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1. Introduction

Feature interaction refers to situations where a combination of different services behaves differently than expected from the single services’ behaviors. In today’s intelligent telecommunication networks, feature interaction is considered a major obstacle to the introduction of new features.

We propose a new interaction detection approach which uses bounded model checking. The central idea behind bounded model checking is to reduce the model checking problem to the propositional satisfiability (SAT) checking problem and to look for counterexamples that are shorter than some fixed length k for a given property.

In the literature, it has been reported that this method can work efficiently; but the original method does not work well for feature interaction detection, because a large formula is required to represent the transition relation, thus resulting in large execution time. We develop an alternative encoding method to address the problem.

2. Model

We adopt a variant of State Transition Rules (STR) to formally describe services. Each rule r is in the form pre-condition [event] post-condition. Figure 1 shows an example of a specification which describes the Plain Old Telephone Service (POTS).

An STR specification specifies the state transition system defined as follows. An instance t of a rule is obtained by substituting users for variables of the rule. We represent the event and the post-condition of an instance t of a rule as e[t] and Post[t], respectively. In addition, we denote by Pre[t] and Post[t] the set of predicates in the pre-condition and the set of predicates whose negations are in the pre-conditions.

A state s is defined as a set of instances of predicates. We say that an instance of rule, t, is enabled for e[t] at s iff all instances in Pre[t] hold and no instances in Post[t] hold at s. The execution of the enabled rule causes the next state \( s' = (s \setminus Pre[t]) \cup Post[t] \). We define a relation \( \rightarrow \) over states as follows: s \( \rightarrow \) s’ iff the execution of t causes s’ from s.

3. Bounded Model Checking

To apply bounded model checking to service specifications, it is necessary to encode the state space and the transition relation by Boolean functions. Let \( P = \{ p_1, \cdots, p_m \} \) and \( T = \{ t_1, \cdots, t_n \} \) be the set of all instances of predicates and rules, respectively. A state s can then be viewed as a Boolean vector s = \( (b_1, \cdots, b_m) \) such that \( b_i = true \) iff an instance \( p_i \) of a predicate holds in that state.

Any set of states can be represented as a Boolean function such that \( f(s) = true \) iff s is in the set. We say that \( f \) is the characteristic function of the state set.

The characteristic function \( E_i(s) \) of the set of states
where $t \in T$ is enabled is

$$E_t(s) = \bigwedge_{p_i \in \text{Pre}[t]} b_i \land \bigwedge_{p_i \in \text{Pre}[t]} \neg b_i.$$ 

Any relation over states can be similarly encoded since they are simply sets of tuples. The relation $\rightarrow$ is represented as Boolean function $T_i(s, s')$ as follows.

$$E_i(s) \land \bigwedge_{p_i \in \text{Post}[t]} b_i' \land \bigwedge_{p_i \in \text{Pre}[t]} \neg b_i' \land \bigwedge_{p_i \in \text{Pre}[t]} \bigwedge_{p_j \in \text{Post}[t]} (b_i \leftrightarrow b_j')$$

where \(s' = (b_1', \ldots, b_m').\)

The traditional encoding uses a disjunction of $T_i(S, S')$ to represent one state transition. The formula would be very large in size, which becomes a major obstacle to applying bounded model checking to feature interaction detection.

Our scheme alleviates the above problem with a new encoding. Let \(d_i(s, s') = T_i(s, s') \land \bigwedge_{p_i \in \varphi}(b_i \leftrightarrow b_i').\) Then \(d_i(s, s')\) is

$$ ((\bigwedge_{p_i \in \text{Pre}[t]} b_i \land \bigwedge_{p_i \in \text{Pre}[t]} \neg b_i) \land \bigwedge_{p_i \in \text{Post}[t]} b_i' \land \bigwedge_{p_i \in \text{Pre}[t]} \neg b_i') \land \bigwedge_{p_i \in \text{Pre}[t]} \bigwedge_{p_j \in \text{Post}[t]} (b_i \leftrightarrow b_j')) $$

It is easy to see that \(d_i(S, S') = \text{true} \iff S \rightarrow S'\) or \(S = S'.\) \(d_i(S, S')\) differs from $T_i(S, S')$ only in that $d_i(S, S')$ evaluates to true also when $S = S'$. Using this property, a transition (or more) can be represented by a conjunction of $d_i$.

Let

$$\varphi = I(s_0) \land d_1(s_0, s_1) \land d_2(s_1, s_2) \land \cdots \land d_n(s_{n-1}, s_n)$$

$$d_1(s_n, s_{n+1}) \land d_2(s_{n+1}, s_{n+2}) \land \cdots \land d_n(s_{n-1}, s_{n+1})$$

$$\cdots$$

$$\bigwedge_{i \in \text{Post}[t]} (\bigwedge_{i \in \text{Pre}[t]} b_i \land \bigwedge_{i \in \text{Pre}[t]} \neg b_i) \land \bigwedge_{i \in \text{Pre}[t]} \bigwedge_{j \in \text{Post}[t]} (b_i \leftrightarrow b_j')$$

where $G$ is the set of states whose reachability is to be decided, and $f_G(S)$ and $I(S)$ are the characteristic functions for $G$ and the initial state. If the formula $\varphi$ is satisfiable, then we can conclude that there is a state in $G$ that can be reached in at most $k \cdot n$ steps, because $\varphi$ evaluates to true iff (i) $s_0$ is the initial state, (ii) for any $0 \leq i < k \cdot n$, $s_i \rightarrow s_{i+1}$ for some $t \in T$ or $s_i = s_{i+1}$, and (iii) $s_{k \cdot n} \in G$. Therefore $s_{k \cdot n}$, which belongs to $G$, is reachable from the initial state in at most $k \cdot n$ steps. An important observation here is that the method may be able to find a state in $G$ that requires more than $k$ transition executions to reach.

More importantly, $\varphi$ can be converted into a much succinct formula that is not logically equivalent but has the same satisfiability. Let $s_i = (b_1,i, b_2,i, \ldots, b_m,i)$. For each \(d_i(s_j, s_j+1)\) in $\varphi$, term $(b_i,j \leftrightarrow b_i,j+1)$ can be omitted for all $p_i \in (P \setminus \{\text{Pre}[t] \cup \text{Post}[t]\}) \cup (\text{Pre}[t] \cap \text{Post}[t])$ by quantifying $b_i,j+1$ away. That is, \(d_i\) in $\varphi$ can be replaced with

$$((\bigwedge_{p_i \in \text{Pre}[t]} b_i \land \bigwedge_{p_i \in \text{Pre}[t]} \neg b_i) \land \bigwedge_{p_i \in \text{Post}[t]} b_i' \land \bigwedge_{p_i \in \text{Pre}[t]} \neg b_i') \land \bigwedge_{p_i \in \text{Post}[t]} \bigwedge_{p_j \in \text{Post}[t]} (b_i \leftrightarrow b_j').$$

For example, when $t$ is the instance of the rule $\text{dialtone}A$ in Figure 1 with substitution $(x, y) = (A, B)$, the above formula will be $(\text{dialtone}(A) \land \neg \text{idle}(B) \land \text{busytone}(A)' \land \neg \text{busytone}(A)'), \lor ((\text{dialtone}(A) \leftrightarrow \text{busytone}(A)'), \land (\text{busytone}(A) \leftrightarrow \text{busytone}(A')))$. 

| Table 1. Performance of bounded model checking. |
| --- | --- | --- |
| $k$ | Time(sec) | Trad. scheme | length |
| CW+CF | 2 | 3.02 | 10 |
| CW+DT | 3 | 4.81 | 8 |
| CW+OCS | 2 | 2.90 | 15 |
| CW+TCS | 2 | 3.80 | 8 |
| CF+DT | 2 | 0.02 | 53.52 |
| CF+OCS | 2 | 0.02 | 89.32 |
| CF+TCS | 2 | 0.02 | 65.10 |
| DC+DO | 1 | 0.02 | 0.87 |
| DT+OCS | 2 | 0.05 | 1.91 |
| DT+TCS | 1 | 0.02 | 1.86 |
| OCS+TCS | 1 | 0.01 | 1.01 |

| CW: Call Waiting, CF: Call Forwarding, DC: Direct Connect, DO: Denied Origination, DT: Denied Termination, OCS: Originating Call Screening, TCS: Terminating Call Screening. |

4. Experimental Results

We conducted experimental evaluation for the seven services. Combining two of the seven services, we examined a total of 21 pairs.

The experiments were performed on a Linux workstation with a 853 MHz Pentium III processor. The number of users was assumed to be four. ZChaff was used as a SAT solver.

Of the 21 combinations, 11 can cause nondeterminism, a situation where an event can simultaneously activate two or more functionalities of different services. Table 1 compares the proposed encoding and the traditional one with respect to the running time to detect nondeterminism. Items in the ‘length’ column represent the length of the shortest path to the states that cause nondeterminism.

As can be seen in this table, when using the proposed encoding, interaction was detected with $k$ of less than or equal to three for all cases. Note that the length of the shortest counterexample coincides with the smallest $k$ value at which the traditional scheme can find such a computation. This resulted in large detection time of the traditional scheme, as shown in this table.