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Abstract—Service-Oriented Architectures (SOAs) offer attractive advantages in respect of reusability, interoperability and dynamics, and are nowadays widely accepted in industry. Achieving established software quality levels also with SOAs, while mandatory, is challenging, as, for instance, a SOA's dynamics and heterogeneity exacerbate verification issues like observability, controllability, and distribution. Regarding verification, we thus have to evolve available technology in order to enable the assessment of essential functional and non-functional system properties, including correctness, performance, stability, robustness and scalability. Adopting a model-based grey box testing approach that can exploit mixed description levels for individual (possibly 3rd party) services promises the required flexibility for successful development workflows. In this paper, we propose such a testing approach that, considering a SOA model, defines constraint satisfaction problems for the test case generation step. First empirical results for our approach are promising.

I. INTRODUCTION

Service-Oriented Architectures, SOAs for short, offer attractive advantages in respect of interoperability, reusability, dynamics and compatibility. Their essentially loose (i.e. dynamic) client and server coupling principle leveraged new R&D in challenging fields such as autonomic computing [1], adaptive systems [2], self-healing distributed systems [3] and cloud computing [4] that is considered an evolution of the SOA idea. Unsurprisingly, SOAs thus have been gaining in attention by software-related communities and are nowadays widely accepted in industry [5].

A crucial factor for the attractiveness and success of any software is its quality. Achieving the same, established quality levels as for non-SOA software is a mandatory business requirement, but a severe challenge in practice. In the context of testing, SOAs exacerbated issues [6] like observability, controllability and distribution [7], [8], [9] due to inherent traits like heterogeneity and dynamics. Traditional white or black box testing approaches also do not take full advantage of all available data: For SOAs, service data are offered at different levels for individual services, due to, for instance, Intellectual Property encapsulation. While a service provider might not disclose a service’s actual implementation, it has to offer some abstract model depicting its interfaces as well as pre and post conditions at least at that abstract level required for system integration purposes. For our work, we thus adopt a grey box strategy using a model-based testing [10] approach.

One advantage of developing a model-based approach is that we can effectively accommodate varying description levels for the individual services in an actual scenario. Adopting an established approach for the SOA domain also shortens the time needed to provide the essential technology for a corresponding example test and diagnosis [11] workflow like the one we envisioned for SOAs in [12], so that our focus is solely on scientific questions arising from the SOA domain.

Targeting grey box support, we show in this paper our model-based testing approach for SOAs that derives and solves a sequence of constraint satisfaction problems in order to derive a sensible test suite. In particular, we focus on SOA testing based on BPEL processes [13], where the underlying idea is to extract paths from these processes and check their feasibility via underlying path constraints obtained from the BPEL process elements, i.e., its activities. BPEL is an XML based business process executable language, whose primary scope is the orchestration of multiple heterogeneous web services for the fulfillment of a business process. BPEL processes can be abstract or executable, where in our work, we are interested in synchronous executable BPEL processes. BPEL activities can be categorized into basic and structured ones. Our approach handles most of the basic activities, including receive, reply, assign and invoke. Among the structured activities, we support if, while and sequence. The flow activity, which is used for concurrent execution of process parts, will be handled in future work. Here it is worth noting that when assuming that there is no (hidden) interaction between concurrent sub-processes, they can be easily handled in a sequential way.

This paper is structured as follows: We discuss the characteristics of our work in the context of related research in Section II, with Section III offering the specific details and features of our approach. Following a report of empirical results in Section IV, we conclude the paper in Section V discussing also perspectives for future work.

II. RELATED WORK

Exploiting constraints for testing has already been considered in the literature. Gotlieb and colleagues [14] presented an approach for extracting test cases from programs using a constraint representation of source code. Our work is quite close to Gotlieb et al.'s seminal paper on constraint based test generation. The papers differ, however, in the application domain and in the extraction of constraints. In our case we rely also on a service’s pre and post conditions, because, as a matter of fact, the implementation of a service is hardly available in the context of SOAs.

In the context of web service testing, researchers have reported on the use of mainly three model based testing techniques in literature, i.e., symbolic execution, petri nets,
Moreover, they also developed a tool for the generation of state space explosion problem inherent with model checking. Then are derived from the counter examples provided by the tool to generate test cases, e.g. the SPIN model checker. The actual test cases serve as input to, e.g. the BPELUnit tool. Specifications and properties then serve a test oracle problem. In addition, we use the Minion constraint solver to generate test data instead of relying on Lp.

Another closely related work is from Yan et al. [20], which relies on an extended Control Flow Graph (XCFG). The idea behind their work is to extract all sequential paths from the XCFG, and to combine them into concurrent test paths. From the concurrent test paths they collect constraints using backward substitution. In our approach, we transform each sequential path directly into a set of constraints, which is checked for satisfiability directly, using the Minion constraint solver. If the constraints are not satisfiable, we discard the corresponding path. Otherwise, the constraint solver returns values for all variables used to execute the path, which we directly generate test cases. However, our approach differs from Yuan’s work. Although we use the path coverage criterion for test path generation, we further add pre and post condition contracts to the test paths, in order to handle the test oracle problem. In addition, we use the Minion constraint solver to generate test data instead of relying on Lp.

For the execution of generated test cases, we use the work of Mayer [21], where we convert the abstract test cases manually to executable ones accepted by the BPELUnit tool. This tool supports both, simulated as well as real-life testing. Another advantage of using this tool is that it supports many BPEL engines like Active VOS [23], Oracle BPEL Process Manager[24], and Apache ODE [25]. For simulated testing, a BPEL process is not deployed, rather the intended engine is called through a debug API. In real-life testing mode, a business process is actually deployed onto the selected engine and the partner web services are tested using mocks.

The survey [26] by Zakaria et al. gives a very good comparison of different unit testing approaches applied to BPEL processes. A key issue they pointed out is the lack of an empirical evaluation. Surprisingly, only one out of 27 considered studies provides results on real-life BPEL processes.

Another widely discussed model based technique exploited in the context of web service testing is model checking. The general idea behind its application is to convert BPEL specifications into a formal modeling language like PROMELA [27] and test criteria into a formal property language like LTL [28]. Specifications and properties then serve as input to, e.g. the SPIN model checker. The actual test cases then are derived from the counter examples provided by the model checker. Zhen et al. [29] applied the same idea to web services and BPEL processes. There is a more enhanced work by the same authors, in which Zhou et al.[30] also address the state space explosion problem inherent with model checking. Moreover, they also developed a tool for the generation of JUnit test cases for automated test execution.

Model based testing techniques using Petri Nets have also been explored extensively. Petri Nets are used for modeling concurrent processes, and can be categorized into Plain Petri Nets [31], Colored Petri Nets [32] and High-level Petri Nets. Dong [33] developed a tool for test case generation of BPEL processes using High-level Petri Nets. The basic approach is to build a reachability graph from which test cases can be extracted. The approach has a very high space complexity.

Contract based testing techniques are also relevant to our work. This idea [34] has been applied in WSDL Web Service Technology [35], where the authors argue that the contracts applied at the model level are useful in the automated generation of test oracles, but can be very costly to implement. Also, the assertions are easier to apply in OWL WS technology but are difficult to implement in a WSDL based process model [15]. Dai et al. [36] combine this approach with Petri Nets. They specify contracts using a OWL-S model and transform them into Petri Nets. The test cases are generated based on a Petri Net behavioral analysis. In contrast, we combine contract based testing with symbolic execution in our approach.

While our work is based on classical symbolic execution, the usage of dynamic symbolic execution for test input generation has been explored extensively. Corresponding tools include DART [37], Pex [38], CUTE and JCUTE [39]. DART was the first attempt for dynamic symbolic execution of C programs. CUTE is an extension of DART for handling concurrent programs, where its java version is named JCUTE. Similarly “Pex” is a white box test generator for .NET [38]. The feasibility of execution paths is determined using the constraint solver Z3 [40].

III. TESTING BPEL PROCESSES USING CONSTRAINTS

Web Services are considered the life blood of a Service Oriented Architecture (SOA). The internal structure of services is usually not available, which distinguishes SOAs from ordinary software architectures. Therefore, these highly distributed, autonomous web services can only be tested as a black box. On the other hand, when considering service compositions that are usually defined using BPEL processes, a white box testing approach can be performed considering each service as a black box again. However, because BPEL processes are highly dynamic, i.e., actual partner services are not known prior to workflow execution time, there is still a need to tackle the issue of trust for the involved partner web services. Hence, BPEL process testing can be characterized as grey box testing. In order to automate test case generation, we have to introduce additional knowledge that captures the behavior of the black boxes, i.e., the BPEL services. It is worth noting that this augmentation knowledge has only to capture those parts of the behavior that are relevant for testing.

For example, have a look at the Bank Loan example [41] depicted in Figure 1. The business process starts upon receiving a loan request from a client. Low risk clients, who request loans up to 10,000 credits are issued an immediate approval. Requests from high risk clients or with loan...
amounts starting at 10,000 credits are decided upon only after thorough assessment. The BPEL services calculateRisk and thoroughAssessment take information like the loan amount and the client ID in order to compute an output. While the actual implementation of these services is unknown, their behavior has to be known to some extent. In this example, we assume that calculateRisk returns low if the amount is less than 1000 credits or the client has an excellent bank record. Such knowledge can be easily formalized and added to the process components using the concept of pre and post conditions.

Our contribution is based on model based testing of BPEL processes using symbolic execution. For our test case generation, we adopt a graph based search method that relies on a combination of path extraction from control flow graphs and constraint solving. Both, control flow graph and constraints, can be extracted from BPEL source code automatically. We aspire to address three issues in this paper: space complexity of test case generation, the test oracle problem and an empirical evaluation. We focus on the functional aspects of BPEL executable processes. While this area has been explored previously [26], there is still a lack of empirical studies.

### A. Basic definitions

Before discussing the test case generation algorithm in more detail, we briefly introduce the underlying basic definitions. We start with the definition of BPEL Flow Graphs, which are used as an intermediate representation of BPEL processes. As we consider only assign, receive, reply, invoke, while, if, and sequence activities in a BPEL process, its corresponding flow graph is very similar to the graphical representation of the original process. However, in case of flow constraints, the flow graph might be different, e.g., when representing concurrency in form of sequential computation (if possible).

**Definition 1 (BPEL Flow Graph):** A BPEL Flow Graph \( G \) is a tuple \( (V, E, s, F, \Gamma_A, \Gamma_C) \), where \( V \) are the vertices representing the activities of a BPEL process, \( E \) are the edges that correspond to the connections between BPEL activities, \( s \in V \) is the start vertex, \( F \subseteq V \) are the graph’s end vertices and \( \Gamma_A \) as well as \( \Gamma_C \) are functions that map vertices to activity assignments and conditions respectively.

A path in a BPEL Flow Graph is a sequence of vertices, leading from the start vertex to an end vertex. Formally, we define a path as follows:

**Definition 2 (Path):** Given a BPEL Flow Graph \( G \), a sequence of vertices \( v_1, \ldots, v_n \) is a path iff (1) for all \( i \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \) the vertex \( v_i \) is an element of \( V \), (2) \( v_1 \) is the start vertex \( s \), (3) \( v_n \in F \) is an end vertex, and (4) for all \( i \in \{1, \ldots, n-1\} \) we have that \( v_i \) and \( v_{i+1} \) are connected via some edge \( e \in E \).

In the following, we use paths to define a test case. In particular, we are interested in value assignments to variables in the BPEL process that cause the execution of a specific path. Note that it might be the case that such a value assignment does not exist. Hence, we have to check whether a path can be executed by setting the variables to certain values. For checking purposes, we now define path conditions comprising the assignments and conditions of the vertices in a path.

**Definition 3 (Path condition):** Given a path \( p = < v_1, \ldots, v_n > \) of a BPEL Flow Graph \( G \), \( p \)’s path condition is a sequence of assignments and conditions of its vertices, obtained from \( < \Gamma_A(v_1) \cup \Gamma_C(v_1), \ldots, \Gamma_A(v_n) \cup \Gamma_C(v_n) > \), where variables are replaced by variables with indices in order to ensure static single assignment form [42].

Using a static single assignment form (SSA) [42] ensures that every variable is defined only once in a program. In our case, we make use of indices for variables (i.e. temporal variable instances clocked by assignment events). At the beginning, every variable has index 0. If a variable is defined, i.e., occurs at the right side of an assignment, its index is increased by one. Every reference to this variable afterwards is using this new index, unless a redefinition of the variable occurs again. In this case, a new index is computed and used afterwards, and so on. Representing the path condition in SSA form, we can easily check feasibility using any constraint solver. For this purpose, the assignments have to be converted to conditions, i.e., by replacing the assignment operator with the sign of the equality operator and the conditions can be left as they are.

**Definition 4 (Feasible path):** A path \( p \) of a BPEL Flow Graph \( G \) is feasible if its path condition is satisfiable.

Using the previously stated definitions, we can easily define a test case.

**Definition 5 (Test Case):** A test case of a BPEL Flow Graph \( G \) is a variable assignment that makes a path \( p \) feasible.

Having only one test case is usually not sufficient for testing BPEL processes. Hence, we further define test suites.

**Definition 6 (Test Suite):** A test suite \( TS \) for a BPEL Flow Graph \( G \) is a set of test cases.

Computing a test suite for a BPEL process can be easily done by computing feasible paths. We discuss this process in more detail in the following subsection.

### B. BPEL Test Case Generation

Figure 2 comprises our test case generation algorithm. The algorithm takes the BPEL Flow Graph \( G \) and the maximum path length \( \text{MaxLen} \) as inputs and computes feasible test cases. Note that \( \text{MaxLen} \) has to be equal or larger than the length of the smallest path in \( G \) from the start to an end vertex. The algorithm is search based and traverses the flow graph using a depth-first search strategy for extracting paths. Afterwards, the path conditions are computed and checked for consistency. If the path condition is feasible, the variable assignments that
The following example illustrates our conversion process. For the Bank loan example described earlier (see Figure 1), the SSA form of that path with high loan amounts is as follows:

1: input_0 > 0
2: loan_1 = input_0
3: loan_1 > 10000
4: AssessRiskPLRequest_1 = loan_1
5: output_1 = AssessRiskPLResponse_0

The statement in Line 1 is the pre-condition defined on the loan request variable in the contract specification step. Line 2 is simply an assignment activity in the BPEL process, while the third line denotes the representation of the if condition. The “AssessRiskPLRequest” is the BPEL variable responsible for passing the “loan” amount to the “Assessment” web service. The response from the partner web service is received by the “AssessRiskPLResponse” variable. The last statement shows the SSA representation of the Reply BPEL activity.

- Constraint conversion: The second step involves the conversion of SSA statements into their corresponding constraints. The representation of the conditions and assignments resulting from the SSA conversion as constraints is simple and requires basically nothing else than a direct mapping from variables to constraint variables and from the conditions to assignments to their respective representation. The concrete representation of constraints depends on the used constraint solver. In our implementation we make use of MINION [18]. MINION is an out of the box, open source constraint solver. Its syntax requires a little more effort on modeling the constraints than other constraint solvers, e.g., it does not support different operators to be used within one constraint. In order to illustrate the constraint conversion we show the constraint representation for the path from the Bank Loan example using MINION constraints.

\begin{align*}
\text{ineq}(0, \text{input}_0, -1) \\
\text{eq}(\text{loan}_1, \text{input}_0) \\
\text{ineq}(10000, \text{loan}_1, -1) \\
\text{eq}(\text{AssessRiskPLRequest}_1, \text{loan}_1) \\
\text{eq}(\text{output}_1, \text{AssessRiskPLResponse}_0)
\end{align*}

The constraint \text{ineq}(x, y, k) ensures that \(x \leq y + k\), and \text{eq} states that both variables used as parameters have to have the same value.

IV. EMPIRICAL EVALUATION

For first empirical results, we implemented the proposed approach making use of the MINION constraint solver [18], and BPELUnit [22] for unit test execution, where the idea is to automatically generate tests using the proposed approach. Furthermore, our implementation relies on the Eclipse BPEL Designer\footnote{http://www.eclipse.org/bpel/} and the Apache ODE deployment engine [25]. We considered three examples in our tests, namely LoanApproval

\begin{enumerate}
\item[	exttt{procedure}] TEST CASE GENERATION($G$,MaxLen)
\item Compute all possible paths $P$ up to length MaxLen.
\item for Each path $p \in P$ do
\item Compute the path condition of a path $p$
\item Check this path condition for consistency (using a constraint solver)
\item if the constraints are satisfied then
\item Save the solution, i.e., the variable assignments coming from the constraint solver, as a feasible test case.
\item end if
\item end for
\item Return all stored solutions.
\item end procedure
\end{enumerate}

Fig. 2. BPEL Test Case Generation algorithm

result from such a check are saved as test case. Finally, the algorithm returns a test suite.

In the following, we discuss the different steps of the algorithm and those activities that have to be carried out in more detail. In particular, we focus on the representation of the path conditions as constraint satisfaction problem (CSP). Note that the approach is similar to symbolic execution, which is very well known in testing [43]. Similar to symbolic execution, conditions are computed which belong to a particular execution path. In our case, we convert each path condition of a path into a constraint satisfaction problem. Unlike earlier work, e.g., [44], the conversion algorithm works as follows:

- SSA conversion: The static single assignment (SSA) form is an intermediate representation of a program such that no two left-side variables share the same name. This intermediate representation enables an easier conversion into a CSP. The basic rules used for the conversion of a BPEL path into its SSA representation are listed below:

  - We convert an \textit{Assign} activity by adding an index to a \textit{To} variable each time the variable is defined, i.e. declared as the TO variable. If a variable is redefined, the index is incremented so as to satisfy the SSA property. The index of a \textit{From} variable i.e. referenced variable is equal to the last definition of the variable.

  - We convert \textit{Receive} and \textit{Reply} activities into assignments.

  - \textit{Invoke} is easily converted into assignments, where the right hand side variable is the “input variable” and the left side variable is the “output variable”.

  - We convert the structured activity \textit{If} in two steps: 1) the condition is saved in an auxiliary variable. 2) each assign or invoke activity is converted according to the above rule. 3) The condition variable is set to true in case of an “if ” or “else if” branch, but to false in case of an “else” branch.

  - The \textit{while} structure is converted similarly to \textit{if}, with the exception that the condition is always set to true. The loop is repeated up till the maximum length specified by the tester.

- Constraint conversion: The second step involves the conversion of SSA statements into their corresponding constraints. The representation of the conditions and assignments resulting from the SSA conversion as constraints is simple and requires basically nothing else than a direct mapping from variables to constraint variables and from the conditions to assignments to their respective representation. The concrete representation of constraints depends on the used constraint solver. In our implementation we make use of MINION [18]. MINION is an out of the box, open source constraint solver. Its syntax requires a little more effort on modeling the constraints than other constraint solvers, e.g., it does not support different operators to be used within one constraint. In order to illustrate the constraint conversion we show the constraint representation for the path from the Bank Loan example using MINION constraints.
as described earlier, ATM\textsuperscript{2}, and a simple hand-crafted example comprising a while loop. The first two examples were tailored in order to remove flow and fault handling BPEL constructs, which are currently not supported by our implementation. Table I gives a brief description of activities used in these examples.

In the current implementation, the test cases are transformed manually to BPELUnit test cases. We are currently working on a prototype where BPELUnit tests are automatically computed. We carried out the experiments using a MacBook Pro 2.4 GHz Intel Core i5, 4 GB 1333 MHz DDR3, under OSX 10.7.2 operating system. The obtained figures are depicted in Table II. In this table we state the following results: the number of BPEL activities in any process $n$, the number of paths $p$ which is in our case equal to the number of derived test cases, the maximum path length $\text{maxLen}$ varying from 10 to 50 (in case of examples with while loops), the minimum path length of the BPEL process $\text{minP}$, the maximum path length of the BPEL Process $\text{maxP}$, the minimum number of Minion constraints $\text{minC}$, the maximum number of Minion constraints $\text{maxC}$. The total time $\text{totalT}$ represents the total time in milliseconds taken to run an experiment. The time for constraint solving used to check feasibility of paths was always very small ranging from 11 to 26 milliseconds and is therefore omitted in the table.

From the results we see that even for a vast amount of paths, computation time never exceeds half an hour, which seems to be acceptable from a practical point of view. However, the underlying examples are rather small and improvements regarding the selection of paths are necessary. One idea here is to make use of mutation scores and heuristics in order to generate a test suite. Note that the current approach ensures activity and path coverage with respect to the pre-specified maximum path length.

V. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we discussed the use of constraints for test case generation in the context of SOA and in particular BPEL processes. We proposed a test case generation approach that focuses on functional testing and combines constraints that are extracted from the BPEL process activities directly with pre and post conditions for called services. The underlying idea of the approach is to extract paths from the process and to check feasibility using the corresponding path constraints. First empirical results show that constraint solving can be effectively used for SOA test case generation. However, computing all paths might be infeasible for larger BPEL processes, and thus optional means for terminating the test case generation on the fly are necessary. In particular, using mutation score or source code based metrics other than path and activity coverage might help in this respect.

In the near future, we will improve our test case generation using mutation scores and coverage. Moreover, in the context of our envisioned test and diagnosis workflow for SOAs [12], we plan to combine testing with fault localization similar to [45]. Here the question is how to adapt the concept of distinguishing test cases, which heavily relies on mutations in the SOA domain. Another research area of interest is the use of constraints for verification purposes (see for example [46]). Aside functional testing, non-functional testing is aimed at, which is of specific interest for SOAs. Checking the fulfillment of service level agreements (SLAs) like the maximum time for responses or checking the automated adaptation of the underlying SOA structure in case of faults seems to be a promising area. To the best of our knowledge, the question about the potential of using constraints for this purpose has not been sufficiently answered.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

We would like to thank Schahram Dustdar, Philipp Leitner, and Stefan Schulte for fruitful discussions on the research presented in this paper. This work is partially supported by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF): P23313-N23, P22959-N23.

REFERENCES


\textsuperscript{2}http://docs.jboss.com/jbpm/bpel/v1.1/aseuguide/tutorial.atm.html
TABLE II
EMPIRICAL RESULTS OBTAINED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prog</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>maxLen</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>minP</th>
<th>maxP</th>
<th>minC</th>
<th>maxC</th>
<th>totalT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loan</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atm</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1,312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1,367</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>108,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12,950</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1,372,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6,194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>13,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>23,849</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


