

Audit Report

Margined Power

v1.0

September 26, 2023

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	2
License	3
Disclaimer	3
Introduction	5
Purpose of This Report	5
Codebase Submitted for the Audit	5
Methodology	6
Functionality Overview	6
How to Read This Report	7
Code Quality Criteria	8
Summary of Findings	9
Detailed Findings	10
1. Vault safeness incorrectly calculated due to the usage of wrong decimals	10
The power contract no longer works if apply_funding_rate is not called for 4.	8 hours
3. User funds are lost when using Burn to withdraw collateral	11
4. Power contract can be used if not yet opened or if paused	11
5. The staking contract does not handle transfers of staked coins properly	12
6. Normalization factor could be manipulated	12
7. Unpause delay too small to react	13
8. Missing fee_rate validation	13
9. Lack of denomination and pool validation	14
10. Contracts should implement a two-step ownership transfer	14
11. get_index does not return a scaled index	15
12. Events/attributes are not always emitted	15
13. Inefficient execution could be improved	16
14. The power contract can be opened multiple times	16
15. Lack of role-based access controls for the pausing mechanism	16
16. Widespread usage of generic errors	17
17. Token authority check can be bypassed	17
18. Unused code	18

License







THIS WORK IS LICENSED UNDER A CREATIVE COMMONS ATTRIBUTION-NODERIVATIVES 4.0 INTERNATIONAL LICENSE.

Disclaimer

THE CONTENT OF THIS AUDIT REPORT IS PROVIDED "AS IS", WITHOUT REPRESENTATIONS AND WARRANTIES OF ANY KIND.

THE AUTHOR AND HIS EMPLOYER DISCLAIM ANY LIABILITY FOR DAMAGE ARISING OUT OF, OR IN CONNECTION WITH, THIS AUDIT REPORT.

THIS AUDIT REPORT IS ADDRESSED EXCLUSIVELY TO THE CLIENT. THE AUTHOR AND HIS EMPLOYER UNDERTAKE NO LIABILITY OR RESPONSIBILITY TOWARDS THE CLIENT OR THIRD PARTIES.

COPYRIGHT OF THIS REPORT REMAINS WITH THE AUTHOR.

This audit has been performed by

Oak Security

https://oaksecurity.io/ info@oaksecurity.io

Introduction

Purpose of This Report

Oak Security has been engaged by Osmosis Grants Company to perform a security audit of Margined Protocol's Power smart contracts.

The objectives of the audit are as follows:

- 1. Determine the correct functioning of the protocol, in accordance with the project specification.
- 2. Determine possible vulnerabilities, which could be exploited by an attacker.
- 3. Determine smart contract bugs, which might lead to unexpected behavior.
- 4. Analyze whether best practices have been applied during development.
- 5. Make recommendations to improve code safety and readability.

This report represents a summary of the findings.

As with any code audit, there is a limit to which vulnerabilities can be found, and unexpected execution paths may still be possible. The author of this report does not guarantee complete coverage (see disclaimer).

Codebase Submitted for the Audit

The audit has been performed on the following target:

Repository	https://github.com/margined-protocol/power
Commit	4648abf616660017d72fcbfd7ba6106c7384feee
Scope	All contracts except contracts/mocks were in scope.

Methodology

The audit has been performed in the following steps:

- 1. Gaining an understanding of the code base's intended purpose by reading the available documentation.
- 2. Automated source code and dependency analysis.
- 3. Manual line-by-line analysis of the source code for security vulnerabilities and use of best practice guidelines, including but not limited to:
 - a. Race condition analysis
 - b. Under-/overflow issues
 - c. Key management vulnerabilities
- 4. Report preparation

Functionality Overview

Margined Power is a decentralized power perpetual protocol and multi-chain margin engine for CosmWasm networks. The key innovation of Margined Power is the use of concentrated liquidity pools to enable price discovery of the contracts.

How to Read This Report

This report classifies the issues found into the following severity categories:

Severity	Description
Critical	A serious and exploitable vulnerability that can lead to loss of funds, unrecoverable locked funds, or catastrophic denial of service.
Major	A vulnerability or bug that can affect the correct functioning of the system, lead to incorrect states or denial of service.
Minor	A violation of common best practices or incorrect usage of primitives, which may not currently have a major impact on security, but may do so in the future or introduce inefficiencies.
Informational	Comments and recommendations of design decisions or potential optimizations, that are not relevant to security. Their application may improve aspects, such as user experience or readability, but is not strictly necessary. This category may also include opinionated recommendations that the project team might not share.

The status of an issue can be one of the following: Pending, Acknowledged, or Resolved.

Note that audits are an important step to improving the security of smart contracts and can find many issues. However, auditing complex codebases has its limits and a remaining risk is present (see disclaimer).

Users of the system should exercise caution. In order to help with the evaluation of the remaining risk, we provide a measure of the following key indicators: **code complexity**, **code readability**, **level of documentation**, and **test coverage**. We include a table with these criteria below.

Note that high complexity or low test coverage does not necessarily equate to a higher risk, although certain bugs are more easily detected in unit testing than in a security audit and vice versa.

Code Quality Criteria

The auditor team assesses the codebase's code quality criteria as follows:

Criteria	Status	Comment
Code complexity	Medium	-
Code readability and clarity	Medium-High	Readability is in line with other CosmWasm projects in the ecosystem.
Level of documentation	Low-Medium	While a high-level overview documentation is available, there is little inline documentation and no technical specification, for example concerning the core calculation logic, design decisions, and intended behaviors of parameters.
Test coverage	Medium-High	cargo tarpaulin reports a test coverage of 28.08%, 422/1503 lines covered. Note that this does not include integration tests that are implemented using osmosis-test-tube testing framework.

Summary of Findings

No	Description	Severity	Status
1	Vault safeness incorrectly calculated due to the usage of wrong decimals	Critical	Resolved
2	The power contract no longer works if apply_funding_rate is not called for 48 hours	Critical	Resolved
3	User funds are lost when using Burn to withdraw collateral	Critical	Resolved
4	Power contract can be used if not yet opened or if paused	Major	Resolved
5	The staking contract does not handle transfers of staked coins properly	Major	Resolved
6	Normalization factor could be manipulated	Minor	Acknowledged
7	Unpause delay too small to react	Minor	Resolved
8	Missing fee_rate validation	Minor	Resolved
9	Lack of denomination and pool validation	Minor	Resolved
10	Contracts should implement a two-step ownership transfer	Minor	Resolved
11	get_index does not return a scaled index	Minor	Resolved
12	Events/attributes are not always emitted	Informational	Resolved
13	Inefficient execution could be improved	Informational	Resolved
14	The power contract can be opened multiple times	Informational	Resolved
15	Lack of role-based access controls for the pausing mechanism	Informational	Acknowledged
16	Widespread usage of generic errors	Informational	Resolved
17	Token authority check can be bypassed	Informational	Resolved
18	Unused code	Informational	Resolved

Detailed Findings

Vault safeness incorrectly calculated due to the usage of wrong decimals

Severity: Critical

The power contract checks if each user vault is solvent as a pre-condition to perform the mint, burn, deposit, withdraw, and liquidate operations. However, the calculations done in the get_status function in contracts/margined-power/src/vault.rs:319 could yield incorrect results.

When the collateral is turned into decimal type in line 344, power_decimals is used instead of base_decimals, which represents the amount of decimals from the Power denomination instead of the one from the collateral. This error could cause insolvent vaults to be wrongly deemed "safe", allowing further operations or "safe" vaults to be considered "unsafe" and liquidatable.

Recommendation

We recommend using base_denom when converting the collateral into a decimal type.

Status: Resolved

2. The power contract no longer works if apply_funding_rate is not called for 48 hours

Severity: Critical

In contracts/margined-power/src/handle.rs, the apply_funding_rate function calls calculate_normalisation_factor, which checks if the last funding update state.last_funding_update has occurred in the last MAX_TWAP_PERIOD, which is set to 48 hours. If not, it returns an error.

While it is assumed that the <code>apply_funding_rate</code> function is regularly called by the foundation or community, a potential exists that it is not called for extended periods, for example due to network outages. If it is not called for 48 hours, most core functions, such as <code>handle_mint_power_perp</code>, <code>handle_burn_power_perp</code>, <code>handle_liquidation</code>, <code>handle_deposit</code>, and <code>handle_withdrawal</code> will be unusable given the fact that they all invoke <code>apply funding rate</code>.

We recommend using a fixed TWAP period and removing this check or introducing a recovery method that can resolve this issue.

Status: Resolved

3. User funds are lost when using Burn to withdraw collateral

Severity: Critical

The power contract's handle_burn_power_perp function requires the user to send both the power tokens to be burned and the collateral tokens to be withdrawn in contracts/margined-power/src/handle.rs:263 and 264. However, the additional collateral sent this way is never accounted for.

Both amount_to_burn and amount_to_withdraw are supplied as arguments to VAULTS.burn, which deducts each amount from the corresponding field in the storage. Finally, amount_to_withdraw is transferred to the user. The whole operation results in the user sending the requested amount of collateral tokens, getting that amount deducted from the vault but only receiving the amount reimbursed once instead of twice. This leads to lost the user losing funds.

Recommendation

We recommend following one of these two approaches:

- Reimburse amount to withdraw twice at the end instead of once.
- Redesign the function not to require the user to send any additional collateral but to
 provide an additional argument to be passed down at the entry point specifying the
 amount of collateral to be withdrawn.

Status: Resolved

4. Power contract can be used if not yet opened or if paused

Severity: Major

For the power contract to be usable, it must be opened explicitly by executing <code>SetOpen</code> message. It can also be paused and unpaused by executing <code>Pause</code> and <code>UnPause</code> messages. These actions modify the variable <code>state.is_open</code>. However, the code does not contain a check if the value of this variable is <code>true</code> before user actions are performed. Hence it is possible to interact with the contract, even when it has not been opened yet or is paused.

We recommend querying state.is_open before every action and returning an error when it is false.

Status: Resolved

5. The staking contract does not handle transfers of staked coins properly

Severity: Major

The function handle_unstake in contracts/margined-staking/src/handle.rs:209 decrements staked_amounts of a user whenever they unstake. Since staked_amounts is not updated when the staked coin (staked_denom) is transferred, this calculation can underflow when transferred coins are later unstaked. For instance, when Alice transfers her staked coins to Bob (who does not have a staked position) and Bob tries to unstake, he will not be able to.

Recommendation

We recommend disabling transfers of staked coins or updating the staked_amounts variable when transfers happen.

Status: Resolved

6. Normalization factor could be manipulated

Severity: Minor

The power contract's apply_funding_rate function calculates the normalization factor in contracts/margined-power/src/funding.rs:20 only if it has not been already calculated at the current timestamp (and hence in the current block). The calculation_normalisation_factor function queries the oracle in TWAP mode using the difference from the last update of normalisation_factor and the current timestamp as its period. This is the first step in the five major external functionalities: mint, burn, liquidate, deposit, and withdraw.

Given the mentioned restriction, performing consecutive calls in different blocks with just one second of difference between their timestamps could be possible, forcing the oracle to return information of just a one-second period. This mostly defeats the benefits of using the TWAP mechanism, as it is possible to briefly manipulate the Oracle in favor of the user before interacting with the contract.

We recommend setting a minimum period for TWAP queries.

Status: Acknowledged

The client acknowledges that there is some room for manipulation but due to the bounds placed on the index price in the calculation, adequate protection from oracle attacks already

exists.

7. Unpause delay too small to react

Severity: Minor

The power contract's pause mechanism allows anonymous users to unpause the contract 24 hours after it has been paused. Although this feature follows best practices to reduce centralization concerns, the period of one day may be too small in case of an incident

response situation or after the discovery of a critical vulnerability in the code.

Recommendation

We recommend increasing the period for anonymous users to unpause the contract, for example, to one week. Moreover, we recommend implementing a disaster recovery procedure such that users can still withdraw their funds when the contract is paused in

response to a vulnerability.

Status: Resolved

8. Missing fee rate validation

Severity: Minor

contracts/margined-power/src/contract.rs:60, config.fee rate missing validation for the value to be between 0 to 1. Without validation, misconfiguration may

go unnoticed and will eventually be difficult to correct. the

handle update config

contracts/margined-power/src/handle.rs:49 should have the same validation for

the config.fee rate.

Recommendation

We recommend adding fee rate validation.

Status: Resolved

13

9. Lack of denomination and pool validation

Severity: Minor

In several instances in the staking and power contracts, denomination and pools lack validation:

- deposit_denom and reward_denom in contracts/margined-staking/src/contract.rs:59 and 61
- power_denom, base_denom, power_pool, and base_pool in contracts/margined-power/src/state.rs:59-69
- token in contracts/margined-collector/src/state.rs:8

For example, for the last instance, if an invalid denom is added to the list of allowed tokens, it will not be usable within the collector contract.

Further, if a typo is made when removing a token the same "token not added" error will be raised as when a valid but non-existent token is to be removed.

Recommendation

We recommend querying the token factory to check if a token denomination has a valid token associated. Likewise, we recommend querying pools to confirm whether the expected denominations align with those within that pool.

Status: Resolved

10. Contracts should implement a two-step ownership transfer

Severity: Minor

The contracts within the scope of this audit allow the current owner to execute a one-step ownership transfer. While this is common practice, it presents a risk for the ownership of the contract to become lost if the owner transfers ownership to the incorrect address. A two-step ownership transfer will allow the current owner to propose a new owner, and then the account that is proposed as the new owner may call a function that will allow them to claim ownership and actually execute the config update.

In addition, the staking contract does not have a mechanism to transfer ownership at all. This is problematic as in case of a suspected compromise, no action could be taken.

We recommend implementing a two-step ownership transfer. The flow can be as follows:

- 1. The current owner proposes a new owner address that is validated.
- 2. The new owner account claims ownership, which applies the configuration changes.

Status: Resolved

11. get index does not return a scaled index

Severity: Minor

The get_index function in contracts/margined-power/src/query.rs:78-95 does not scale the calculated index, as the naming suggests. Also, it does the same as the get unscaled index function, making one of these functions redundant.

We classify this issue as minor given that the get_index function is used as part of a query entry point that third-party contracts may rely on.

Recommendation

We recommend querying the scaled entry point instead.

Status: Resolved

12. Events/attributes are not always emitted

Severity: Informational

Multiple functions within the scope of this audit do not emit event attributes. It is best practice to emit attributes to improve the contracts' usability and support off-chain event listeners and blockchain indexers.

The following functions do not emit events or attributes:

- In contracts/margined-collector/src/handle.rs:56, the send_token function is lacking attributes, such as amount and to_address.
- In contracts/margined-staking/src/handle.rs:89, the handle_claim function is lacking attributes, such as amount.
- In contracts/margined-staking/src/handle.rs:152, the handle_stake function is lacking attributes, such as staked amounts.
- In contracts/margined-staking/src/handle.rs:209, the handle unstake function is lacking attributes, such as sent funds.

We recommend emitting event attributes as described above.

Status: Resolved

13. Inefficient execution could be improved

Severity: Informational

The update_rewards function of the staking contract in contracts/margined-staking/src/distributor.rs:36 lacks optimization of the execution path when block_rewards is zero: Although the result could be short-circuited if there are no block_rewards, the whole function is executed, consuming unnecessary resources and gas.

Recommendation

We recommend returning zero in line 40 if there are no block rewards.

Status: Resolved

14. The power contract can be opened multiple times

Severity: Informational

In <code>contracts/margined-power/src/handle.rs:41</code> within the <code>handle_open_contract</code> function, it is not checked if the contract was already opened. An administrator can therefore open it multiple times successfully. While this has no negative security impact, it can confuse consumers because the event <code>open_contract</code> is emitted every time the function is executed.

Recommendation

We recommend disallowing opening an already opened contract.

Status: Resolved

15. Lack of role-based access controls for the pausing mechanism

Severity: Informational

The contracts within scope implement pausing mechanisms, which is in line with best practices. However, all of the administrative functions of the contract are centralized in the owner role, which goes against the principle of least privilege.

Segregating the pauser role has the additional benefit of swifter reactions in case of need when assigned to an EOA compared to the admin that may be a multi-sig or managed by a

governance contract.

Recommendation

We recommend implementing a separate pauser role that can turn trigger the pausing

mechanism.

Status: Acknowledged

16. Widespread usage of generic errors

Severity: Informational

The contracts within scope of this audit make widespread use of generic errors. Although not

a security issue, generic errors are discouraged as they may decrease the maintainability of

the codebase.

Recommendation

We recommend making use of custom errors.

Status: Resolved

17. Token authority check can be bypassed

Severity: Informational

The power contract implements the SetOpen entry point to unpause the contract for the first

time after checking that the contract is the authority of the power token.

However, there is no mechanism to ensure that this entry point is used the first time - the

authority check can be bypassed by directly calling UnPause.

Recommendation

We recommend checking the authority upon instantiation instead.

Status: Resolved

17

18. Unused code

Severity: Informational

Across the codebase, instances of unused errors, constants, fields within structs and functions exist in the following locations. Unused code should be removed as it can decrease the readability and maintainability of the codebase.

- InsufficientFunds in contracts/margined-power/src/errors.rs:19.
- UserStakeNotFound in contracts/margined-staking/src/errors.rs:13.
- InvalidLiquidation in contracts/margined-staking/src/errors.rs:19.
- InsufficientFunds in contracts/margined-staking/src/errors.rs:22.
- VaultDoesNotExistin contracts/margined-staking/src/errors.rs:25.
- Stakers constant in contracts/margined-staking/src/state.rs:9.
- average_staked_amounts field within the UserStake struct is never read and only assigned once in
 - contracts/margined-staking/src/distributor.rs:85.
- DECIMALS, DECIMAL_PLACES, and SCALE_FACTOR constants in contracts/margined-staking/src/contract.rs:25-28.
- quote_decimals field in the Config struct in contracts/margined-power/src/state.rs:31.
- DECIMAL_TWO constant in contracts/margined-power/src/helpers.rs:15.
- execute_transfer function in contracts/margined-collector/src/messages.rs:3-8.
- update and mint functions in contracts/margined-power/src/vault.rs:122 and 149 are redundant and one of them is unused.

Recommendation

We recommend removing unused code.

Status: Resolved