Verification Games Making Verification Fun

Werner Dietl

Stephanie Dietzel, Michael D. Ernst, Nathaniel Mote, Brian Walker, Seth Cooper, Timothy Pavlik, Zoran Popović

http://cs.washington.edu/verigames



University of Washington Computer Science & Engineering

Angry Birds



Software verification

[nmote@monarch level]\$ antf check-nullness

Searching for build.xm¹ ... By 1dfil :: /homes/ws/ip/te/d/mo/jara/Transl/ci n/biild.xtil

clean:

[delete] Deleting directory /homes/gws/nmote/demo/java/Translation/bin

check-nullness:

[mkdir] Creater. Vir: /ho.ver/cws/hmc.e/d.m.V/av/T.Vanslation/bin [jsr308.javac] Compiling 14 source files to /homes/gws/nmote/demo/java/Translation/bin [jsr308.javac] javac 1.7.0-jsr308-1.1.4

Which is more fun?

- Play games
- Prove your programs correct

Angry Birds: 02 Nov 2011: 200000 years play-time 11 May 2012: downloaded one billion times

Crowd-sourced verification

- 1. Make software verification **easy** and **fun**
- 2. Make the game **accessible** to everyone
- 3. Harness the power of the **crowd**
- Goal: Verify software while you wait for the bus







Connection-run---V

Connection

Connection-vulture--GET

Connection-vulture--SET



Connection-client--GET



Example: null pointer errors

Goal: no dereference of null

- Pipe Pipe width
- Ball Ball size

↔ a variable
↔ narrow: non-null
wide: maybe null



- ↔ a value
- ↔ small: non-null large: maybe null

Pinch point ↔ dereference Unmodifiable ↔ literal **null**, object creation pipe/ball

Program ↔ game correspondence

Pipe Pipe width ↔ a variable

↔ type of the variable

Ball ↔ a value

Ball size ↔ a property of the value

Pinch point ↔ requirement Unmodifiable ↔ requirement pipe/ball



Intuition: dataflow



0

Other examples

SQL injection unintended side effects format string and regexp validation incorrect equality checks race conditions and deadlocks units of measurement aliasing

. . .

Challenges

Will the game be fun? Better than waiting for the bus

Do people outperform verification algorithms? Inference is undecidable

Hypothesis:

no for correct, verifiable programs
yes for incorrect or unverifiable programs

Game players only have to reduce overall verification cost, not fully verify the program

Scoring & Collaboration

- 1. Game score influenced by
 - Collisions (verifiability)
 - Use of buzzsaws (trusted assumptions)
 - Pipe widths, distinguishing input and output pipes (re-usability of modules)
- 2. Collaboration & competition between players
 - High-score boards
 - Collaborative teams solve challenges
 - Social aspects (chats, forums, ...)

Scalability & Optimization

- 1. Brute force not feasible for large programs
- 2. Scale-up verification by
 - Crowdsourcing games
 - 1. Distribute games to humans
 - 2. Reconfigure games to adjust difficulty
 - 3. Redundancy
 - Automatic inference and optimizations
 - 1. How many easy challenges should be left for humans to feel good about progress?

FoldIt

- 1. Proteomics game at UW
- 2. Effectively created the genre of games that solve hard problems
- 3. Three Nature papers in under 2 years
- 4. Over 240,000 players, 200+ new per day

FoldIt



Contributions



Gamification of program verification Game...

- encodes correctness conditions
- utilizes human intuition & insight
- is playable by anyone

Goal: cheaper verification \Rightarrow more verification http://cs.washington.edu/verigames

Verification Games Making Verification Fun Werner Dietl

Stephanie Dietzel, Michael D. Ernst, Nathaniel Mote, Brian Walker, Seth Cooper, Timothy Pavlik, Zoran Popović

http://cs.washington.edu/verigames



University of Washington Computer Science & Engineering

Checker Framework Tutorial

Do you want to learn how to build your own pluggable type systems?

Come see my PLDI tutorial!

Saturday, 16 June from 9:00 to 12:00 Conference 9