scheme and provides a first assessment on how it can be improved.

2 Design Objectives

One key idea behind the SAT competition is to award a solver that is good previous year of the competition, this was implemented using a scoring sc system: First, the solvers were ranked by being able to solve *some instance* i were then broken using the total number of benchmarks solved. Unfortun between solving a benchmark solved by all solvers or one solved by only too.

Another key idea of the competition was to focus on solvers that are th the SAT and CASC competitions, those solvers are called *state-of-the-art* previous scoring scheme, the solvers did not benefit directly for being SOT solvers were usually among the top ranked solvers.

Third, the time needed to solve a given benchmark also needs to be cons used for scoring the solvers in the previous years of the SAT competitions there was no way to discriminate among the solvers able to solve a given be

Furthermore, the second stage ranking was based only on the number stage, among those benchmarks that had not been solved by *any solver* du on very strong assumptions:

- The remaining benchmarks are representative of the initial set of ben
- The solvers will behave in the second stage in a way similar to the fi

However, these assumptions did not necessarily hold. Although it is likely tions could have been declared winners using various scoring schemes, neve solvers could have changed a lot.

The scoring scheme used for the SAT 2005 competition is designed to features:

- It gives more credit for solving hard benchmarks than solving easy o
- It gives more credit for solving a benchmark fast.
- It gives extra credit for each series solved.