules); Fortify [28] (for verifying security); and several static code analyzers used for specific purposes such as code coverage, metrics, etc. (e.g., Coverity Prevent [29], HP Code Advisor [30], Klockwork K7 [31], and IBM's Rational Logiscope [32]). Comparisons between some of these tools can be found in [33] and [34].

Many more testing tools and even categories of code-centric testing tools exist. But the point we want to emphasize is that, by definition, such tools use code for the expression of test cases. In other words, the latter are not

---

1 A test case can in fact be viewed as an instantiation of a test for a specific IUT [3].
derived from models (in which case, we would necessarily be dealing with a model-based approach, by definition). The absence of a model of the requirements to test against an IUT is problematic: without such a model, the IUT can be debugged and verified, but validation per se is not possible.

Let us turn to model-based approaches and tools.

III. MODEL-BASED TESTING

In her seminal review of the state-of-the-art in software testing, Bertolino [35] writes: “A great deal of research focuses nowadays on model-based testing. The leading idea is to use models defined in software construction to drive the testing process, in particular to automatically generate the test cases. The pragmatic approach that testing research takes is that of following what is the current trend in modeling: whichever be the notation used, say e.g. UML or Z, we try to adapt to it a testing technique as effectively as possible [...].”

Model-Based Testing (MBT) involves the derivation of test cases, in whole or in part, from a model that describes at least some of the aspects of the IUT. Typically, MBT is the automation of a black-box test design [35]. More precisely, a MBT tool uses various algorithms and strategies to generate tests from a behavioral model of the IUT. Such a model is usually a partial representation of the IUT’s behavior, ‘partial’ because the model abstracts away some of the implementation details. Tests cases derived from such a model are functional ones expressed at the same level of abstraction as the model. Such test cases are grouped together to form an abstract test suite. Such an abstract test suite cannot be directly executed against an IUT because the test cases are not at the same level of abstraction as the code. Therefore, the abstract test suite must be ‘transformed’ into an executable test suite that can run against an IUT. Such a transformation is performed, typically manually, by mapping each abstract (model-generated) test case to a concrete test case suitable for execution on a particular IUT. The unavoidable difficulty with such a transformation is to have it establish and maintain traceability between its inputs and outputs (especially if this transformation is performed manually).

Using the definition for a model-based test generator put forth by Hartman [36], we remark that model-based tools must have the following two characteristics:

1. The model must define a specification (i.e., a 'testable model' [3] of some of the behavior) of an IUT, and
2. The tool must supply a set of test generation directives that guide test case generation.

We focus here on MBT tools that fulfill these two characteristics. In general such tools accept a specification, an IUT, and a test purpose [2]. The tools use the specification to create an internal model, usually based on a Finite State Machine (FSM) or FSM-like representation. The model is then traversed according to the test purpose, leading to the generation of test cases. The test cases can be specified using different notations, such as TTCN [10] or an XML schema. Such test cases typically capture, albeit at an abstract level, stimuli for an IUT and corresponding expected outputs from this IUT (which confirms the black-box nature of such test cases).

As a first example, consider Lutess [37] that accepts three elements as input for the automatic generation of a testing harness: a test sequence generator, the IUT, and an oracle [3]. The test sequence generator is derived from an environment description written in the synchronous dataflow language Lustre [38]. The description is composed of a set of constraints that describe the set of 'interesting' test sequences, operational profiles, properties to be tested, and behavioral patterns. The environment description can be viewed as a program that observes the input/output stream of the IUT (which is limited to Booleans!!). The environment then determines if a given test sequence is realistic with respect to the IUT, and then the oracle determines correctness. The oracle and the IUT can be provided in one of two ways. The first is as a synchronous program, and Lutess will handle the IUT as a black box (with only Boolean I/O). The second way is to supply the IUT as a program written in Lustre. In this case, Lutess automatically compiles and integrates this model of an actual IUT into the test harness.

Lurette [39] is similar to Lutess but allows for numerical input/output monitoring of the IUT. Whereas Lutess and Lurette start all test sequence generation from an initial state, GATEL [40] starts with a set of constraints on the last state of a test sequence. In all of these tools however, what the behavioral model of an IUT can observe with respect to the actual execution is extremely constrained.

The use of Extended Finite State Machines (EFSMs) dominates MBT approaches. For example, an AutoFocus [41] model is a hierarchical set of time-synchronous communicating EFSMs used to model distributed systems. The graphical models created in AutoFocus can be used for both test generation (using logic programming, as for GATEL!) and execution. But it is important to understand that 'test execution' consists of symbolic execution, that is, is carried out using the EFSMs, not the actual IUT. The latter (which is taken to be a black-box binary) is merely stimulated in order for it to generate the outputs that act as triggers for the transitions of the EFSMs.

The Conformance Kit was developed in the early 1990s by KPN research to support the automatic testing of protocol implementations [42]. Like many other tools such as AutoFocus, this kit uses EFSMs to represent system specifications. In 1995, Philips extended the Conformance Kit creating a set of tools called the Philips Automated Conformance Tester (PHACT) [43]. PHACT extends the Conformance Kit with the ability to execute the computed TTCN-2 test cases against an IUT. PHACT uses three elements for test case execution: the supervisor, the stimulator, and the observer. For each candidate IUT, a dedicated stimulator and observer must be created. As with AutoFocus, the stimulator and the observer interact directly (albeit, as usual, in a very constrained way) with the IUT. Again, 'test execution' consists in symbolic execution and rests on an EFSM simulator.

In the same vein, TorX is both an architecture for a flexible open testing tool for test case derivation and execution, and an implementation of such a tool [44]. TorX can be used with any modeling language that can be
expressed as a Labeled Transition System (LTS). Its test execution rests on an LTS simulator (which is very similar to an EFSM simulator).

As another example, Automated Generation and Execution of test suites for Distributed component-based Software (AGEDIS) [36] was a project running from October 2000 until the end of 2003. The goal of the AGEDIS project was to develop a methodology and tools for the automation of software testing, with emphasis on distributed component-based software systems. The AGEDIS Modeling Language (AML) is a UML 1.4 profile that serves as the behavioral modeling language. The behavior of each class is defined with a state machine using an action language. In other words, as usual, test execution rests on some kind of state machine simulator, but the specification language used to model the behavior of an IUT varies from tool to tool.

Similarly, an executable specification language, called Abstract State Machine Language (AsmL), was developed by the Foundations of Software Engineering (FSE) group at Microsoft Research [45]. AsmL has a built-in conformance test facility that is based on two steps. First, the AsmL specification is transformed into a FSM, and then well-known FSM-based algorithms [46] are used to generate a test suite. The process of generating an FSM out of an AsmL is a difficult task that requires considerable expertise from the tester for defining both a suitable equivalence relation and a relevance condition that prunes the state space into something manageable. It is also problematic that the AsmL to FSM transformation may yield a FSM that is non-deterministic. The AsmL test generator cannot handle non-deterministic FSMs. Microsoft Research is working to address the non-deterministic FSM generation issue and state space explosion problems in their current state-of-the-art tool: Spec Explorer [47]. Before turning to that tool, it is important to understand that the semantic richness and the resulting semantic challenges of AsmL are far greater than those of previous tools. Indeed, the complexities involved in test specification and execution using AsmL emphasize the simplicity (if not oversimplification) of previous MBT approaches.

Spec Explorer is a tool for testing reactive, object-oriented systems. The inputs and outputs can be viewed as parameterized action labels that represent the invocations of methods with dynamically created object instances and other complex data structures.

A model in Spec Explorer is specified using Spec# [48]. Spec# is a textual programming language that includes and extends C#. In addition to the functionality provided by C#, Spec# adds pre- and post-conditions, high-level data types, logical quantifiers (e.g., forAll and Exists), and a simple form of scenarios (which is generally absent in other state-based approaches). A Spec# model can be viewed as a program. It can be compiled and executed just like a C# program. A Spec# model can call .NET framework code, and the model can be explored using Spec Explorer (a kind of state machine simulator). More precisely, using a model specified in Spec#, Spec Explorer extracts a representative behavior of the system according to user-defined parameters for scenario control. Spec Explorer accomplishes this using a state exploration algorithm that works as follows: In a given model, the current state determines the next possible invocations (e.g., procedure calls to an actual IUT). An invocation is denoted by an action/parameter combination that is enabled by the preconditions in the current state. Spec Explorer then computes the successor states for each invocation. The process is repeated until there are no more states or invocations to explore. Parameters used for these invocations are provided by state dependent parameter generators. Enabledness is determined by the precondition of an action. Spec Explorer also must use heuristics to prune the generated state space.

Spec Explorer indicates that an IUT conforms to the model if the following conditions are met:

• The IUT must be able to perform all transitions outgoing from the active state.
• The IUT must produce no transitions other than those outgoing from a passive state.
• Every test must terminate in an expected accepting state.

If the IUT is a non-distributed .NET program, then Spec Explorer will automatically generate the testing harness. In other cases, the tester is required to write a wrapper around a distributed IUT.

In our opinion, Spec Explorer constitutes the state-of-art in MBT tools (due to the use of Spec# to capture a detailed model of the behavior, which can be exercised via the use of scenarios [47]). But ultimately, as with other MBT approaches, requirements are not tested against an actual IUT but rather against a model of the behavior of this IUT. That is, the executability of tests (e.g., for requirements) occurs in the semantic space of a specification language and is most often rooted in the concept of state exploration. For example, Spec# refers to queues of unreceived messages, a notion remote from any actual implementation.2

IV. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Whereas the development of an IUT by designers is unavoidable (because it constitutes the artifact to test in order to validate requirements), the creation of a model-based testable model [3] rooted in the semantics of a particular specification language is likely to represent a significant investment of time that does not eliminate the necessity of also testing requirements directly against the IUT. Generally, this necessity is downplayed, if not ignored, by current MBT approaches (e.g., [49]) and tools (e.g., [50]). More specifically, IUT-independent models are used to generate tests. Then, in order to bridge the gap between such abstract tests and an actual IUT, the widespread solution consists in using ‘glue code’. That is, tests obtained from the models are subsequently coded or, more precisely, have some of their corresponding test cases coded (typically manually). In other words, glue code requires a programmer to make abstract tests become executable. The resulting code (which

2 Many other specification languages (e.g., SDL, LOTOS, ESTELLE, CHILL, etc.) have been proposed over the years and have been surveyed extensively elsewhere. Semantically, they are generally rooted in state machines and, consequently, do not add to this discussion.
includes not only executable test cases but also test drivers and oracles [3] must be handcrafted and may end up not corresponding to the abstract tests. In other words, as mentioned in section II, traceability is likely to be a serious problem. Moreover, this glue code is implementation-specific: both its reusability across several IUTs and its maintainability are highly problematic. In summary, the creation of glue code is a non-automated endeavor that is time-consuming and just as error-prone as development of the original IUT.

The significant investment made in the creation of a more or less detailed model of the behavior of an IUT may be leveraged by attempting to explicitly tie this model to an IUT. Consider, for example, the TOTEM method proposed by Briand and Labiche [51]. In summary, that work explains how to generate test cases from UML activity diagrams used to capture use cases. The claim is made that the models of their simple example are 'linked' to an actual implementation in Java via the use of 'contracts' expressed in UML's Object Constraint Language (OCL) [52]. We see three immediate problems with such an approach:

First, models involving OCL are tightly coupled to specific implementation details. For example, OCL expressions must refer explicitly to the names of the attributes and operations of a class. Thus, the use of OCL is not desirable for expressing requirements: any change to the implementation could ripple into OCL expressions meant to address IUT-independent requirements... This is counter-intuitive and leads to a maintenance nightmare. In other words, the point to be grasped is that OCL is not adequate for the capturing of IUT-independent requirements (which constitute the foundations of MBT).

Second, the need to use code-centric tools (such as [53, 54]) to generate test cases from OCL highlights the fact that such OCL statements are not only tied to a specific IUT, but most importantly, disconnected from the other models proposed for TOTEM! In other words, the tests generated from OCL statements are essentially semantically unrelated to the other tests generated in TOTEM...

Third, OCL does not address interactions between components (i.e., scenarios). Thus, the scenarios generated from TOTEM's models remain completely disconnected from any IUT.

In summary, attempting to combine MBT concepts (e.g., the generation of tests from activity diagrams) with code-centric concepts (such as OCL and its related test case generators) does not necessarily enable the validation of IUT-independent requirements against an actual IUT. Quite the contrary, it may lead to two separate, semantically disconnected, sets of artifacts (as in TOTEM): IUT-independent ones (e.g., scenarios in TOTEM) and IUT-specific ones (e.g., TOTEM's OCL expressions).

The separation (i.e., lack of traceability) between IUT-independent models and IUT-specific test cases appears to have been avoided in tools such as Cucumber, which "lets software development teams describe how software should behave in plain text. The text is written in a business-readable domain-specific language and serves as documentation, automated tests and development-aid all rolled into one format." [55]. Cucumber and similar tools proceed from Behavior Driven Development (BDD) [56], which "helps you do TDD right". Scrutinizing the few documents that explain this most recent proposal, one realizes that BDD is in fact TDD [13] augmented with a user-friendly language for expressing scenarios (which had no way to be captured in TDD). Semantically, this business-readable (i.e., stakeholder-friendly) specification language is utterly simplistic, as are the available examples. We are far, extremely far, for the semantic richness of Spec# [48] and the subtle complexities of expressing intricate scenario interrelationships [57]. Moreover, further study of Cucumber and BDD reveals that the BDD approach rests on the ability to code a priori a transformation from the business-readable specification language to a specific programming language (be it Ruby, Java, etc.). Ultimately, Cucumber and similar tools are 'story' (or scenario) runners but offer no traceability: it is left to their users to manually associate specific 'code snippets' to each step of each scenario. Consequently, from an industrial viewpoint, this approach is not only semantically simplistic but also pragmatically unscalable...

Thus, the question remains: how is a tool to support the validation of IUT-independent (stakeholder readable) requirements against the actual behavior of an IUT? We believe the answer lies in the notion of explicit traceability links (which we call bindings) between an IUT-independent testable requirements model and specific components of an IUT. This idea has been developed at length elsewhere [58, 59, 60]. Let us summarize it here:

1) Code-centric approaches to the validation of stakeholders' requirements against the actual behavior of an IUT appear to be doomed: such requirements must be captured in some IUT-independent model. And, ideally, this model should be testable against several possible candidate IUTs. Thus, we believe validation against actual behavior entails an MBT approach.

2) This testable requirements model (TRM) must enable the generation of tests and/or test cases, ultimately executable on some IUT. Following Grieskamp's [2] observation that industrial users of MBT approaches prefer scenario-based semantics (over state-based semantics and their problem with state explosion), the semantics of a TRM should be rooted in the notions of responsibilities and scenarios. Scenarios are conceptualized as grammars of responsibilities [50]. Each responsibility represents a simple action or task, such as the saving of a file, or the firing of an event. Intuitively, a responsibility is either bound to a procedure within an IUT, or the responsibility is to be decomposed into a sub-grammar of responsibilities. Semantically, scenarios can be captured in one of several formats from which tests can be extracted (e.g., [49, 50, 51]). Furthermore, the addition of pre- and post-conditions [20] to responsibilities provides for a simple way to obtain more fine-grained tests.

3) The TRM must be traceable 'down' to elements of an IUT. More precisely, types and responsibilities used in a TRM must be explicitly linked to types and procedures (or chains of procedures) of an IUT. Such mappings consequently allow for scenarios of the TRM to be easily
transformed into paths of procedures, and tests to be transformed into IUT-specific test cases. The setting up and maintenance of such explicit traceability links is likely to represent a considerable amount of tedious work over the iterations of a development lifecycle. Consequently, such bindings should ideally be automatically inferred, saved and updated by a tool (but overridable by users to deal with situations in which the inference rules used by such a tool to obtain these bindings would be inadequate).

A prototype of such a tool to support the validation of IUT-independent (stakeholder readable) requirements against the actual behavior of an IUT has been built \[58, 59\] and tried out in the context of a graduate course in software engineering \[60\]. While experimentation with this prototype demonstrates the feasibility of such a tool, it also emphasizes the need for supporting 'intelligent traceability' (with respect to the creation, maintenance and evolution of bindings). That is, while bindings do allow to bridge between an IUT-independent requirements model and an actual IUT, their use must be automated as much as possible in order to avoid being overwhelmed by the large number of bindings to maintain when working with non-trivial applications (as is the case in the extensive examples we developed in \[58\]).
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