

Optimal Scheduling of Agents in ADTrees: Specialised Algorithm and Declarative Models

Jaime Arias¹, Carlos Olarte¹, Laure Petrucci¹
¹LIPN, CNRS UMR 7030,
Université Sorbonne Paris Nord
Villetaneuse, France
{arias, olarte, petrucci}@lipn.univ-paris13.fr

Łukasz Maśko², Wojciech Penczek², Teofil Sidoruk^{2,3}
²Institute of Computer Science, Polish Academy of Sciences
³Faculty of Math. and Inf. Science, Warsaw University of Technology
Warsaw, Poland
{masko, penczek, t.sidoruk}@ipipan.waw.pl

Abstract—Expressing attack-defence trees in a multi-agent setting allows for studying a new aspect of security scenarios, namely how the number of agents and their task assignment impact the performance, *e.g.* attack time, of strategies executed by opposing coalitions. Optimal scheduling of agents’ actions, a non-trivial problem, is thus vital. We discuss associated caveats and propose an algorithm that synthesises such an assignment, targeting minimal attack time and using the minimal number of agents for a given attack-defence tree. We also investigate an alternative approach for the same problem using Rewriting Logic, starting with a simple and elegant declarative model, whose correctness (in terms of schedule’s optimality) is self-evident. We then refine this specification, inspired by the design of our specialised algorithm, to obtain an efficient system that can be used as a playground to explore various aspects of attack-defence trees. We compare the two approaches on different benchmarks.

Index Terms—attack-defence trees, multi-agent systems, scheduling, rewriting logic

I. INTRODUCTION

Security of safety-critical multi-agent systems [1] is a major challenge. Attack-defence trees (ADTrees) have been developed to evaluate the safety of systems and to study interactions between attacker and defender parties [2], [3]. They provide a simple graphical formalism of possible attacker’s actions to be taken in order to attack a system and the defender’s defences employed to protect the system. Recently, it has been proposed to model ADTrees in the formalism of asynchronous multi-agent systems (AMAS) extended with certain ADTree characteristics [4], [5]. In this setting, one can reason about attack/defence scenarios considering agent distributions over tree nodes and their impact on the feasibility and performance (quantified by metrics such as time and cost) of attacking and defending strategies executed by specific coalitions.

A. Minimal schedule with minimal number of agents

The time metric, on which we focus here, is clearly affected by both the number of available agents and their distribution over ADTree nodes. Hence, there arises the problem of optimal scheduling, *i.e.* obtaining an assignment that achieves the lowest possible time, while using the minimum number of

agents required for an attack to be feasible. To that end, we first preprocess the input ADTree, transforming it into a Directed Acyclic Graph (DAG), where specific types of ADTree gates are replaced with sequences of nodes with normalised time (*i.e.* duration of either zero, or the greatest common factor across all nodes of the original ADTree). Because some ADTree constructs (namely, OR gates and defences) induce multiple alternative outcomes, we execute the scheduling algorithm itself on a number of independently considered DAG variants. For each such variant, we synthesise a schedule multiple times in a divide-and-conquer strategy, adjusting the number of agents until the lowest one that produces a valid assignment is found. Since we preserve labels during the preprocessing step, all DAG nodes are traceable back to specific gates and leaves of the original ADTree. Thus, in the final step we ensure that the same agent is assigned to nodes of the same origin, reshuffling the schedule if necessary.

B. An alternative approach: Rewriting Logic

We also study the optimal scheduling problem for ADTrees through the lenses of Rewriting Logic (RL) [6] (see also the surveys in [7], [8]). RL is a formal model of computation whose basic building unit is a rewrite theory \mathcal{R} . Roughly, the states of the modelled system are encoded in \mathcal{R} via algebraic data types, and the (non-deterministic) transitions of the system are expressed by a set of (conditional) rewriting rules. If the theory \mathcal{R} satisfies certain executability conditions (making the mathematical and the execution semantics of \mathcal{R} coincide), \mathcal{R} can be executed in Maude [9], a high-performance language and system supporting rewriting logic.

We start with a rewrite theory giving meaning to the different gates of an ADTree. The correctness of such a specification is self-evident and it allows us to solve the optimal scheduling problem by exploring, via a search procedure, all the possible paths leading to an attack. Unfortunately, this procedure does not scale well for complex ADTrees. Hence, we refine the first rewrite theory by incorporating some of the design principles devised in our specialised algorithm. We better control the non-deterministic choices in the specification, thus reducing the search space. The resulting theory can be effectively used in the case studies presented here and it opens the possibility

The authors acknowledge the support of CNRS and PAN, under the IEA project MoSART, and of NCBR Poland and FNR Luxembourg, under the PolLux/FNR-CORE project STV (POLLUX-VII/1/2019).

of exploring different optimisation ideas and different aspects of ADTrees as discussed in Section VII.

C. Contributions

In this paper, we: (i) present and prove the correctness of an algorithm for ADTrees which finds an optimal assignment of the minimal number of agents for all possible DAG variants of a given attack/defence scenario, (ii) show the scheduling algorithm's complexity to be quadratic in the number of nodes of its preprocessed input DAG, (iii) implement the algorithm in our tool `ADT2AMAS`, (iv) propose a rewrite theory, implemented in Maude, for a general solution to the considered problem, evaluate results and compare them against those of our specialised algorithm.

D. Related work

ADTrees [2], [10] are a popular formalism that has been implemented in a broad range of analysis frameworks [11], [12], [13], [14], comprehensively surveyed in [15], [16]. They remain extensively studied today [17]. Of particular relevance is the ADTree to AMAS translation [5], based on the semantics from [18]. Furthermore, the problem discussed in this paper is clearly related to parallel program scheduling [19], [20]. Due to time normalisation, it falls into the category of Unit Computational Cost (UCC) graph scheduling problems, which can be effectively solved for tree-like structures [21], but cannot be directly applied to a set of DAGs. Although a polynomial solution for interval-ordered DAGs was proposed by [22], their algorithm does not guarantee the minimal number of agents. Due to zero-cost communication in all considered graphs, the problem can also be classified as No Communication (NC) graph scheduling. A number of heuristic algorithms using list scheduling were proposed [19], including Highest Levels First with No Estimated Times (HLFNET), Smallest Co-levels First with no Estimated Times (SCFNET), and Random, where nodes in the DAG are assigned priorities randomly. Variants assuming non-uniform node computation times are also considered, but are not applicable to the problem solved in this paper. Furthermore, this class of algorithms does not aim at finding a schedule with the minimal number of processors or agents. On the other hand, known algorithms that include such a limit, *i.e.* for the Bounded Number of Processors (BNP) class of problems, assume non-zero communication cost and rely on the clustering technique, reducing communication, and thus schedule length, by mapping nodes to processing units. Hence, these techniques are not directly applicable.

The algorithm described in this paper can be classified as list scheduling with a fusion of HLFNET and SCFNET heuristics, but with additional restriction on the number of agents used. The length of a schedule is determined as the length of the critical path of a graph. The number of minimal agents needed for the schedule is found with bisection.

Branching schedules analogous to the variants discussed in Section III have been previously explored, albeit using different models that either include probability [23] or require

an additional DAG to store possible executions [24]. Zero duration nodes are also unique to the ADTree setting.

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first work dealing with agents in this context. Rather, scheduling in multi-agent systems typically focuses on agents' *choices* in cooperative or competitive scenarios, *e.g.* in models such as BDI [25], [26].

Rewriting logic and Maude have been extensively used for the formal analysis and verification of systems. The reader can find in [7], [8] a survey of the different techniques and applications in this field. In the context of ADTrees, the work in [27] and the companion tool `SPTool` define a rewrite theory that allows for checking the equivalence between ADTrees featuring sequential AND gates. The work in [28] extends the `SPTool` by adding different backend theories written in Maude: one for checking equivalence of ADTrees and one implemented a linear-logic based semantics [29] for it. In none of these works and tools, the problem of finding the optimal scheduling for agents is considered.

E. Outline

The next section briefly recalls the ADTree formalism. In Section III, several preprocessing steps are discussed, including transforming the input tree to a DAG, normalising node attributes, and handling different types of nodes. Section IV describes the main algorithm, as well as a proof of its correctness and optimality. The algorithm, implemented in our tool `ADT2AMAS` [30], is benchmarked in Section V. The rewriting logic specification is described and experimented in Section VI, and we discuss the pros and cons with respect to the specialized algorithm proposed here. Section VII concludes the paper and provides perspectives for future work.

This paper is an extended version of [31]. From the theoretical point of view, the rewriting semantics in Section VI is completely new. From the practical side, we provide another tool, `ADT2MAUDE`, that enacts the rewriting approach.

II. ATTACK-DEFENCE TREES

To keep the paper self-contained, we briefly recall the basics of ADTrees and their translation to a multi-agent setting.

A. Attack-defence trees

ADTrees are a well-known formalism that models security scenarios as an interplay between attacking and defending parties. Figure 1 depicts the basic constructs used throughout the paper. For a more comprehensive overview, we refer the reader to [5].

Attacking and defending actions are depicted in red and green, respectively. Leaves represent individual actions at the highest level of granularity. Different types of gates allow for modelling increasingly broad intermediary goals, all the way up to the root, which corresponds to the overall objective. OR and AND gates are defined analogously to their logical counterparts. SAND is a sequential variant of the latter, *i.e.* the entire subtree a_i needs to be completed before handling a_{i+1} . While only shown in attacking subtrees here, these gates may refine defending goals in the same way. Reactive or passive




Fig. 1: Basic ADTree constructs

countering actions can be expressed using gates CAND (counter defence; successful iff a succeeds and d fails), NODEF (no defence; successful iff either a succeeds or d fails), and SCAND (failed reactive defence; sequential variant of CAND, where a occurs first). We collectively refer to gates and leaves as *nodes*.

ADTree nodes may additionally have numerical *attributes*, e.g. the time needed for an attack, or its financial cost. Boolean functions over these attributes, called *conditions*, may then be associated with counter-defence nodes to serve as additional constraints for the success or failure of a defending action.

In the following, the *treasure hunters* ADTree in Figure 2 will be used as a running example. While both the gatekeeper b and the door f need to be taken care of to steal the treasure (ST), just one escape route (either h or e) is needed to flee (GA), with TF enforcing sequentiality.




Fig. 2: Running example: treasure hunters

B. Translation to extended AMAS

Asynchronous multi-agent systems (AMAS) [18] are essentially networks of automata, which synchronise on shared transitions and interleave private ones for asynchronous execution. An extension of this formalism with attributes and conditional constraints to model ADTrees, and the translation of the latter to extended AMAS, were proposed in [5]. Intuitively, each node of the ADTree corresponds to a single automaton in the resulting network. Specific patterns, embedding reductions to minimise state space explosion [4], are used for different types of ADTree constructs. As the specifics exceed the scope and space of this paper, we refer the reader to [18] for the AMAS semantics, and to [5] for the details on the translation.

In the multi-agent setting, groups of agents working for the attacking and defending parties can be considered. Note that

the *feasibility* of an attack is not affected by the number or distribution of agents over ADTree nodes, as opposed to some *performance* metrics, such as time (e.g. a lone agent can handle all the actions sequentially, albeit usually much slower).

C. Assignment of agents for ADTrees

Consequently, the optimal distribution of agent coalitions is of vital importance for both parties, allowing them to prepare for multiple scenarios, depending on how many agents they can afford to recruit (thereby delaying or speeding up the completion of the main goal). For instance, the thieves in Figure 2, knowing the police response time, would have to plan accordingly by bringing a sufficiently large team and, more importantly, schedule their tasks to make the most of these numbers. Thus, we can formulate two relevant and non-trivial scheduling problems. *The first one*, not directly addressed here, is obtaining the assignment using a given number of agents that results in optimal execution time. *The second one*, on which we focus in this paper, is synthesising an assignment that achieves a particular execution time using the least possible number of agents. Typically, the minimum possible time is of interest here. As we show in Section III, this time can be computed from the structure of the input ADTree itself (and, of course, the time attribute of nodes). However, our approach can also target a longer attack time if desired. In the next section, we discuss it in more detail as normalisation of the input tree is considered, along with several other preprocessing steps.

III. PREPROCESSING THE TREE

In this preprocessing step, an ADTree is transformed into DAGs (*Directed Acyclic Graphs*) of actions of the same duration. This is achieved by splitting nodes into sequences of such actions, mimicking the scheduling enforced by ADTrees sequential gates, and considering the different possibilities of defences. Therefore, we introduce a sequential node SEQ, which only waits for some input, processes it and produces some output. It is depicted as a lozenge (see Figure 4a).

In what follows, we assume that one time unit is the greatest common factor of time durations across all nodes in the input ADTree, i.e. $t_{unit} = \text{gcf}(t_{N_1} \dots t_{N_{|ADTree|}})$. By *time slots*, we refer to fragments of the schedule whose length is t_{unit} . That is, after normalisation, one agent can handle exactly one node of non-zero duration within a single time slot. Note that, during the preprocessing steps described in this section, node labels are preserved to ensure backwards traceability. Their new versions are either primed or indexed.

A. Nodes with no duration

It happens that several nodes have no time parameter set, and are thus considered to have a duration of 0. Such nodes play essentially a structuring role. Since they do not take any time, the following proposition is straightforward.

Proposition 1. *Nodes with duration 0 can always be scheduled immediately before their parent node or after their last occurring child, using the same agent in the same time slot.*

Preprocessing introduces nodes similar to SEQ but with 0 duration, called NULL and depicted as trapeziums (Fig. 4b).

B. Normalising time

The first preprocessing step prior to applying the scheduling algorithm normalises the time parameter of nodes.

Proposition 2. Any node N of duration $t_N = n \times t_{unit}$, $n \neq 0$ can be replaced with an equivalent sequence consisting of a node N' (differing from N only in its 0 duration) and n SEQ nodes N_1, \dots, N_n of duration t_{unit} .

C. Scheduling enforcement

SAND nodes enforce some scheduling, and are transformed into a sequence containing their subtrees and NULL nodes.

Proposition 3. Any SAND node N with children subtrees T_1, \dots, T_n can be replaced with an equivalent sequence $T_1, N_1, T_2, \dots, N_{n-1}, T_n, N_n$, where each N_i is a NULL node, its input is the output of T_i and its outputs are the leaves of T_{i+1} (except for N_n which has the same output as N if any).

D. Handling defences

The scheduling we are seeking to obtain will guarantee that the necessary attacks are performed. Hence, when dealing with defence nodes, we can assume that all attacks are successful. However, they may not be mandatory, in which case they should be avoided so as to obtain a better scheduling of agents.

Taking into account each possible choice of defences will lead to as many DAGs representing the attacks to be performed. This allows for answering the question: ‘‘What is the minimal schedule of attackers if these defences are operating?’’

Composite defences. Defences resulting from an AND, SAND or OR between several defences are operating according to the success of their subtrees: for AND and SAND, all subtrees should be operating, while only one is necessary for OR. This can easily be computed by a boolean bottom-up labelling of nodes. Note that different choices of elementary defences can lead to disabling the same higher-level composite defence, thus limiting the number of DAGs that will need to be considered.

No Defence nodes (NODEF). A NODEF succeeds if its attack succeeds or its defence fails. Hence, if the defence is not operating, the attack is not necessary. Thus, the NODEF node can be replaced by a NULL node without children, and the children subtrees deleted. On the contrary, if the defence is operating, the attack must take place. The defence subtree is deleted, while the attack one is kept, and the NODEF node can be replaced by a NULL node, as depicted in Figure 3.

Counter Defence (CAND) and Failed Reactive Defence (SCAND) nodes. A CAND succeeds if its attack is successful and its defence is not. A SCAND additionally specifies that the defence takes place after the attack. In both cases, if the defence is not operating, its subtree is deleted, while the attack one is kept, and the CAND (or SCAND) node can be replaced by a NULL node, as in Figure 3c. Otherwise, the CAND (or SCAND) node is deleted, as well as its subtrees. Moreover, it transmits its failure recursively to its parents, until a choice of another

branch is possible. Thus, all ancestors are deleted bottom up until an OR is reached.

Thus, we have a set of DAGs with attack nodes only.




Fig. 3: Handling NODEF A

E. Handling OR branches

OR nodes give the choice between several series of actions, only one of which will be chosen in an optimal assignment of events. However, one cannot simply keep the shortest branch of an OR node and prune all others. Doing so minimises attack time, but not necessarily the number of agents. In particular, a slightly longer, but narrower branch may require fewer agents without increasing attack time, provided there is a longer sequence elsewhere in the DAG. Consequently, only branches that are guaranteed not to lead to an optimal assignment can be pruned, which is the case when a branch is the longest one in the entire graph. All other cases need to be investigated, leading to multiple variants depending on the OR branch executed, similar to the approach for defence nodes.

F. Preprocessing the treasure hunters ADTree

Figures 4 and 4a detail the preprocessing of the treasure hunters example step by step. The time unit is one minute. Long sequences of SEQ are shortened with dotted lines. Note that when handling the defence, at step 3, we should obtain two DAGs corresponding to the case where the defence fails (see Figure 4c), or where the defence is successful. This latter case leads to an empty DAG where no attack can succeed. Therefore, we can immediately conclude that if the police is successful, there is no scheduling of agents.

IV. BEST MINIMAL AGENT ASSIGNMENT

At this stage, we have DAGs where nodes are either (i) a leaf, or of type AND, OR, or NULL, all with duration 0 or (ii) of type SEQ with duration t_{unit} . Their branches mimic the possible runs in the system.

The algorithm’s input is a set of DAGs preprocessed as described in Section III, corresponding to possible configurations of defence nodes’ outcomes and choices of OR branches in the original ADTree. For each of these DAGs, n denotes the number of SEQ nodes (all other ones have 0-duration). Furthermore, nodes (denoted by N) have some attributes: their *type*; four integers *depth*, *level*, *agent* and *slot*, initially with value 0. The values of *depth* and *level* denote, respectively, the height of a node’s tallest subtree and the distance from the root (both without counting the zero duration nodes). The attributes *agent* and *slot* store the node’s assignment in the schedule.




Fig. 4: Treasure hunters ADTree: preprocessing steps (top, left, middle) and initial part of the main algorithm (bottom right)

A. Depth and level of nodes

We first compute the nodes' depth and level, handled by procedures `DEPTHNODE` and `LEVELNODE`, respectively. They explore the DAG in a DFS (*depth first search*) manner, starting from the root. Both attributes are assigned recursively, with *depth* computed during backtracking, *i.e.* starting from the leaves. There are slight differences in the way specific node types are handled; we refer the reader to [31] for the details.

B. Number of agents: upper and lower bounds

The upper bound on the number of agents is obtained from the maximal width of the preprocessed DAG, *i.e.* the maximal number of SEQ nodes assigned the same value of *level*. These nodes must be executed in parallel to guarantee that the attack is achieved in the minimal time.

The minimal attack time is obtained from the number of levels l in the preprocessed DAG. Note that the longest path from the root to a leaf has exactly l nodes of non-zero duration. Clearly, none of these nodes can be executed in parallel, therefore the number of time slots cannot be smaller than l . Thus, if an optimal schedule of $l \times t_{unit}$ is realisable, the n nodes must fit in a schedule containing l time slots. Hence, the lower bound on the number of agents is $\lceil \frac{n}{l} \rceil$. There is, however, no guarantee that it can be achieved, and introducing additional agents may be necessary depending on the DAG structure, *e.g.* if there are many parallel leaves.

C. Minimal schedule

The algorithm for obtaining a schedule with the minimal attack time and also minimising the number of agents is given in Alg. 1. Input DAGs are processed sequentially and a schedule is computed for each one. Not restricting the output to the overall minimum allows to avoid “no attack” scenarios where the time is 0 (*e.g.* following a defence failure on a root NODEF node). Furthermore, with information on the distribution of agents for a successful minimal time attack in all cases of defences, the defender is able to decide which defences to enable according to these results.

The actual computation of the schedule is handled by the function `SCHEDULE` (Alg. 2). Starting from the root and going top-down, all SEQ nodes at the current level are added to set S . The other nodes at that level have a null duration and can be scheduled afterwards with either a parent or child. An additional check in l. 5 ensures that non-optimal variants (whose longest branch exceeds a previously encountered minimum) are discarded without needlessly computing the schedule. Nodes in S are assigned an agent and time slot, prioritising those with higher *depth* (*i.e.* taller subtrees), as long as an agent is available. Assigned nodes are removed from S , and any that remain (*e.g.* when the bound was exceeded) are carried over to the next level iteration. At this point, it is possible for a parent and a child node to be in S concurrently. However, since higher *depth* takes precedence, they will never be scheduled in the wrong order, and an extra check in the while loop avoids scheduling both nodes to be executed in parallel.

Algorithm 2 calls function `RESHUFFLESLOT` after the complete assignment of a time slot at l. 12 to ensure consistent assignment of sub-actions of the same ADTree node. Note that depending on *depth*, a sub-action may be moved to the next slot, creating an interrupted schedule where an agent stops an action for one or more time units to handle another. Alternatively, agents may collaborate, each handling a node's action for a part of its total duration. Such assignments could

Algorithm 1: MINSCHEDULE(DAG_set)

```
1  $output = \emptyset$ 
2 while  $DAG\_set \neq \emptyset$  do
3   Pick  $DAG \in DAG\_set$ 
4   if  $DAG.n = 0$  then continue ▷ Skip empty DAGs
5    $DEPTHNODE(root(DAG))$  ▷ Compute depth of nodes
6    $DAG \leftarrow DAG \setminus \{N \mid \neg N.keep\}$ 
7    $LEVELNODE(root(DAG), 0)$  ▷ Compute level of nodes
8    $slots \leftarrow root(DAG).depth$ 
9    $low\_bound \leftarrow \lceil \frac{DAG.n}{slots} \rceil - 1$ 
10   $max\_agents \leftarrow \max_j (\{|N : N.type =$ 
     $SEQ \wedge N.level = j|\})$  ▷ Max. level width (concur. SEQ nodes)
11   $up\_bound \leftarrow max\_agents$ 
12   $curr\_output = \emptyset$ 
13  while  $(up\_bound - low\_bound > 1)$  do
14     $agents \leftarrow low\_bound + \lfloor \frac{up\_bound - low\_bound}{2} \rfloor$ 
15     $(candidate, n\_remain) \leftarrow$ 
       $SCHEDULE(DAG, slots, agents)$ 
16    if  $n\_remain = 0$  then ▷ Candidate schedule OK
17       $up\_bound \leftarrow agents$ 
18       $curr\_output \leftarrow candidate$ 
19    else  $low\_bound = agents$  ▷ Cand. schedule not OK
20  if  $up\_bound = max\_agents$  then
21     $(curr\_output, \_) \leftarrow$ 
       $SCHEDULE(DAG, slots, max\_agents)$ 
22   $ZEROASSIGN(DAG)$ 
23   $output \leftarrow output \cup curr\_output$ 
24   $DAG\_set \leftarrow DAG\_set \setminus DAG$ 
25 return  $output$ 
```

be deemed unsuitable for specific scenarios where extra conditions need to be satisfied. In those cases, manual reshuffling or adding extra agent(s) is left to the user's discretion.

At this point, either the upper or the lower bound on the number of agents is adjusted, depending on whether the resulting schedule is valid (that is, there are no nodes left to assign at the end). Scheduling is then repeated for these updated values until the minimal number of agents is found (*i.e.* the two bounds are equal).

After the complete computation for a given DAG, l. 22 calls function ZEROASSIGN in order to obtain assignments for all remaining nodes, *i.e.* those of zero duration. Functions RESHUFFLESLOT and ZEROASSIGN are detailed in Sections IV-D and IV-E, respectively.

Although this algorithm assumes the minimal time is of interest, it can be easily modified to increase the number of time slots, thus synthesising the minimal number of agents required for a successful attack of any given duration.

D. Uniform assignment for SEQ nodes

A separate subprocedure, given in Algorithm 3, swaps assigned agents between nodes at the same level so that the same agent handles all SEQ nodes in sequences obtained during the

Algorithm 2: SCHEDULE($DAG, slots, agents$)

```
1  $l \leftarrow 0, slot \leftarrow slots, S \leftarrow \emptyset, n\_remain \leftarrow DAG.n$ 
2 while  $n\_remain > 0$  and  $slot > 0$  do
3    $agent \leftarrow 1$ 
4    $S \leftarrow S \cup \{N \mid N.type = SEQ \wedge N.level = l\}$ 
5   if  $\exists N \in S, s.t. N.depth < slots - slot$  then
6      $\lfloor$  return  $\emptyset, n\_remain$ 
7   while  $agent \leq agents$  and  $S \neq \emptyset$  and
     $(Pick N \in S, s.t. \forall N' \in S N.depth \geq N'.depth \wedge$ 
     $\forall N': N'.slot = slot N' \notin ancestors(N)) \neq \emptyset$  do
8      $N.agent \leftarrow agent$ 
9      $N.slot \leftarrow slot$ 
10     $agent \leftarrow agent + 1, n\_remain \leftarrow n\_remain - 1$ 
11     $S \leftarrow S \setminus \{N\}$ 
12   $RESHUFFLESLOT(slot, agent - 1)$ 
13   $l \leftarrow l + 1, slot \leftarrow slot - 1$ 
14  $output \leftarrow \bigcup_{N \in DAG} \{(N.agent, N.slot)\}$ 
15 return  $output, n\_remain$ 
```

time normalisation step (*i.e.* corresponding to a single node in the original ADTree).

Algorithm 3: RESHUFFLESLOT($slot, num_agents$)

```
1 for  $agent \in \{1..num\_agents\}$  do
2    $current\_node \leftarrow N, s.t.$ 
     $N.agent = agent \wedge N.slot = slot$ 
3    $par\_agent \leftarrow parent(current\_node).agent$ 
4   if  $par\_agent \neq agent \wedge par\_agent \neq 0$  then
5     if  $\exists N' \neq current\_node, s.t.$ 
     $N'.agent = par\_agent \wedge N'.slot = slot$  then
6        $N'.agent \leftarrow agent$  ▷ Swap with  $N'$  if it exists
7        $N'.slot \leftarrow slot$ 
8        $current\_node.agent \leftarrow par\_agent$ 
9        $current\_node.slot \leftarrow slot$ 
```

Proposition 4. *Reshuffling the assignment by swapping the agents assigned to a pair of nodes in the same slot does not affect the correctness of the scheduling.*

Proof. See [31, Proposition 4]. □

E. Assigning nodes without duration

After all non-zero duration nodes have been assigned and possibly reshuffled at each level, Alg. 4 handles the remaining nodes. Our choice here stems from the ADTree gate the node originates from. We first assign zero-duration nodes to the same agent and time slot as their parent if the parent is a SEQ node (l. 2–6). NULL, OR and LEAF nodes get the same assignment as their only child if any, or as their parent if they have no child (l. 8–19). The latter case may happen for NULL when handling defences as in *e.g.* Fig. 3b, and for LEAF nodes originally of null duration. AND nodes are assigned the same agent and time slot as the child that occurs last (l. 20–30).

Algorithm 4: ZEROASSIGN(DAG)

```

1  $S \leftarrow \{N \mid N.agent = 0\}$  ▷ Nodes not assigned yet
2 for  $node \in S$  do
3   if  $N \in parent(node) \wedge N.type = SEQ$  then
4      $node.agent \leftarrow N.agent$ 
5      $node.slot \leftarrow N.slot$ 
6      $S \leftarrow S \setminus \{node\}$ 
7 while  $S \neq \emptyset$  do
8   for  $node \in S$  s.t.  $node.type \in \{NULL, OR, LEAF\}$  do
9     if  $N.agent \neq 0$  s.t.  $N \in child(node)$  then
10       $node.agent \leftarrow N.agent$ 
11       $node.slot \leftarrow N.slot$ 
12       $S \leftarrow S \setminus \{node\}$ 
13     if  $(child(node) = \emptyset$ 
14        $\vee (N.depth = 0$  s.t.  $N \in child(node)))$  then
15        $parent\_node \leftarrow N \in parent(node)$  s.t.
16          $\forall N' \in parent(node) N.slot \leq N'.slot$ 
17       if  $parent\_node.agent \neq 0$  then
18          $node.agent \leftarrow parent\_node.agent$ 
19          $node.slot \leftarrow parent\_node.slot$ 
20          $S \leftarrow S \setminus \{node\}$ 
21     for  $node \in S$  s.t.  $node.type = AND$  do
22       if  $node.depth = 0 \wedge parent(node).agent \neq 0$  then
23          $node.agent \leftarrow parent(node).agent$ 
24          $node.slot \leftarrow parent(node).slot$ 
25          $S \leftarrow S \setminus \{node\}$ 
26       if  $node.depth \neq 0$ 
27          $\wedge \forall N \in child(node) (N.agent \neq 0 \vee N.depth = 0)$ 
28         then
29          $child\_node \leftarrow N \in child(node)$  s.t.
30            $\forall N' \in child(node) N.slot \geq N'.slot$ 
31          $node.agent \leftarrow child\_node.agent$ 
32          $node.slot \leftarrow child\_node.slot$ 
33          $S \leftarrow S \setminus \{node\}$ 

```

Note that in all cases the agents (and time slots) assigned to zero duration nodes are the same as those of their immediate parents or children. Hence, no further reshuffling is necessary.

Proposition 5. *Adding nodes of zero duration to the assignment in Alg. 4 does not affect the correctness of the scheduling.*

Proof. See [31, Proposition 5]. □

F. Complexity and correctness

We now consider the algorithm's complexity and prove that it achieves its intended goal.

Proposition 6. *Algorithm 1 is in $\mathcal{O}(kn^2 \log n)$, where k is the number of input DAGs, and n their average number of nodes.*

Proof. See [31, Proposition 6]. □

Thus, while the scheduling algorithm itself is quadratic, it is executed for k DAG variants, where k is exponential in the number of OR and defence nodes in the ADTree.

Proposition 7. *The assignments returned by Algorithm 1 are correct and use the minimal number of agents for each variant $DAG \in DAG_set$ to achieve the attack in minimal time.*

Proof. See [31, Proposition 7]. □

G. Scheduling for the treasure hunters ADTree

We now apply these algorithms to the treasure hunters example. Figure 4d shows the output of the three initial subprocedures. The depth of nodes assigned by DEPTHNODE is displayed in green. The branch corresponding to attack e has been pruned as per Section III-E. Levels assigned by LEVELNODE are displayed in blue. Finally, the agents assignment computed by Algorithm 1 is shown in Figure 5.

slot	agent	
	1	2
125	h_3, GA', TF'_2, TS'	
124	h_2	
123	h_1, h'	
122	ST_2, TF'_1	
121	ST_1, ST'	
120	f_{120}	b_{60}
...
61	f_{61}	b_1, b'
60	f_{60}	
...	...	
1	f_1, f'	

Fig. 5: Treasure hunters: Assignment of Algorithm 1

V. EXPERIMENTS

The algorithms presented here are implemented in our open source tool ADT2AMAS [32], written in C++17. It allows for specifying input ADTrees either via simple-syntax text files or using an intuitive GUI, and handles both their translation to extended AMAS and computation of an optimal schedule with minimal number of agents. Intermediary steps of the algorithm can be exported as Tikz figures, allowing to easily visualise and understand them. For more details on the architecture of ADT2AMAS, we refer the reader to [30]. Here, we present its application to the use cases from [5], plus examples that feature some specific behaviour. All the figures and tables of the examples can be found in the supplementary material of this paper <https://bit.ly/3ONeSzq> and in the extended version of [31] available at <https://arxiv.org/abs/2101.06838>.

fore stall: This case study models forestalling a software instance. Depending on the active defences, 4 cases are possible. However, the DAG for no active defence and the one where the only active defence is id (intrusion detection [5]), are the same. All three remaining DAGs have an optimal schedule with only 1 agent, in 43 days for the no defence (or id only) case, 54 if only scr (secure coding rooms) is active, and 55 if both defences occur. Although only a single agent is needed to achieve the attack in minimal time, the schedule exhibits which specific attacks must be performed to do so.

iot-dev: This example models an attack on an IoT device via a network. There are 4 cases, according to the active defences, but only the one with no defence leads to a DAG. Indeed, t1a (two-level authentication) causes the failure of

GVC (get valid credentials) which in turn makes APN (access private net) and then APNS fail, independent of the defence `inc` (inform of new connections). Thus the attack necessarily fails. This is also the case if defence `inc` is active. The only way for an attack to succeed is that all defences fail, leading to an optimal schedule in 694 minutes with 2 agents. Hence an attacker will use 2 agents to perform the fastest attack. On the other hand, the defender knows that a single one of the two defences is sufficient to block any attack.

gain-admin: This third case is about an attacker trying to gain administration privileges on a computer system. There are 16 possible defences combinations, which are covered by only 3 cases: `scr` (secure coding rooms) is not active; `scr` is active but not DTH (defence against trojans); both of them are active. In all three cases, the shortest attack requires only a single agent, and can be scheduled in 2942, 4320 and 5762 minutes, respectively.

Exhibiting particular scheduling features: Experiments were conducted on the example used in [5] to evaluate the impact of the number of agents on the attack time, and two small examples designed to exhibit particular characteristics of the schedule. Our algorithm confirms an optimal schedule in 5 minutes with 6 agents for the example of [5]. Then, *interrupted* (see Figure 6) shows that the scheduling algorithm can produce an interleaved execution of two attacks (b and e), assigned to the same agent. Finally, the *last* example provides a succession of nodes with 0 duration (`a'`, `e'`, `f'`, `h'` and `i'`), and shows they are handled as expected.

Scaling example: In the *scaling* example, the first agent processes the longest path while the second agent handles all other actions. It is extended to analyse the scaling capabilities of the scheduling algorithm. For this purpose, we wrote an automatic generator of ADTrees. The parameters of the generated ADTrees are the *depth*, the *width* corresponding to the number of deepest leaves, the number of *children* for each AND, and the total number of *nodes*. All nodes have time 1 except the first leaf that has time *width* - 1. The results show that the number of agents is not proportional to the width of the tree, and the optimal scheduling varies according to the time of nodes. We refer the reader to [31] for a detailed comparison.

VI. A GENERAL APPROACH WITH REWRITING LOGIC

This section presents an alternative approach for solving the optimal scheduling problem in ADTrees, which is more general in the sense that it does not build upon a dedicated algorithm. We start with an appropriate representation for the ADTree structure (§VI-A) and present a rewrite theory giving meaning to the gates of the tree (§VI-B). Since the resulting theory is executable, we can use the system Maude [9] as a decision procedure to enumerate all the possible configurations leading to an attack and find the optimal one (§VI-C). However, without a suitable strategy, it is not efficient enough for more complex scenarios. Hence, we refine (§VI-D) the theory by adapting some of the ideas and heuristics implemented in the specialised algorithm proposed in Section IV. The

resulting procedure is easy to prove correct, and exhibits good performance for all the case studies considered in Section V.

In what follows, we explain the main concepts behind Rewriting Logic (RL) [6], [7], while gradually introducing the proposed rewrite theory for ADTrees. We adopt, in most cases, the notation of Maude [9], a high-level language supporting rewriting logic theories. This allows for producing an executable specification. For the sake of readability, we omit some details and the complete specification can be found at the website of our tool ADT2MAUDE [33].

A *rewrite theory* is a tuple $\mathcal{R} = (\Sigma, E \uplus B, R)$. The static behaviour (§VI-A) of the system is modelled by the ordered equational theory $(\Sigma, E \uplus B)$ and the dynamic behaviour (§VI-B) by the set of rewrite rules R .

A. Equational theory

The signature Σ defines a set of typed operators used to build the terms of the language (*i.e.* the syntax of the modelled system). E is a set of (conditional) equations over T_Σ (the set of terms built from Σ) of the form $t = t' \text{ if } \phi$. The equations specify the algebraic identities that terms of the language must satisfy. For instance, if the operator $|\cdot|$ denotes the length of a sequence of symbols, then the following equations must hold: $|\epsilon| = 0$ and $|ax| = 1 + |x|$ (where ϵ is the empty sequence).

In $(\Sigma, E \uplus B)$, B is a set of structural axioms over T_Σ for which there is a finitary matching algorithm. Such axioms include associativity, commutativity, and identity, or combinations of them. For instance, ϵ is the identity for concatenation and then, modulo this axiom, the terms $x\epsilon$ and x are equivalent. The equational theory associated with \mathcal{R} thus defines algebraic data types and deterministic and finite computations as in a functional programming language.

RL allows for defining any syntax for the operators in Σ , using *sorts* along with constructors and operators for them. Here is a simple example defining Peano's natural numbers:

```
fmod NAT is                                     --- equational theory
sort Nat.                                       --- sort definition
op 0 : -> Nat [ctor] .                         --- zero
op s : Nat -> Nat [ctor] .                    --- successor
op _+_ : Nat Nat -> Nat .                    --- addition
vars x y : Nat .                               --- logical variables
eq 0 + x = x .                                 --- equations defining +
eq s(y) + x = s(y + x) .
endfm
```

The attribute `[ctor]` in the definition of zero and successor is optional. It is used to document that these operators are constructors for terms of sort `Nat`. The positions of the arguments in the (mixfix) operator `+` are indicated with underscores and the equations give meaning to it: $\forall x : Nat, 0 + x = x$ and $\forall xy : Nat, s(y) + x = s(x + y)$. Hence, the term $s(0) + s(s(0))$ reduces to the normal form $s(s(s(0)))$.

The starting point for our specification is to define an equational theory for building terms representing ADTrees. In Maude, systems are specified using a syntax resembling that of object oriented languages. The needed sorts and operators are defined in the module `CONFIGURATION`, available in Maude's prelude. The idea is to represent entities as record-like structures (sort `Object`) of the form $\langle O : C \mid a_1 : v_1, \dots, a_n : v_n \rangle$

where O is an object identifier (sort `Oid`), C is a class identifier (sort `Cid`), a_i is an attribute (sort `Attribute`) and v_i is a term that represents the current value of a_i . We start by defining the class identifiers for each kind of gate:

```
mod ADTree is          --- Rewrite theory ADTree
--- Class IDs for Nodes
op NOT :    -> Cid .    op AND :    -> Cid .
op SAND :   -> Cid .    op OR :    -> Cid .
op ATK :    -> Cid .    op DEF :    -> Cid .
```

The class `NOT` is used to define subtrees that are defences (as in `NAND` gates); `SAND` stands for sequential `AND`; and the last two classes represent attacks and defences.

The attributes for the gates include the (accumulated) time, cost, and the number of agents needed to perform the attack:

```
--- attributes for gates
op time:_   : Nat      -> Attribute .
op cost:_   : Nat      -> Attribute .
op agents:_ : Nat      -> Attribute .
op acctime:_ : Nat     -> Attribute .
op acccost:_ : Nat     -> Attribute .
```

The equational theory is ordered-sorted, *i.e.* there is a partial order on sorts defining a sub-typing relation: `subsort Qid < Oid`. The sort `Qid` is part of Maude's standard library and represents quoted identifiers, *e.g.* `'TS` (a sequence of characters preceded by an apostrophe). Hence, `'TS` is both a quoted identifier and an object identifier.

An interesting RL feature is the definition of axioms for the operators (B above), *e.g.* it is straightforward to define a list as a non-commutative monoid and a set as an abelian monoid:

```
subsort Oid < List .      --- singleton list
subsort Oid < Set .      --- singleton set
op nil : -> List [ctor] . --- empty list
op empty : -> Set [ctor] . --- empty set
--- building lists and sets
op __ : List List -> List [ctor assoc id: nil] .
op _ , _ : Set Set -> Set [ctor assoc comm id: empty] .
```

In this specification, the term `"'A 'B 'C"` (resp. `"'A, 'B, 'C"`) represents a list (resp. a set) of three object identifiers. The concatenation operator `__` is called *empty syntax*, since a white space is used to concatenate elements. Note that being associative, the lists `"'A ('B 'C)"` and `"('A 'B) 'C"` are equivalent (modulo `assoc`), as are the terms `"'A, 'B, 'C"` and `"'C, 'B, 'A"` due to commutativity.

The sorts and operators needed to specify lists and sets are already available in Maude. The sorts for these data structures are renamed here, respectively, as `NodeList` and `NodeSet` and used below to define two new attributes for gates:

```
--- ordered and unordered children
op lchd:_ : NodeList -> Attribute .
op schd:_ : NodeSet  -> Attribute .
```

The first one is used for sequential gates `SAND`, and the second one for all others. Each node is associated with a state:

```
--- states for nodes in the tree
sort Status .
op Fail Succeed Unknown :    -> Status .
op stat:_                : Status -> Attribute .
```

Initially, all the nodes are in state `Unknown`, which may change to `Succeed` or `Fail`, according to the rules described in the next section.

Suitable operators for building the different gates in an `ADTree` are introduced. For instance:

```
--- building an attack: ID, time and cost
op makeAtk : Qid Nat Nat -> Object .
eq makeAtk(Q, t, c) =
  < Q : ATK | time: t, cost: c, agents: 1 ,
    acctime: 0, acccost: 0,
    stat: Unknown > .
--- build. an OR gate: ID, children, time and cost
op makeOr : Qid NodeSet Nat Nat -> Object .
eq makeOr(Q, S, t, c) =
  < Q : OR | time: t, cost: c, agents: 0 ,
    acctime: 0, acccost: 0, schd: S,
    stat: Unknown > .
```

Note that a leaf attack requires one agent and the number of agents for the `OR` gate is initially zero. That value will be updated as explained below.

An equational theory is executable only if it is terminating, confluent and sort-decreasing [9]. Under these conditions, the mathematical meaning of the equality $t \equiv t'$ coincides with the following strategy: reduce t and t' to their unique (due to termination and confluence) normal forms t_c and t'_c using the equations in the theory as *simplification rules* from left to right. Then, $t \equiv t'$ iff $t_c =_B t'_c$ (note that $=_B$, equality modulo B , is decidable since a finitary matching algorithm for B is assumed). For instance, the term `makeAtk('A, 3, 2)` can be reduced to the normal form `<'A : ATK | time: 3, agents: 1, stat: Unknown, ...>` using the equations above.

The Maude's theory `CONFIGURATION` defines the sort `Configuration` as a set of objects concatenated with the empty syntax (an associative and commutative operator with none as identity). Hence, the term t_{GA} below, with sort `Configuration`, encodes the subtree GA in Figure 2.

```
--- t_GA (subtree GA)
MakeAtk('h, 3, 500) MakeAtk('e, 10, 0)
MakeOr('GA, ('h, 'e), 0, 0)
```

Finally, two additional constructors for the sort `Configuration` are defined in the theory `ADTree`:

```
op {_;_} : Oid Configuration -> Configuration .
op {_}   : Configuration -> Configuration .
```

Given an `ADTree` T , we shall use $\llbracket T \rrbracket$ to denote the corresponding term of the form $\{Q, Cnf\}$ where Q is the root of T and Cnf is the set of objects encoding the gates in T . As shown in the next section, the second operator `op {_}` will be useful to simplify the final configuration and summarise the results of the analysis.

B. Rewriting semantics for gates

Now we focus on the last component R in the rewrite theory $\mathcal{R} = (\Sigma, E \uplus B, R)$. This is a finite set of conditional rewriting rules of the form $l(\vec{x}) \rightarrow r(\vec{x})$ if $\phi(\vec{x})$, specifying a pattern $l(\vec{x})$ that can match some fragment of the system's state t if there is a substitution θ for the variables \vec{x} that makes $\theta(l(\vec{x}))$

equal (modulo axioms) to that state fragment. If the condition $\theta(\phi(\vec{x}))$ is true, the new state fragment is $\theta(r(\vec{x}))$, leading to a local transition. Hence, rules define state transformations modelling the dynamic behaviour of the system (which is not necessarily deterministic, nor terminating).

Conditions and patterns in rules may considerably affect the performance of a rewrite theory when it is used to explore all the possible reachable states from a given term. In this section, we propose rules that are self-explanatory but that may exhibit unnecessary non-determinism during the search procedure. Later, we add extra conditions to reduce the search space and improve efficiency.

Leaves. Let us start defining the behaviour for the gates representing leaves of an ADTree, i.e., attacks and defences:

```

--- semantics for attacks
rl [ATKOK] : < Q : ATK | stat: Unknown, ats > =>
             < Q : ATK | stat: Succeed, ats > .
rl [ATKNOK]: < Q : ATK | stat: Unknown, ats > =>
             < Q : ATK | stat: Fail, ats > .

```

These are unconditional ($\phi = true$) rules and then, ϕ is omitted. Q (resp. ats) is a logical variable of sort Qid (resp. $AttributeSet$, a set of attributes). These rules change the state of an attack currently in state `Unknown` to either `Succeed` or `Fail`. For instance, consider the term t_{GA} (of sort `Configuration`) above. Due to the structural axioms governing the juxtaposition operator (`[assoc comm id: none]`), these two rules can be applied in two different positions (local fragments) of the system represented by t_{GA} . More precisely, the rules `[ATKOK]` and `[ATKNOK]` can be applied by either substituting the variable Q with the term 'h (and ats with `time: 3, cost: 500, ...`) or substituting Q with 'e. Hence, the term t_{GA} can be rewritten in two steps into four possible configurations where: both attacks fail, one of the attacks succeeds and the other fails, or both attacks succeed. That is, all the possible outcomes for the attacks are covered.

The rules for defences are defined similarly:

```

--- semantics for defences
rl [DEFOK] : < Q : DEF | stat: Unknown, ats > =>
             < Q : DEF | stat: Succeed, ats > .
rl [DEFNOK]: < Q : DEF | stat: Unknown, ats > =>
             < Q : DEF | stat: Fail, ats > .

```

Gates. Let us start with the rules for the OR gate:

```

rl [OR] :
< Q : OR | schd: (o, S), stat: Unk., used: U, ats >
< o : C | stat: Succ., ats' > =>
< Q : OR | schd: empty, stat: Succ., used: (U,o),
accumulate(ats,ats') >
< o : C | stat: Succ., ats' >

```

The left-hand side (LHS) of the rule matches a fragment of the global system containing two objects: an OR gate and an object o of any class (o and C are variables of sort Oid and Cid respectively). The term (o, S) , where S has sort `NodeSet`, is a set. Hence, this rule applies to any of the children (in state `Succeed`) of the gate. The right-hand side (RHS) dictates the new state: the OR gate moves to the state `Succeed`; the node o is added to the attribute `used`, witnessing that o is required to perform the attack Q ; and the attributes for time, cost and

the number of agents in o are accumulated in Q . This is the purpose of the function `accumulate` that computes the new values from the attributes of Q (ats) and those of o (ats'). The new values for time and cost result from adding the time and cost accumulated in the children o with the time and cost of the gate Q . Moreover, the number of agents needed to perform Q is set to the number of agents needed to perform o . This is an upper bound for the number of agents needed, where one of the agents working on the subtree o can complete Q .

Now we consider two rules for handling the cases when one of the children of the OR gate fails and where there are no more children to be considered:

```

rl [OR] : --- failing child
< Q : OR | schd: (o, S), stat: Unknown, ats >
< o : C | stat: Fail, ats' > =>
< Q : OR | schd: S, stat: Unknown, ats >
< o : C | stat: Fail, ats' > .
rl [OR] : --- no more children
< Q : OR | schd: empty, stat: Unknown, ats > =>
< Q : OR | schd: empty, stat: Fail, ats > .

```

The first rule discards a failing child of the OR gate. The second rule changes the state of the gate to `Fail` when there are no remaining children. With these rules, the term t_{GA} can be rewritten into three possible configurations where the gate GA : fails (when both h and e fail); succeeds with total time 3 (when h succeeds, regardless the state of e); and succeeds with total time 10 (when e succeeds).

The rules for the (parallel) AND gate are defined as follows:

```

rl [AND] : --- succeeded child
< Q : AND | schd: (o, S), stat: Unk., used: U, ats >
< o : C | stat: Succeed, ats' > =>
< Q : AND | schd: S, stat: Unknown, used: (U,o),
acc-max(ats,ats') >
< o : C | stat: Succeed, ats' > .
rl [AND] : --- failing child
< Q : AND | schd: (o, S), stat: Unknown, ats >
< o : C | stat: Fail, ats' > =>
< Q : AND | schd: empty, stat: Fail, ats > .
rl [AND] : --- no more children
< Q : AND | schd: empty, stat: Unknown, ats > =>
< Q : AND | schd: empty, stat: Succeed, ats > .

```

In the first rule, the operator `acc-max` accumulates the time attribute by using the function `max`. That is, the AND gate computes the maximal value among the time needed to perform the attacks in each of the children of Q . On the contrary, the number of agents is accumulated by adding the value of the attribute `agents` of o and Q . Intuitively, since the children of Q can be executed in parallel (and in any order), an upper bound for the number of agents needed in Q is the sum of the agents needed for each of Q 's children. In the second rule, as expected, a failure of one of the children implies the failure of the gate. In the third rule, when all the children succeed (and `schd` is empty) the gate succeeds.

The behaviour of the sequential gate is specified as follows:

```

rl [SAND] :
< Q : SAND | lchd: (o L), stat: Unk., used: U, ats >
< o : C | stat: Suc., ats' > =>
< Q : SAND | lchd: L, stat: Unk., used: (U,o)
accumulate(ats,ats') >
< o : C | stat: Suc., ats' > .

```

The term $(o \ L)$ is a list and this rule only matches a state where the first child of the gate is in state `Succeed`. Similar rules to those presented for the `AND` gate handling the cases for a failing child and an empty list of children are also part of the specification and omitted. The attribute `time` is accumulated in this case by adding the values in o and Q . For the number of agents, the value is accumulated using the function `max`: the attack is sequential and the number of agents needed in Q is bound by the child that requires more agents.

The next rules give meaning to the `NOT` gate, used to model the gates `CAND`, `NODEF` and `SCAND` in Figure 1:

```

rl [NOT] :
  < Q : NOT | lchd: o, stat: Unknown, ats >
  < o : C | stat: Succeed, ats' > =>
  < Q : NOT | stat: Fail, acc-def(ats) >
  < o : C | stat: Succeed, ats' > .
rl [NOT] :
  < Q : NOT | lchd: o, stat: Unknown, ats >
  < o : C | stat: Fail, ats' > =>
  < Q : NOT | stat: Succeed, acc-def(ats) >
  < o : C | stat: Fail, ats' > .

```

As expected, if the (unique) child of a `NOT` gate succeeds, the gate fails and vice-versa. The time, cost and number of agents are accumulated in a different attribute (`acc-def`) since those correspond to the resources for a defence (and not for an attack).

We add an extra rule whose unique purpose is to summarise the results of the analysis:

```

rl [END] :
  { Q ; < Q : C | stat: Succeed,
    agents: a, acctime: t, ats > Cnf } =>
  { < Q : C | agents: a, acctime: t >
    < gates: attacks(< Q : C | ats > Cnf ) >
    < defences: act-defences(Cnf) > } .

```

This rule is enabled only when the root of the tree Q is in state `Succeed`. All the attributes but the accumulated time and the number of agents are discarded. The nodes of the tree (`Cnf`) but the root are also discarded. Two new objects are created, namely `gates` and `defences`, that store the set of attacks and defences enabled in the final configuration. Such sets are computed with the aid of the operators `attacks` (that uses the attribute `used` in the gates) and `act-defences`. Note that the shape of the configuration has changed, from $\{Q;Cnf\}$ to $\{Cnf\}$ (see the operators defined in the end of Section VI-A).

Exploring the search space. A rewrite theory \mathcal{R} proves sequents of the form $\mathcal{R} \vdash t \longrightarrow^* t'$ meaning that the term t rewrites in zero or more steps into t' . Here, we are interested in proving sequents of the form $\mathcal{R} \vdash t \longrightarrow! t'$ meaning that $t \longrightarrow^* t'$ and t' cannot be further rewritten.

Let us call \mathcal{R}_{ADT} the rewrite theory defined above that represents the state of an ADTree and its execution. For an ADTree T , if $\mathcal{R}_{ADT} \vdash \llbracket T \rrbracket \longrightarrow! t'$ then t' can be either a configuration where the root node Q fails (and the other gates are in a state different from `Unknown`) or a term of the form

$$\{\langle Q : C \mid agents : a, acctime : t \rangle \langle gates : SA \rangle \langle defences : SD \rangle\}$$

where a and t are, respectively, the upper bound for the number of agents and the time needed to perform the root attack Q . Moreover, SA and SD are, respectively, the set of enabled attacks and defences in the final configuration. For now on, the term above will be written as $[a, t, SA, SD]$.

Example 1. Let T be the ADTree in Figure 2 and $t_{TS} = \llbracket T \rrbracket$. Using the above defined rewrite theory, the Maude's command `search t-TS =>! Cnf:Configuration finds four (distinct) final configurations corresponding to the two possible outcomes of the defence p and the choice of the attack used in the gate GA . In the two non-failing configurations, p is not enabled. In one of them, h is chosen and the total time for the attack is 125. In the other, e is executed with total time 132.`

Theorem 1 (Correctness). Let T be an ADTree. Then, $\mathcal{R}_{ADT} \vdash \llbracket T \rrbracket \longrightarrow! [a, t, SA, SD]$ iff there is an attack in T of time t where the attacks (resp. defences) in SA (resp. SD) are enabled.

Proof. (\Rightarrow) We must have $\llbracket T \rrbracket \longrightarrow^* t' \longrightarrow [a, t, SA, SD]$ where the last rule applied is necessarily `[END]`. Consider the derivation $\llbracket T \rrbracket \longrightarrow^* t'$ where the rules for the different gates are applied. An invariant in each step of such a derivation is that when the accumulated time attribute is modified in a gate, it is computed correctly. For instance, when the rule `[SAND]` is applied, the accumulated time is the sum of the time needed to perform each of the children of the gate. Following the rules applied in the derivation, we can reconstruct the attack in T . (\Leftarrow) Consider the particular sequence of rewriting where the rule `[ATKOK]` is applied in all the attack leaves in SA and `[ATKNOK]` in the others. Similarly for the defences in SD . This completely determines the way the rules for the gates need to be applied, thus reproducing the same attack. \square

As illustrated in Example 1, we can use the search facilities in Maude to list all the final (successful) configurations to perform an attack and find the minimal time.

Theorem 2 (Optimal time). Let T be an ADTree. If the minimal time to perform the main attack in T is t , then there exists a , SD and ST s.t. $\mathcal{R} \vdash \llbracket T \rrbracket \longrightarrow! [a, t, SA, SD]$.

Proof. Immediate from Theorem 1. \square

Unfortunately, this procedure does not allow for finding the minimal number of agents but only an upper bound for it. The reason is that the operator `acc-max` (see rule `[AND]`) sums the number of agents needed for each child of the gate. Hence, for instance, this procedure determines that the number of agents to perform the attack in Figure 6 is 3 (two agents to perform concurrently d and e and an extra one to perform b). However, there is an attack using only 2 agents (Example 2). The key point is that the semantics does not handle the case where an agent can be shared between different branches of the tree.

Theorem 3 (Upper bound for the number of agents). Let T be an ADTree. If n agents can perform an attack on T with time t , then there exists a , SA and SD s.t. $\mathcal{R} \vdash \llbracket T \rrbracket \longrightarrow^* [a, t, SA, SD]$ and $n \leq a$.

Proof. Similar to the proof of Theorem 1. \square

C. Minimal set of agents

This section proposes a second rewrite theory \mathcal{R}_{ADT}^A useful for finding the minimal set of agents to perform an attack. The starting point is a new constructor for the sort `Configuration` with the following attributes:

```
{agents:_      --- schedule
 global-time:_ --- elapsed time
 max-time:_    --- max time for the attack
 enabled:_     --- set of enabled attacks
 disabled:_    --- atks. that cannot be performed now
 system:_     --- representation of the system/gates
}
```

The first attribute is a list of terms of the form $[L] :: N$ where L is a list of node identifiers and N a natural number. The term $([a\ b] :: 3) ([c] :: 0)$ represents a scenario with two agents: the first one has already performed the attack a and she is currently working on b with remaining duration 3; and the second agent has already performed c and she is currently free ($N = 0$). The attribute `global-time` is a global clock indicating the current time-unit. `max-time` is the maximal time the agents have to perform the attack, and its value will be initialised with the time computed with the theory \mathcal{R}_{ADT} . The set SA , computed by \mathcal{R}_{ADT} , is partitioned into two sets, namely, `enabled` and `disabled`. All the non-leaf gates are in the second set as well as the leaves which belong to a subtree that is not the first child of a sequential gate. The other (leaf) attacks are in the set `enabled`. The last attribute stores the representation of the ADTree ($\llbracket T \rrbracket$).

The following operator will be useful to build the initial configuration:

```
op make-schedule : Nat Nat NodeSet Conf -> Conf .
ceq make-schedule(n, t, S, Sys) =
  { agents: make-agents(n) --- build. the list of ag.
    global-time: 0
    max-time: t
    enabled: intersection(S', S)
    disabled: S \ S' --- set difference
    system: Sys
  } if S' := all-attacks(Sys) .
```

where the first two parameters are, respectively, the number of agents and the total time for the attack. The third parameter is the set of enabled attacks and the last parameter the representation of the ADTree.

In what follows, we define rules to non-deterministically assign attacks to agents, move attacks from the set `disabled` to the set `enabled` and make the global time advance. Let us start with the rule assigning an attack to an agent. For the sake of readability, the parts of the configuration not modified by the rule are omitted:

```
rl [pick] :
{ agents: SL ([L] :: 0) SL'
  enabled: (o, S)
  system: { Q ; Cnf < o : C | ats, time: t > } } =>
{ agents: SL ([L o] :: t) SL'
  enabled: (S)
  system: { Q ; Cnf < o : C | ats, time: t > } } .
```

One of the enabled attacks o is assigned to a free agent (SL and SL' are lists of terms of the form $[L] :: N$). After the transition, the chosen agent is working on o with duration t .

It is also possible for an agent to interrupt the current attack she is working on and pick another (enabled) attack. This is the purpose of the following rule:

```
rl [inter] :
{ agents: SL ([L o] :: nt) SL'
  enabled: (o', S)
  system: { Q ; Cnf < o : C | ats, time: t >
          < o' : C' | ats', time: t' > }
} =>
{ agents: SL ([L o'] :: t') SL'
  enabled: (o, S)
  system: { Q ; Cnf < o : C | ats, time: nt >
          < o' : C' | ats', time: t' > } }
```

After the transition: the attack o is back to the set `enabled`; the remaining time for o is updated to nt in the attribute `system`; and the attack o' with duration t' is scheduled.

The next rule models the fact that the time advances for all the (busy) agents:

```
rl [time] : {agents: SL global-time: n }
=> {agents: minus(SL, 1) global-time: n+1} .
```

The function `minus` simply decrements by 1 the time needed to finish the current task for each busy agent. Since time advances by one unit and agents are free to interrupt their current task, these rules effectively model the preprocessing proposed in Section III. Now, consider the two rules below:

```
rl [END]: {agents: SL global-time: n
  enabled: empty disabled: empty
  system: { Q ; Cnf < Q:C|stat: Suc., ats > } }
=> { agents: SL } .
crl [FAIL]: { global-time: n max-time: n' } => fail
  if n > n' .
```


The rule `[END]` finishes the computation when the root of the ADTree is in state `Succeed` and there are no more pending attacks to be executed. The second rule is conditional: if the global time n is greater than the maximal time n' , then the configuration reduces to `fail`. That is, the agents could not meet the deadline for the attack.

To conclude, we introduce rules governing the movement of attacks between the sets `enabled` and `disabled`:

```
rl [done] :
{ agents: SL ([L o] :: 0) SL'
  system: { Q ; Cnf < o : C | ats, stat: Unknown > }
} =>
{ agents: SL ([L o] :: 0) SL'
  system: { Q ; Cnf < o : C | ats, stat: Succeed > } } .
rl [active] :
{ enabled: S disabled: (o, S')
  system: { Q ; Cnf
    < o:SAND | ats, stat: Unk., lchd: nil > }
} =>
{ enabled: (o, S) disabled: S'
  system: { Q ; Cnf
    < o:SAND | ats, stat: Unk., lchd: nil > }
} .
```

If an agent has already finished the attack o , the rule `[done]` updates the state of o from `Unknown` to `Succeed`. The second rule enables the attack o when it is a sequential gate whose

children have all already been performed ($lsch=nil$). Similar rules are introduced for the other gates.



Name	Time
a	0 m
b	2 m
c	1 m
d	4 m
e	3 m

Example 2. Consider the ADTree in Figure 6. The \mathcal{R}_{ADT} theory determines that the attack can be performed in 5 time-units with at most 3 agents. Starting from a configuration where the attribute *agents* is set to $([nil]::0) ([nil]::0) ([nil]::0)$ and *max-time* to 5, we can enumerate all the possible schedules leading to the attack. One of these includes the configuration $(['d' 'c' 'a']::0) (['e' 'b']::0) ([]::0)$, where the third agent was not assigned any attack.

Fig. 6: Interrupted schedule example

In what follows, we use $[n, t, S, T]$ to denote the term $\text{make-schedule}(n, t, S, [T])$ and $[SL]$ to denote the term $\{\text{agents: } SL\}$ (see the RHS in rule $[END]$).

Theorem 4 (Correctness). *Let T be an ADTree. $\mathcal{R}_{ADT}^A \vdash [n, t, S, T] \longrightarrow! [SL]$ iff there is an attack in T with n agents and time t where all the attacks in S are performed.*

Proof. As in Theorem 1, the close correspondence of steps in the attack and rules in \mathcal{R}_{ADT}^A allows us to rebuild the attack in T from the derivation in $\mathcal{R}_{ADT}^A (\Rightarrow)$ and vice-versa (\Leftarrow). \square

D. Heuristics and strategies

As illustrated in Examples 1 and 2, it is possible to explore the reachable state space generated from a given term. The `search` command uses a breadth-first strategy: for each node of the search tree, all the rules, with all possible matchings, are applied to produce the next level in the search tree. This guarantees completeness: if $\mathcal{R} \vdash t \longrightarrow^* t'$ then the search command will eventually find t' .

The search space generated by terms in the theories \mathcal{R}_{ADT} and \mathcal{R}_{ADT}^A is certainly finite but it can grow very fast, especially in \mathcal{R}_{ADT}^A . Hence, for more complex ADTrees, the search procedure will not terminate in a reasonable time. In this section we show how to control the non-determinism in the proposed theories. The result is a decision procedure that can be effectively used in the case studies presented in Section V. **Strategy for \mathcal{R}_{ADT} .** By inspecting the rules in the theory \mathcal{R}_{ADT} , we can observe that there are different sources of non-determinism that can be controlled (without losing solutions). For instance, the last two rules for the `OR` gate (failing child and no more children) can be eagerly applied: any interleaving with those rules will produce the same effect. Note that this is not the case for the first `OR` rule: different choices for matching the pattern (o, s) produce different results and all the possibilities need to be explored. Now consider the rules for the (parallel) `AND` gate. A failing child implies the failing of the gate, regardless of the state of the other children. Moreover,

given two children in state `Succeed`, it is irrelevant which one is considered first in an application of the first rule (pattern (o, s)). This is the case since function `act-max` accumulates values using $+$ and `max`, both commutative operations.

Now let us explore the rules for the nodes in the leaves of the ADTree. Consider $[ATKOK]$ and $[ATKNOK]$ and the gate `GA` in Figure 2. This attack succeeds only if either h or e succeeds. If both succeed, the $[OR]$ rule discards one of them. In other words, when the rule $[OR]$ is applied, the status of the discarded children s in the pattern (o, s) is irrelevant and we can safely assume that the attacks in the subtree s were not performed. This means that we can dispense with the application of $[ATKNOK]$ and rely on the rule `OR` to explore all the possible configurations. Also, the rules for defences are both needed: the activation or not of a defence limits the attacks that can be accomplished.

Strategies [34] provide a mechanism for controlling the way rules are applied in a given theory. In Maude, this is implemented with the help of a strategy language that tells the rewriting engine how to explore the state space. The command `srew T using STR` rewrites the term T according to the strategy expression `STR` and returns all its possible results.

The basic building block in the strategy language is the application of a rule. For instance, the command `srew T using OR` will apply the rule $[OR]$ in all possible ways on term T . As discussed above, if there are different matchings for the application of $[AND]$, all of them lead to the same result. The strategy `one(AND)` applied to a term T succeeds if $[AND]$ matches, possibly in different ways, but only one matching is considered and the others discarded.

Strategies can be defined by using constructors similar to regular expressions (see the complete list in [8, Section 4]): `idle` (identity); empty set / no solution (`fail`); concatenation ($\alpha; \beta$); disjunction ($\alpha | \beta$); iteration (α^*); conditional application, $\alpha ? \beta : \gamma$, where β is applied on the resulting terms after the application of α , or γ is applied if α does not produce any result. From these, it is possible to define: α `or-else` β that executes β if α fails; and the normalisation operator $\alpha!$ that applies α until it cannot be further applied.

Consider the following strategy:

```
deter := ( one(ATKOK) or-else one(NOT) or-else
           one(ORD) or-else one(SAND) or-else
           one(PAND) ) ! .
solve := ( ChoiceOK | ChoiceNOK ) ! ;
```

where `ORD` refers to the second and third rules for the `OR` gate. The strategy `deter` applies the confluent rules until a fixed point is reached (!). The strategy `solve` first explores all the configurations for the defences (active or inactive). Then, the confluent rules are eagerly applied. Next, if the $[END]$ rule can be applied, the computation finishes: the rules for gates do not apply on the resulting term on the RHS of $[END]$, and a further application of `deter` necessarily fails. If this is not the case, the $[OR]$ rule is tried. If there are no more `OR` gates in the configuration, the strategy fails. Otherwise, the `OR` rule is applied (considering all possible matchings) and the confluent rules are used again.

Recall that final/irreducible configurations can be either $\{C\}$ (RHS in `[END]`) or $\{Q; C\}$ where the gate Q is in state `Fail` and all the other rules are in a state different from `Unknown`.

Theorem 5 (Completeness). $\mathcal{R}_{ADT} \vdash \{Q; C\} \longrightarrow! \{C'\}$ iff the configuration $\{C'\}$ is reachable from $\{Q; C\}$ following the strategy *solve*.

Proof. As explained above, the final outcome of the attack depends on the defences and the choices in `OR` gates (if any). Consider the rules applied in the derivation $\{Q; C\} \longrightarrow! \{C'\}$ (where the last one is necessarily `[end]`). The activation or not of a defence does not depend on any other action (leaf nodes). Hence, we can permute the application of those rules to be done at the beginning of the derivation. Due to the commutativity of the operations for accumulating values (`max` and `+`), we can also rearrange the application of the rules (except `[OR]`) following *deter*. Note that the rule `[ATKNOK]` may appear in the derivation. However, this is only possible in the scope of a subtree discarded in an `OR` gate. Hence, we still have a valid derivation without using that rule. \square

Non-determinism in \mathcal{R}_{ADT}^A . Now let us consider the theory \mathcal{R}_{ADT}^A that exhibits many sources of non-determinism. The `[pick]` rule can select any enabled element \circ and schedule it for any free (`[L] :: 0`) agent. Since in the current model agents have the same abilities to perform any of the attacks, we may impose an additional restriction in this rule: all the agents in the list `SL` must be working (remaining time different from zero). Hence, `[pick]` will schedule \circ to the first free agent in the list, thus eliminating some (unnecessary) choices.

The rules `[pick]` and `[time]` can be interleaved in many ways. One might be tempted to restrict the application of `[time]` to configurations where either there is no enabled activity or where all the agents are busy. Let us call this strategy *PBT* (`[pick]` before `[time]`). Since \mathcal{R}_{ADT} computes an upper bound for the number of agents, the strategy *PBT* cannot be used to compute the minimal set of agents: it will enforce the use of all of them.

An approach to circumvent the problem above is the following. Assume that for a given *ADTree*, \mathcal{R}_{ADT} finds an attack with a number of agents n . Then, execute \mathcal{R}_{ADT}^A with the strategy *PBT* with a configuration of i agents, iterating i from 1 to n . The first value for $i \in 1..n$ that succeeds will correspond to the optimal number of agents. The easiest way to enforce *PBT* is by adding an extra condition to `[time]`:

```

crl [time] :
{ agents: SL global-time: n enabled: S } =>
{ agents: minus(SL, 1)      global-time: n + 1
  enabled: S }
if all-busy(SL) or (some-not-busy(SL) and S == empty)

```

Hence, time advances only if all the agents are currently working or the set of enabled attacks is empty.

There is one extra source of non-determinism that we can control. The `[pick]` rule, in its current form, can choose any of the enabled activities. How can we guide such a choice? The answer is in the algorithm in Section IV: choose by levels and prioritising the activities with higher depth. Based on the level

and depth, we can define the strict lexicographical total order $(l, d, id) \prec (l', d', id')$ iff $l < l'$ (first nodes with higher levels); or $l = l'$ and $d < d'$ (priority to higher depth); or $l = l'$, $d = d'$ and $id < id'$ (needed to break ties on activities with the same level and depth). Hence, the rule `[pick]` becomes:

```

crl [pick] :
{ agents: SL ([L] :: 0) SL'
  enabled: (o, S)
  system: { Q ; Cnf < o : C | ats , time: t > }
} =>
{ agents: SL ([L o] :: t) SL'
  enabled: (S)
  system: { Q ; Cnf < o : C | ats , time: t > }
}
if all-busy(SL)      --- [L]::0 is the fst free ag.
/\ o == max(o, S). --- o is the max wrt <

```

Let \mathcal{R}_{ADT}^A be as \mathcal{R}_{ADT}^A but replacing `[time]` and `[pick]` with the conditional rules above.

Theorem 6 (Correctness). Let T be an *ADTree* and suppose that \mathcal{R}_{ADT} finds an attack with time t and number of agents n using the set of attacks S . If $\mathcal{R}_{ADT}^A \vdash [n, t, S, T] \longrightarrow^* [SL]$ and m agents in `SL` were not assigned any task, then $\mathcal{R}_{ADT}^A \vdash [n - m, t, S, T] \longrightarrow^* [SL']$ where SL' is as SL but with the m (unused) agents removed.

Proof. Assume that in a given state, there are two enabled attacks o and o' and $o' \prec o$. \mathcal{R}_{ADT}^A may pick either o or o' and \mathcal{R}_{ADT}^A is forced to pick o . We show that \mathcal{R}_{ADT}^A necessarily chooses o . Let X be the common ancestor of o and o' . Since both actions are enabled, X is necessarily an `AND` gate. The minimal remaining time mt for X is bound by the maximum time needed to perform the actions in the path from o to X (say t) and the time needed to perform the path from o' to X (say t'). Since $o' \prec o$, then $t' < t$. Suppose, to obtain a contradiction, that at a given time, o' is scheduled and o is not. When the time advances, t' is decremented but t remains the same. Hence, the deadline mt for X cannot be met. \square

E. Results

In the repository [33] of *ADT2MAUDE*, the reader can find the complete specification of the proposed rewrite theories. A script written in Python, using the bindings for Maude (<https://github.com/fadoss/maude-bindings>), translates the input format for *ADTrees* used in *ADT2AMAS* and produces a term representing the tree ($\llbracket T \rrbracket$). Then, the analyses for finding the minimal time and the optimal schedule are performed. The resulting schedules coincide with those reported in Section V. Even though the specialised algorithm outperforms Maude in most cases, Table I shows that the specification is useful in practice. Additional benchmarks can be found at <https://bit.ly/3ONeSsq>.

Being declarative (since behaviour is easily described by rules) and based on a search procedure, the rewriting logic specification is easily extensible to consider other constraints and metrics in *ADTrees*. For instance, the algorithm (and the optimisation in \mathcal{R}_{ADT}^A) assumes that agents can interrupt an activity and start another one. We may add, as an additional attribute, that such an interruption requires additional time

model	ADT2AMAS (ms)	ADT2MAUDE (ms)
forestall	20.05	160.12
gain_admin	3342045.64	6129.03
icfem2020	2.51	180.35
interrupted	1.31	121.70
iot_dev	2652.56	629.17
last	1.83	129.84
scaling	1.22	122.94
treasure_hunters	26.70	131.56
adtree-d5_w3_c10_AND	12.41	7007.98
adtree-d5_w4_c10_AND	13.72	5008.19

TABLE I: ADT2AMAS vs. ADT2MAUDE in benchmarks

since the tasks are not executed in the same room. It is also possible to specify different kind of agents where only some of them are trained for some specific tasks. The RL approach also opens the possibility of considering multi-objective optimisations including the cost, time and number of agents to perform the attack.

VII. CONCLUSION

This paper has presented an agents scheduling algorithm that allows for evaluating attack/defence models. It synthesises a minimal number of agents and their schedule, providing insight to both parties as to the number of agents and actions necessary for a successful attack, and the defences required to counter it. We have also presented an executable rewrite theory to solve the same problem. The specialised algorithm inspired some optimisations that allowed us to reduce the state space and show that the specification can be used in practice.

The declarative model in RL opens different alternatives to consider other constraints and quantitative measures in ADTrees. We thus obtain a complete framework for not only analysis but also synthesis of agent configurations and schedules to achieve a given goal in a multi-agent system. Targeting more elaborate goals, expressed in the TATL logic [35], will allow for analysing more general multi-agent systems and their properties. Also, we plan to use rewriting modulo SMT [36] to encode configurations induced by OR and defence nodes and perform symbolic analysis [8] on ADTrees.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. J. Wooldridge, *An Introduction to Multiagent Systems*. John Wiley & Sons, 2002.
- [2] B. Kordy, S. Mauw, S. Radomirović, and P. Schweitzer, “Foundations of ADTrees,” in *Proceedings of FAST 2010*. Springer, 2011, pp. 80–95.
- [3] Z. Aslanyan and F. Nielson, “Pareto Efficient Solutions of ADTrees,” in *Proceedings of POST 2015*. Springer, 2015, pp. 95–114.
- [4] L. Petrucci, M. Knapik, W. Penczek, and T. Sidoruk, “Squeezing State Spaces of ADTrees,” in *Proc. of ICECCS 2019*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 71–80.
- [5] J. Arias, C. E. Budde, W. Penczek, L. Petrucci, T. Sidoruk, and M. Stoelinga, “Hackers vs. Security: ADTrees as Asynchronous Multi-agent Systems,” in *Proc. of ICFEM 2020*. Springer, 2020, pp. 3–19.
- [6] J. Meseguer, “Conditional Rewriting Logic as a Unified Model of Concurrency,” *Theoretical Computer Science*, vol. 96, no. 1.
- [7] —, “Twenty Years of Rewriting Logic,” *Journal of Logic and Algebraic Programming*, vol. 81, no. 7–8, pp. 721–781, 2012.
- [8] F. Durán, S. Eker, S. Escobar, N. Martí-Oliet, J. Meseguer, R. Rubio, and C. L. Talcott, “Programming and Symbolic Computation in Maude,” *J. Log. Algebraic Methods Program.*, vol. 110, 2020.
- [9] M. Clavel, F. Durán, S. Eker, P. Lincoln, N. Martí-Oliet, J. Meseguer, and C. L. Talcott, Eds., *All About Maude - A High-Performance Logical Framework*. Springer, 2007.

- [10] B. Kordy, S. Mauw, S. Radomirović, and P. Schweitzer, “ADTrees,” *Journal of Logic and Computation*, vol. 24, no. 1, pp. 55–87, 2014.
- [11] O. Gadyatskaya, R. R. Hansen, K. G. Larsen, A. Legay, M. C. Olesen, and D. B. Poulsen, “Modelling ADTrees Using Timed Automata,” in *Proceedings of FORMATS 2016*. Springer, 2016, pp. 35–50.
- [12] F. Arnold, D. Guck, R. Kumar, and M. Stoelinga, “Sequential and Parallel Attack Tree Modelling,” in *Proceedings of SAFECOMP 2015*. Springer, 2015, pp. 291–299.
- [13] M. Gribaudo, M. Iacono, and S. Marrone, “Exploiting Bayesian Networks for the Analysis of Combined Attack Trees,” *Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science*, vol. 310, pp. 91–111, 2015.
- [14] Z. Aslanyan, F. Nielson, and D. Parker, “Quantitative Verification and Synthesis of Attack-Defence Scenarios,” in *Proceedings of CSF 2016*. IEEE, 2016, pp. 105–119.
- [15] B. Kordy, L. Piètre-Cambacédès, and P. Schweitzer, “DAG-based Attack and Defense Modeling: Don’t Miss the Forest for the Attack Trees,” *Computer Science Review*, vol. 13–14, pp. 1–38, 2014.
- [16] W. Widell, M. Audinot, B. Fila, and S. Pinchinat, “Beyond 2014: Formal Methods for Attack Tree-based Security Modeling,” *ACM Computing Surveys*, vol. 52, no. 4, pp. 75:1–75:36, 2019.
- [17] B. Fila and W. Widell, “Exploiting ADTrees to Find an Optimal Set of Countermeasures,” in *Proc. of CSF 2020*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 395–410.
- [18] W. Jamroga, W. Penczek, P. Dembinski, and A. Mazurkiewicz, “Towards Partial Order Reductions for Strategic Ability,” in *Proceedings of AAMAS ’18*. ACM, 2018, pp. 156–165.
- [19] T. L. Adam, K. M. Chandy, and J. R. Dickson, “A Comparison of List Schedules for Parallel Processing Systems,” *Communications of the ACM*, vol. 17, no. 12, p. 685–690, Dec. 1974.
- [20] Y. Kwok and I. Ahmad, “Static Scheduling Algorithms for Allocating Directed Task Graphs to Multiprocessors,” *ACM Computing Surveys*, vol. 31, no. 4, pp. 406–471, 1999.
- [21] T. C. Hu, “Parallel Sequencing and Assembly Line Problems,” *Operations Research*, vol. 9, no. 6, pp. 841–848, 1961.
- [22] C. H. Papadimitriou and M. Yannakakis, “Scheduling Interval-Ordered Tasks,” *SIAM Journal on Computing*, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 405–409, 1979.
- [23] D. F. Towsley, “Allocating Programs Containing Branches and Loops Within a Multiple Processor System,” *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, vol. 12, no. 10, pp. 1018–1024, 1986.
- [24] H. El-Rewini and H. H. Ali, “Static Scheduling of Conditional Branches in Parallel Programs,” *Journal of Parallel and Distributed Computing*, vol. 24, no. 1, pp. 41–54, 1995.
- [25] I. Nunes and M. Luck, “Softgoal-based Plan Selection in Model-driven BDI Agents,” in *Proc. of AAMAS ’14*. IFAAMAS, 2014, pp. 749–756.
- [26] M. Dann, J. Thangarajah, Y. Yao, and B. Logan, “Intention-Aware Multiagent Scheduling,” in *Proc. of AAMAS ’20*. IFAAMAS, 2020, pp. 285–293.
- [27] B. Kordy, P. Kordy, and Y. van den Boom, “SPTool - Equivalence Checker for SAND Attack Trees,” in *Proc. of CRiSIS 2016*. Springer, 2016, pp. 105–113.
- [28] H. Eades III, J. Jiang, and A. Bryant, “On Linear Logic, Functional Programming, and Attack Trees,” in *Proc. of GramSec 2018*. Springer, 2018, pp. 71–89.
- [29] R. Horne, S. Mauw, and A. Tiu, “Semantics for specialising attack trees based on linear logic,” *Fundam. Informaticae*, vol. 153, no. 1–2, pp. 57–86, 2017.
- [30] J. Arias, W. Penczek, L. Petrucci, and T. Sidoruk, “ADT2AMAS: Managing Agents in Attack-Defence Scenarios,” in *Proceedings of AAMAS ’21*. ACM, 2021, pp. 1749–1751.
- [31] J. Arias, L. Masko, W. Penczek, L. Petrucci, and T. Sidoruk, “Minimal Schedule with Minimal Number of Agents in Attack-Defence Trees,” in *Proceedings of ICECCS 2022*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 1–10.
- [32] “ADT2AMAS: Tool for Managing Agents in Attack-Defense Scenarios,” <https://depot.lipn.univ-paris13.fr/parties/tools/adt2amas>.
- [33] “ADT2MAUDE: Tool for Managing Agents in Attack-Defense Scenarios,” <https://depot.lipn.univ-paris13.fr/parties/tools/adt2maude>.
- [34] N. Martí-Oliet, J. Meseguer, and A. Verdejo, “A Rewriting Semantics for Maude Strategies,” in *Proc. of WRLA 2008*, ser. ENTCS, G. Rosu, Ed., vol. 238, no. 3. Elsevier, 2008, pp. 227–247.
- [35] M. Knapik, É. André, L. Petrucci, W. Jamroga, and W. Penczek, “Timed ATL: Forget Memory, Just Count,” *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, vol. 66, pp. 197–223, 2019.
- [36] C. Rocha, J. Meseguer, and C. A. Muñoz, “Rewriting Modulo SMT and Open System Analysis,” *J. Log. Algebraic Methods Program.*, vol. 86, no. 1, pp. 269–297, 2017.