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ABSTRACT

Debugging is notoriously difficult and extremely time consuming but also essential for ensuring the reliability and quality of a software system. In order to reduce debugging effort and enable automated failure detection, we propose an automated testing framework for cognitive agent programs. Our approach is based on the assumption that modules within such programs are a natural unit for testing. We identify a minimal set of temporal operators that enable the specification of test conditions and show that the test language is sufficiently expressive for detecting all failures in an existing failure taxonomy. We also introduce an approach for specifying test templates that supports a programmer in writing tests. Furthermore, empirical analysis of agent programs allows us to evaluate whether our approach using test templates detects all failures.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Debugging is notoriously difficult and extremely time consuming [23] but also essential for ensuring the reliability and quality of a software system. Manual testing, using, for example, a debugger for single-step execution to identify differences between observed and intended behaviour, however, is not an efficient failure detection method and heavily relies on the programmer to identify the failure. In order to reduce debugging effort and enable automated failure detection, we propose an automated testing framework for cognitive agent programs. Automated testing yields a reduction in the effort needed to detect a failure and is more effective than code inspection methods [24]. In addition, it also facilitates running tests repeatedly at no additional costs.

The aim of this paper is to introduce and develop a test framework that supports automated failure detection for programs written in rule-based agent programming languages that use a logic for representing the cognitive state of the agent, including e.g. its beliefs. A failure is an event in which a system does not perform a required function within specified limits [16]. Failures thus are manifestations of undesired behaviour. They are caused by a fault, an incorrect step, process, or data definition in a program [16] or mistake in a program [27]. Upon detecting a failure, a programmer needs to locate and correct the fault that causes the failure. Our focus is on automating the detection of failures and on dynamic analysis, i.e., the process of evaluating a system or component based on its behaviour during execution [16]. We will see, however, that the test framework introduced also provides support for fault localization.

The main contribution of this paper is an automated test framework for cognitive agent programs that provides support for detecting frequently occurring failure types. As a first step towards such a framework, we argue that programs modules instead of the top-level agent program are the most natural unit for testing, and that test conditions should be associated with modules. Second, we introduce two basic temporal operators that in practice are sufficient for specifying test conditions to detect failures. Third, using this generic framework, we propose test templates for failure types that have been identified in a previously developed taxonomy in [27]. Finally, we introduce a test approach for deriving test templates given some initial functional requirements. In order to empirically evaluate and demonstrate that our framework is expressive enough to detect all failure types, we verify that we can reproduce and identify all failures found in the sample used in [27]. The test templates that we introduce can be considered as a refinement of the failure taxonomy proposed in [27]. We show that by automating testing, we are able to identify more failures. We also show that our work is not biased towards this sample by demonstrating that the same test approach is also able to identify all failures in different samples of programs.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 discusses related work. Section 3 introduces our automated test framework. Section 4 introduces the test templates and approach. Section 5 evaluates the test framework. Section 6 concludes.

2. RELATED WORK

In general, different techniques for detecting failures of program code are available, ranging from inspection of source code and logs to automated testing tools [24]. The need for debugging techniques and test approaches for agent-oriented programming has been broadly recognized [2, 9, 10]. Techniques for agent-oriented programming need to be based on the underlying agent paradigm [21, 28]. However, this is a significant challenge, as they should for example take into account that agents execute a specific decision cycle and operate in non-deterministic environments [1, 4, 14].
3. AUTOMATED TESTING FRAMEWORK

We introduce an automated test framework for rule-based agent programming languages that use some knowledge representation (KR) for representing the cognitive state of an agent. We aim for a framework that is as generic as possible, but in order to introduce a concrete framework we need to make a number of assumptions about these languages. First, agents have a perception processing component that they use for processing received percepts, which are simple facts that we denote by \( p(\vec{t}) \) (or simply \( p \) if parameters do not matter). We assume that percepts are stored each agent cycle when received from an environment for further processing. Second, we assume that the KR used supports a negation operator, denoted by \( \neg \). Third, we assume that the cognitive state includes a belief state that can be queried and which allows to make percepts persistent. Fourth, we assume that agents somehow can represent goals that they want to achieve as part of their state; agents can do this, for example, by means of events, plans, or declarative goals. Otherwise, the structure of an agent’s cognitive state depends on the specifics of the agent programming language, which almost always includes more, e.g., also events, messages, and/or plans. Fifth, we assume that the language provides support for aggregating or encapsulating basic language elements such as knowledge, goals, plans, and/or rules in what we call modules in this paper. Finally, we assume that an agent has a top-level module, which enables associating test conditions with the agent itself.

Three important design questions need to be addressed to define an automated test framework for cognitive agent programs. First, we need to specify what the basic unit or program component is that tests are performed on or are associated with. Second, we need to define a test language for specifying test conditions. And, third, we need to specify an infrastructure that automates running tests.

3.1 Modules Basic Unit for Testing

An important question that we need to address when setting up a test framework is what the target unit for testing is in an agent-oriented program. We argue that a test framework for agent programs should not focus on knowledge bases to avoid reinventing the wheel, but developers should rather re-use existing (unit) test frameworks for the underlying KR technology of an agent programming language. For example, a language that uses SWI Prolog for KR should aim at re-using the available unit test framework [26]. We have also found that, in practice, testing at the level of individual goals, plans, or rules is too fine-grained and not that useful. Writing tests at the level of individual rules, for example, would not only result in more test than source code, but even worse, would not focus on the failures that need to be detected. A more suitable level is the aggregate level that collects multiple goals, plans, and/or rules in a single unit. We call such units modules and assume agent programming languages provide some level of support for modules. We will therefore associate test conditions with modules and introduce a test language that supports this.

Modules thus can be perceived of as components in an agent program that set goals or plans and generate actions to be executed, much like individual basic actions but at a higher level of abstraction. A module thus provides an execution unit smaller than the agent program itself but larger than other basic language elements. By using modules as targets for testing, we provide a developer with some additional control over which behaviour of the agent program is tested, as only the behaviour generated by the module will be evaluated. This allows a developer to write tests that target only specific parts of an agent program.

An agent enters a module when it starts executing the module and exits the module again when module execu-
tion is finished. These execution points provide two natural places for introducing test conditions. We will associate pre-conditions and post-conditions with a module that is evaluated, respectively, when entering and when exiting the module. Although useful, in practice pre- and post-conditions are not sufficient for monitoring the trace, i.e., behaviour and states, generated while a module is executed. To be able to evaluate a module’s behaviour, we therefore also introduce so-called in-conditions that are associated with a module. An in-condition is a temporal property evaluated on the trace generated by a module. These conditions allow the detection of failures that occur during module execution. They also provide better support for fault localization by indicating the code location where a failure was detected.

3.2 Test Language

A test language should provide support for two main tasks: setting up a test and specifying which test conditions should be evaluated. To this end, we introduce the test language in Table 1. We have developed a test framework\(^1\) that, when provided with a test program as specified by the grammar, will initialize and set up the infrastructure for running an agent system and (external) environment in which test will be automatically performed. A timeout can be specified to ensure termination of the test after a specified time. A timeout is global and specifies how many time (in seconds) is allowed to pass before the entire test should have been completed. If a timeout happens, the test is aborted.

**Test Setup** The agents that are part of a test need to be referenced explicitly in a test program by means of their id’s. These agents are launched when the test is started and automatically connected to an environment, if available, to receive percepts from and perform actions in that environment. The fact that agents are launched, however, does not mean that the program code of these agents is executed. Instead, the testactions that are specified in an agenttest clause (see Table 1) are performed when the test is run. Test actions can be preparatory actions do action for, e.g., initializing an agent’s state, where action can be a sequence of actions that are available in an agent language. Test actions can also be instructions do id to execute a module, with id the module’s name. Note that it is possible to run an agent itself by executing its top-level module (each agent is assumed to have one). Finally, an until \( \psi \) condition can be associated with a module (or, less usefully, an action) that terminates execution when a state condition \( \psi \) holds. An agent test thus determines which actions and modules are executed and when they should be terminated. An agent test can be shared by multiple agents, but it is also possible to define different actions for different agents, which will then be executed in parallel.

The environment that agents operate in is not explicitly referenced in our test language because the specifics of starting an external environment are very different for each agent language. Here, we simply assume that a language-specific mechanism is used for connecting agents to an environment.

**Test Conditions** As explained, test conditions are associated with modules. Which conditions should be evaluated when a module is executed is specified by a test id with statement, where id is a module name. Optionally, a pre-

\(^1\)The source and implementation of the test framework are available at [http://goalhub.github.io/eclipse](http://goalhub.github.io/eclipse)
P1: failure to deal with percept
P2: other incorrect percept processing
G1: failure to add a goal that should be added
G2: failure to drop a goal that should be dropped
G3: adding a goal that shouldn’t be added
G4: incorrectly adding a second goal of the same type
G5: dropping a goal that shouldn’t be dropped
A1: selecting the wrong (user-defined) action
A2: beliefs not updated correctly when action performed
A3: action selected when should be doing nothing
A4: action interface mismatch
O: other failure not classified above

Figure 1: Failure Taxonomy of [27]

is evaluated on the current state when a module is exited or terminated. The value of in-conditions is (re-)evaluated every time the cognitive state of the agent changes while the module is being executed. The temporal operator of the condition determines whether the value is updated:

- **never** \( \psi \): the value is changed to \textit{failed} if \( \psi \) holds in the state; the value is changed to \textit{passed} if the module (or test) is terminated and the value still is \textit{undetermined}; otherwise, its value remains \textit{undetermined}.
- **leadsto** \( \psi \): if the module (or test) is terminated, the value is changed to \textit{passed} if every state where \( \psi \) holds has been followed by a state where \( \psi' \) holds (and vacuously so if \( \psi \) did never hold); otherwise, the value is changed to \textit{failed}. If the module (or test) has not been terminated yet, the value is \textit{undetermined}.

A test is aborted as soon as a condition is assigned the value \textit{failed}. In that case, the entire test is regarded as failed, indicating that something needs to be fixed. Note that when a test is terminated (whether aborted or not), all conditions will have been assigned the value \textit{passed} or \textit{failed}. If a test is terminated because of a timeout, this does not always imply that the test is a failure; if all conditions are passed, the test is considered to have passed as well. Finally, our test framework keeps track of the last code instruction in an agent program that is executed and points at the corresponding code location when testing is terminated (aborted), which is useful for fault localization.

4. TESTING FOR FAILURES

In order to verify that we can detect all failures in agent programs with our framework, we show that we can detect the same failures that were identified by [27] in a given agent program sample that was used to define the failure taxonomy of Figure 1. We provide a systematic approach for detecting failures by introducing test templates that target specific types of failures in the taxonomy, and a systematic method for using these templates for testing.

4.1 Test Templates

A test template consists of one or more templates for individual test conditions. We provide test templates for each failure type in the taxonomy, except for \( A4 \), which calls for another detection method and raises a specific design issue for test frameworks. We note that a test condition specifies expected behaviour, and a violation indicates a failure.

P1, P2: Failure to process percept (correctly).

In order to define test conditions for percept processing, we assume a state operator \textit{percept}(p), indicating that \( p \) is perceived, that can be used to inspect the contents of a percept store. This does not mean that these conditions must be supported in the programming language itself, but only that it should be possible to somehow inspect which percepts have been received.

In order to support various options for percept processing, we distinguish four percept types and associate specific test templates with each type. Although in theory alternatives can easily be conceived of, we have specified test templates below based on the assumption that the percept information needs to be made persistent in the agent’s belief state, which worked well in practice. We also assume that test conditions for percepts can be associated with a percept processing module called \textit{ppm}, and we can write test statements of the form \textit{test ppm with} \( \{ \chi \} \). Each agent language provides some kind of support for this, although perhaps not in the language itself but ‘under the hood’. It is important that test conditions for percepts are associated with and evaluated while executing the percept processing module. Because this module is executed once each cycle of the agent, in order to not violate the test conditions, percepts must have been processed and beliefs updated accordingly at the end of percept processing.

**Template P-once:** concerns percepts that are only received \textit{once}, typically when the agent is launched to inform about static information such as locations on maps. The test template expects that after receiving the percept, it will be made persistent such that the agent believes it.

\[
\text{template P-once: } \text{percept}(p) \text{ leadsto } \text{bel}(p)
\]

**Template P-always:** concerns percepts about facts \( p \) that are \textit{always} received when \( p \) is the case, meaning that not receiving the percept implies that \( p \) does not hold. The test template consists of two test conditions. The first is identical to the one for \textit{P-once}; the second condition expects that not perceiving \( p \), which would indicate that \( p \) does not hold, should lead to removing the belief \( p \) (if present).

\[
\text{template P-always: } \text{percept}(p) \text{ leadsto } \text{bel}(p) \\
\text{not(percept}(p)) \land \text{bel}(p) \text{ leadsto not(bel}(p))
\]

**Template P-on-change:** concerns percepts that are sent only when parameters change. A percept \textit{loc(place)}, for example, is sent each time when an agent’s location changes.

\[
\text{template P-on-change: } \text{percept}(p(t)) \text{ leadsto } \text{bel}(p(t)) \\
\text{percept}(p(t)) \land \text{bel}(p(t)) \land t \neq t' \text{ leadsto not(bel}(p(t')))
\]

**Template P-on-change-with-negation:** concerns percepts \( p \) that are received once when \( p \) becomes true, and percepts \textit{not}(p) that are received once when \( p \) becomes false (again). For example, \textit{in(room)} is received when an agent enters a room, and \textit{not(in(room))} is received when it leaves again.

\[
\text{template P-on-change-with-negation: } \text{percept}(p) \text{ leadsto } \text{bel}(p) \\
\text{percept(not}(p)) \text{ leadsto not(bel}(p))
\]

G1: Failure to add a goal that should be added.

The taxonomy in Fig. 1 includes five failure categories related to goal handling. We therefore assume that a state operator \textit{goal} is available for checking for the presence or
absence of a goal. Each of these failure categories, with the exception of G4, suggest that a reason for (not) having a goal has not been adequately taken into account.

**Template G-adopted:** concerns a goal \( \phi \) that the agent is expected to adopt because of some (sufficient) reason \( \psi \).

\[
\psi \leadsto \text{goal}(\phi)
\]

**G2: Failure to drop a goal that should be dropped.**

The failure to drop a goal is taken here as an indication that the agent did not adequately reconsider its goals if the environment has changed outside the control of that agent, these failures would most likely only occur in dynamic environments or in a multi-agent context.

**Template G-reconsideration:** concerns a goal that should be reconsidered and dropped as a result for some reason \( \psi \).

\[
\psi \leadsto \text{not(goal}(\phi))
\]

**G3: Adding a goal that should not be added.**

The counterpart of G1, reflected by the fact that we use a safety (\( \psi \)) instead of liveness (\( \psi \)) condition here.

**Template G-incorrect:** concerns a situation in which there is a reason \( \psi \) for not adopting (having adopted) the goal.

\[
\neg \text{goal}(\phi) \land \psi
\]

**G4: Adding a second goal of the same type.**

Some goals should only occur once and it should never be the case that the goal is instantiated twice. For example, an agent might have a goal of visiting a room but should never have two of those goals simultaneously.

**Template G-duplicate:** concerns a single-instance goal that should be instantiated at most once.

\[
\neg \text{goal}(\phi(\vec{t})) \land \text{goal}(\phi(\vec{t}')) \land \vec{t} \neq \vec{t}'
\]

**G5: Dropping a goal that should not be dropped.**

Similar to G3, G5 is the counterpart of G2.

**Template G-maintain:** concerns a situation in which \( \psi \) is a reason why an agent should have a goal, and should maintain it for that reason.

\[
\neg \text{not(goal}(\phi)) \land \psi
\]

**A1: Failure to select an action.**

Fig. 1 includes four failure categories related to actions. Categories A1 and A3 suggest that a reason for (not) selecting an action has not been adequately taken into account.

**Template A-selected:** concerns an action \( \alpha \) that the agent is expected to have selected because of some reason \( \psi \).

\[
\psi \leadsto \text{done}(\alpha)
\]

**A2, A3: Incorrect action (selection).**

We provide one test template for categories A2 and A3, which both suggest that something happened that should (never) have happened, and thus can be viewed as the counterpart of A1. A2 indicates that beliefs should not have been updated the way they are, and A3 indicates there is a situation in which an action should never have been selected.

**Template A-incorrect:** concerns an action \( \alpha \) that should never be (immediately) followed by \( \psi \) (A2), or a situation \( \psi \) in which an action should never have been selected (A3).

\[
\neg \text{done}(\alpha) \land \psi
\]

**A4: Action interface mismatch.**

This failure concerns an agent that attempts to perform an action in an environment that is not supported by that environment. An environment is expected to raise an exception or use another event-mechanism to indicate this issue. To detect these failures, rather than providing a test template, the test framework should abort testing immediately after receiving the exception or event. Aborting upon receiving an exception is a general principle that is supported in our framework.

### 4.2 Taxonomy Refinement

The test templates that we have introduced do not offer a perfect match with the failure categories, but provide a refinement of the taxonomy in Fig. 1. Instead of two categories \( P_1, P_2 \) for percept processing failures, we introduced four templates (\( P_{\text{-once}} \), etc.). The main reason for this difference is that in a test approach we should specify what kind of percept is expected, instead of indicating that no processing was done at all (\( P_1 \)) or something went wrong (\( P_2 \)). For a similar reason, we renamed A1 from ‘selecting the wrong action’ to ‘failure to select an action’, which also highlights the similarity with the template for G1. We merged \( A_2 \) and \( A_3 \) which are covered by a single test template; note again the structural similarity with the template for \( G_{\text{-incorrect}} \) (G3). As discussed, we do not have a corresponding template for \( A_4 \), as tests should rather be aborted when this failure happens. Finally, we have no templates for the ‘other’ category; our empirical results suggest there is no need for an additional template, as we show below.

### 4.3 Test Approach

In order to test and use the test templates, we need a systematic test approach that tells us what to do (steps) and, more specifically, provides clues on how to instantiate the templates for a specific application. An important question, for example, is how to find reasons to instantiate the \( \psi \) conditions that occur in the \( G \)- and \( A \)-templates. Table 2 lists information resources that are particularly useful for testing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type of Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agent program (comments)</td>
<td>Clues for reasons &amp; design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agent trace (screen, logs)</td>
<td>Observable behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agent design &amp; specification</td>
<td>Functional requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment (documentation)</td>
<td>Percepts, actions available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2: Information sources for testing**

**Step 1: Defining success.**

The first step is to identify functional requirements from available agent design documentation (Table 2). These requirements define success and provide a concrete method for checking that a program does what it is supposed to do. A program can be considered free of failures if it meets requirements. In order to automatically check this, functional requirements must also be specified in the test language. Typically, these requirements will be associated with the top-level module, called \( \text{main} \) here, that is executed by the agent, and we can specify them as pre-, post-, or in-conditions of that module using \( \text{test main with statements} \) or by using a statement \( \text{do main until } \psi \). The latter is particularly useful for checking that some overall objective \( \psi \) is realized (and, if so, the test will be automatically terminated; a \( \text{timeout} \) should be specified to guarantee termina-
tion if this is not the case). For example, the requirement or objective to pick up and deliver n packages, which was used in [27] and below will be used to reproduce results, can be specified by \texttt{do main until bel(delivered(n))}.

**Step 2: Testing cognitive state updating.**

It is important to test that updating of an agent’s cognitive state works as expected. The state conditions used in test conditions are evaluated on this state and will fail for unclear reasons when state updating has not been implemented correctly. For example, a condition never done(\texttt{putDown}) \land \text{not}(\texttt{bel(in(Room))))}, which expresses that a package should never be put down when not in a room, could simply fail because beliefs about in(\texttt{Room}) were not updated correctly.

**Identify percepts, actions, and goals used** As a preparatory step, it is useful to collect and list all percepts, including their type (once, etc.), that may be received and the actions that may be performed from environment documentation (Table 2). Similarly, all goals that an agent may have should be collected from the agent program code.

**Validating percept processing** The most basic step is to instantiate the appropriate test templates -templates, etc. for each percept according to type. The resulting test conditions should be associated as in-conditions with the percept processing module, and the test framework used to evaluate these conditions. Tests should be repeated sufficiently often as percepts generated will differ per run, if only because environments are more often than not non-deterministic. To gain confidence that percepts are correctly handled, it is important to check against the list of actions created above whether a sufficient variation of actions has been performed during runs, as different actions often yield other percepts.

**Check single-instance goals** Based on design, and intended use of goals in comments in a program (Table 2), for example, and using the goal list created, the subset of goals that are single-instance goals should be identified. For each of these goals, the test template -templates, etc. should be instantiated and associated as an in-condition with the module where the goal is adopted.

We note that Step 2 can be performed by almost mechanically instantiating templates once relevant information has been collected. If these initial tests succeed, therefore, this will give a high level of confidence that cognitive states are updated correctly. For all templates other than those used above, however, a state condition \(\psi\) needs to be derived using insights gained from the design and behaviour of an agent.

**Step 3: Classifying failures.**

After testing state updating and checking that failures still are present (see Step 1), there are two approaches for classifying those failures. A bottom-up approach would start with the action and goal list created and try to instantiate templates for all these actions and goals, using the agent program itself as the main source of information. A top-down approach would rather start by analysing agent traces (Table 2) and observing agent behaviour in order to identify which action should (not) have been performed or goal should (not) have been added. Although a top-down approach suggests to start with testing goals, this order is not fixed and testing might just as well proceed with actions.

**Failures concerning actions** In order to instantiate -templates, apart from the action, a state condition should be identified that provides a reason \(\psi\) for (not) selecting it. For -selected (resp. -incorrect), the question is in which situations \(\psi\) an action should (never) be executed. The instantiated conditions should be associated as in-conditions with the module(s) where the action might (not) be selected.

There are two basic approaches for identifying \(\psi\):

1. By inspecting the agent program, clues may be obtained for useful test conditions \(\psi\). In particular, the triggering conditions of rules can be useful, as they typically indicate reasons for selecting an action. For example, a condition \(\text{bel(in('DropZone') } \land \text{holding(Block))}\) that triggers execution of an action \texttt{putDown} suggests that an agent should execute \texttt{putDown} when it is holding a block in the ‘DropZone’. By simply using this condition for \(\psi\) we can instantiate -selected as follows: \(\text{bel(in('DropZone') } \land \text{holding(Block)) leadsto done(\text{putDown})}\). This simple approach can already detect failures, e.g., in case the rule order prevents the rule for \texttt{putDown} to ever be applied. Similarly, by simply negating conditions found in a program, we can instantiate -incorrect. This assumes that the condition must hold for the action to be selected. Although these assumptions may be too strong, they provide a useful starting point and can be weakened or strengthened based on further analysis.

2. If an action failure is suspected because, for example, a functional requirement is not satisfied, observing an agent’s behaviour may provide clues for identifying a useful condition \(\psi\) for instantiating a test template for that action. Suppose a requirement \(\text{bel(in(Room)) leadsto not(bel(in(Room)))}\) fails, i.e., an agent does not always leave a room after entering it. By observing that the \texttt{goTo} action is never performed, a failure to select this action is suggested. To test for this, the -selected template can be instantiated by instantiating \(\psi\) with the reason for leaving and \(\alpha\) with the \texttt{goTo} action, which yields: \(\text{bel(in(Room) } \land \text{Room } \neq \text{OtherRoom) leadsto done(goTo(OtherRoom))}\). This process can be continued until the root cause has been identified.

**Failures concerning goals** The approach for instantiating -templates, apart from identifying the goal that might cause the failure, is similar to that for -templates. The associated questions for the templates are, for -adopted: for which \(\psi\) should the goal be added?; for -reconsideration: for which \(\psi\) should the goal be dropped?; for -incorrect: for which \(\psi\) should a goal never be added?; and for -maintain: for which \(\psi\) should a goal never be removed. The approach for identifying \(\psi\) above also applies for goals. The instantiated conditions should be associated as in-conditions with the module(s) that are related to the goal.

We illustrate a test for a goal \texttt{in(Room)} that is adopted in a rule with a triggering condition \(\text{bel(room(Place)) } \land \text{not(bel(visited(Place)))}\), i.e., indicating that an agent should adopt (multiple) \texttt{in(Room)} goals when it knows about a room that it has not visited before. By simply using this condition for \(\psi\) we can instantiate -adopted as follows: \(\text{bel(room(Place)) } \land \text{not(bel(visited(Place))) leadsto goal(in(Place))}\). Again, this simple approach can already detect failures, e.g., in case the rule order prevents the rule from ever being applied. Similarly, by simply negating conditions found in a program, we can instantiate -incorrect. This assumes that the condition must hold for the goal to be adopted, e.g., we never want to go to rooms we have visited before. A similar approach can be used for the -reconsideration and the -maintain templates.
5. EVALUATION

In this section, we first evaluate whether our automated approach is able to detect all failures in a specific set of agent programs. Next, we evaluate whether we are able to detect all failures in a different set of agents operating in the same environment, but with additional functional requirements. Finally, we evaluate this for a single agent program sample that operates in a different environment.

5.1 Comparing the Approaches

To establish the effectiveness of our automated test framework and test approach, we evaluate here whether the automated test framework, using the test templates introduced above, is able to detect the failures that were detected by manual inspection in [27]. We aim to show that our framework can be used to detect failures to obtain failure-free programs, meaning that functional requirements are met.

Methodology We used the agent program sample and the methodology for testing, debugging, and classifying failures of Fig. 2 that was also used by [27]. Only step 1 and 3 were replaced by tests performed using our test framework instead of manual inspection of logs and traces. We also used the same ‘success criteria’, i.e., the requirement formulated at the end of Step 1 of our approach. As we want to demonstrate that failures detected in [27] can also be detected automatically, we used a bottom-up approach for writing tests and created test templates for all percepts, actions, and goals in a program to ensure as large a coverage as possible. Upon detecting a failure (bug), we applied the same fixes as [27], which we obtained from the author, and re-ran our tests. We verified that the same bug was found by our tests, e.g., by checking that the code location where the test was terminated corresponds with the code location where a fix was applied. If we could not match a failure found by automated testing with one found originally by manual inspection, this failure was registered separately; the corresponding test conditions were removed, and the evaluation was continued.

Results We analysed and wrote a large set of test conditions for 20 agent programs. The results in terms of number of failures found are summarized in Table 3. Each individual failure found was counted and included in the Table. Note that we used taxonomy of Fig. 1 for classification, and not our refinement, to allow for comparison. We were able to reproduce every failure found by [27] (‘Orig.’ column in Table 3) and often found more (‘Difference’ column). In particular, we were able to automatically verify that all programs were failure-free after fixing buggy programs by testing that they met the requirement, indicating success.

We were able to detect 88% of the original failures by performing automated tests. So even though we were able to fully automatically establish that a program was failure-free, detecting some problems that were originally classified as failures required manual inspection (counts between brackets in Table 3). After analysis, it turned out that all these failures only occur when agent’s cycles are delayed indefinitely while an environment may continue running. This can happen when a developer manually pauses an agent. As an example, an agent that runs at normal speed and is connected to the environment BW4T [17], which we used in our sample, would never simultaneously receive the perceptions $\text{not}(\in\text{room}(a1))$ and $\in\text{room}(a2))$. This is because it takes time to move from $a1$ to $a2$, and an agent running at normal speed would first receive the first and only later receive the second percept. If an agent is paused, because the environment continues running both percepts may be queued and received simultaneously when the agent is resumed. When we run tests with agents using the automated test framework, we do not detect such ‘failures’ because agents are never paused. Our finding thus highlights that it is important to take timing issues into account. We also note that no $G5$ failures were found (confirmed after discussion with the author of [27]), but we did find such a failure in the sample we discuss in Section 5.

We identified 24% more failures, most of which (70%) were detected by means of the percept test templates ($P1, P2$) and the template $G$-duplicate ($G4$). Interestingly, these templates are used in Step 2 of our test approach. This suggests that manual inspection is biased more towards a top-down approach in Step 3. As we argued, developing and testing a program is facilitated, however, if confidence is gained first that state updating is free of failures. One likely other reason that explains why we found more failures is that we were able to perform many test runs, as the test framework facilitates performing repeated test runs, and each run may produce different failures because of non-determinism.

A particularly interesting result is that we found that 63 from the 82 (77%) failures detected by automated tests immediately pointed at the code location of the fault. This, of course, makes it easier for a developer to fix a bug, and is a clear indication of the value that automating testing can have for agent programming. Fault locations are hardly ever pointed at, however, when a wrong action is performed ($A$-selected, $A1$), suggesting that locating faults for such failures may require a different approach.

We now show that our approach is also able to detect all failures in sample programs other than those used to reproduce the results of [27]. The test templates that we proposed have been based on the failure taxonomy of [27] which was derived from an analysis of the sample used in the previous section.
Table 4: Results of the performed evaluation (5.2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Failure</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( P )-failure ( (P1, P2) )</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( A )-selected ( (A1) )</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( A )-incorrect ( (A2,3) )</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( G )-adopted ( (G1) )</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( G )-reconsideration ( (G2) )</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( G )-incorrect ( (G3) )</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( G )-duplicate ( (G4) )</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( G )-maintain ( (G5) )</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We aim to provide additional support that shows that our set of test templates is complete and our approach is not biased towards a particular sample by looking at other sample programs.

### 5.2 Different Agent Program Sample

We selected a new sample of 10 agent programs that were written for the BW4T environment but by different programmers. Moreover, these programs were supposed to satisfy several more functional requirements instead of only one. Agents were required, for example, to not do any redundant tasks: “An agent should go directly to the drop zone when it is holding a block”, formalized as \( \text{never done}(\text{goTo}(\text{Room})) \land \text{Room} \neq \text{'DropZone'} \land \text{bel}(\text{holding}(\text{Block})) \), and “An agent should not go to the drop zone without holding a block”, formalized as \( \text{never done}(\text{goTo}(\text{'DropZone'})) \land \text{not}(\text{bel}(\text{holding}(\text{Block}))) \). These additional requirements also pose a greater challenge for our test approach, as a program is considered failure-free only if all requirements are satisfied, increasing the difficulty of detecting all failures.

All failures found could be classified using our refined taxonomy; Table 4 presents counts per type. We did not find any \( A4 \) failures but did find a \( G \)-maintain \( (G5) \) failure. Failures that were detected were fixed using the same approach as [27]. We thus were able to successfully generate failure-free agents that satisfy all functional requirements.

A larger set of functional requirements facilitated the use of a top-down approach (Section 4) rather than a bottom-up approach, as was used for reproduction. An interesting finding is that this lead to a decrease in the amount of test failures that pointed directly at code locations of corresponding faults \( (25\%, 13 \text{ out of } 53, \text{ as opposed to } 77\% \text{ before}) \). More work is needed to explain this finding.

### 5.3 Different Environment

Finally, we performed an evaluation whether the test framework and approach would detect failures in a single agent program sample that operates in a different environment. We chose an environment called the Vacuum World to this end [8]. In this world, squares in a grid can be either clean, dusty, or contain an obstacle that the robot should move around, thus requiring the agent to also successfully navigate the robot over the grid. A robot is able to move to any neighbouring clean or dusty square and clean up (vacuum) the square it is currently on (removing the dust).

For the evaluation, we used an agent program sample that was developed to meet the requirement that all dusty squares in a grid have been cleaned. This initial agent program did not meet the functional requirement specified, and we thus applied our test approach to detect failures.

Four failures were detected in the agent program, which is similar to the average of about four or five failures that were found for all other sample programs. Two percept failures were detected using the \( P \) templates, and two failures related to action selection were detected using the \( A \)-selected template. After fixes were applied for these failures, the agent did meet its requirement. Consistent with earlier results, percept failures indicated code locations for corresponding faults, whereas the action failures required more debugging effort for fault localization.

### 6. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we proposed and defined an automated testing framework for cognitive agent programs, facilitating automated failure detection and reducing debugging effort that is required from a developer. We argue that modules are a natural unit for testing, and associate test conditions with modules of an agent program. We also introduced a test language that we used to specify test templates for detecting failure types. These test templates refine a failure taxonomy introduced in [27]. A test approach has also been specified that explains how to instantiate test templates and derive test conditions for specific failure types. The main steps of this approach are (i) to define success in terms of functional requirements, (ii) to test cognitive state updating, and (iii) to classify failures that concern actions and goals.

The test language proposed is minimal in the sense that only two temporal operators are provided. We showed by analysing different agent program samples that the language is nevertheless sufficient for detecting all failures in these programs. In particular, we were able to reproduce and detect all failures that were manually identified in [27] using our automated test framework. Interestingly, in about 77% of failures found in this reproduction, the test framework also pointed to the code location of the corresponding fault. We demonstrated that our approach is not biased towards a specific sample of agent programs by applying the framework to other sample programs, and in a different environment. We were able to detect all failures by means of the automated test framework, i.e., all agents eventually met all functional requirements after fixing the detected failures.

Our work points to several issues that need more work. The focus of our work has been on automatically detecting failures. Even though our results are encouraging in that fault localization was facilitated by the test framework, more work is needed for locating faults that correspond with these failures. In particular, we found that faults related to actions that are performed but should not have been performed are difficult to locate. Tools that can explain why these actions were performed might be useful here [13].

Finally, further evaluation of the test framework is needed in more environments. Because of non-deterministic environments and other agents that act in the same environment, failures that occur in one run may not occur in the next. More work is needed to identify how often a test should be repeated in order to find all failures in an agent program. Measures of the variation one should expect in a given environment could be useful here.
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