

### **Audit Report**

# Dymension Phase 1 Stream 3: Dymint

v1.0

July 9, 2024

### **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	11
1. Peer nodes could receive blocks that are not applied by the sequencer	11
2. HTTP server misconfiguration allows Slowloris DoS attacks	11
3. CONTINUATION frames flood vulnerability in x/net allows attackers to DoS the not	ode
4. Incorrect mempool initialization height leads to discarded transactions	12
5. Submitting blocks to the data availability and settlement layer can result in a deadlock	13
6. Invalid blocks can be received via p2p gossip, potentially preventing block syncin 13	ng
7. Non-atomic batch submission to data availability and settlement layers causes repayment for the same data and potential indefinite failure	14
8. Applying blocks concurrently can lead to unexpected errors	14
<ol><li>Stopped block production is immediately resumed after receiving a health status event from the data availability or settlement layer</li></ol>	15
10. Pending blocks are repeatedly gossiped	16
11. Validating gossiped transactions may block the libp2p validator queue	16
12. Mempool is initialized at genesis without the preCheck and postCheck functions leading to not validating the transaction's size and wanted gas until the first block is committed	
13. Maximum number of peer IDs can potentially be reached, preventing gossiped transactions from being added to the mempool	17
14. Incomplete validation of configuration parameters	18
15. Node can be started without providing the genesis	18
16. Suboptimal data retrieval due to static configurations	18
17. Occurrence of "Tendermint" instead of "Dymint"	19
18. Non-sequencer nodes unnecessarily register health status event listener	19
19. Use of magic numbers decreases maintainability	20

### 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 WAS PREPARED EXCLUSIVELY FOR AND IN THE INTEREST OF THE CLIENT AND SHALL NOT CONSTRUE ANY LEGAL RELATIONSHIP TOWARDS THIRD PARTIES. IN PARTICULAR, THE AUTHOR AND HIS EMPLOYER UNDERTAKE NO LIABILITY OR RESPONSIBILITY TOWARDS THIRD PARTIES AND PROVIDE NO WARRANTIES REGARDING THE FACTUAL ACCURACY OR COMPLETENESS OF THE AUDIT REPORT.

FOR THE AVOIDANCE OF DOUBT, NOTHING CONTAINED IN THIS AUDIT REPORT SHALL BE CONSTRUED TO IMPOSE ADDITIONAL OBLIGATIONS ON COMPANY, INCLUDING WITHOUT LIMITATION WARRANTIES OR LIABILITIES.

COPYRIGHT OF THIS REPORT REMAINS WITH THE AUTHOR.

This audit has been performed by

Oak Security GmbH

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

#### Introduction

#### **Purpose of This Report**

Oak Security has been engaged by Dymension Technologies Ltd to perform a security audit of Dymint.

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/dymensionxyz/dymint
Commit	19f8877fe96fb8d3f8b08bd541033b0d9536c7ce
Scope	All contracts were in scope.
Fixes verified at commit	7290af6f00887d09862f32bf43169f42a416e87e
	Note that only fixes to the issues described in this report have been reviewed at this commit. Any further changes such as additional features have not been reviewed.

#### 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**

Dymint is an ABCI-client implementation for Dymension's autonomous RollApps, which can be used as a replacement for CometBFT or Tendermint in any ABCI-compatible blockchain application.

### **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-High	The extensive use of concurrency and the need for synchronization of shared states increase the difficulty of reasoning about the correctness of the code.
Code readability and clarity	High	-
Level of documentation	High	-
Test coverage	Medium	go test reports an average test coverage of 61%.

### **Summary of Findings**

No	Description	Severity	Status
1	Peer nodes could receive blocks that are not applied by the sequencer	Critical	Resolved
2	HTTP server misconfiguration allows Slowloris DoS attacks	Major	Resolved
3	$ \begin{array}{ll} \text{CONTINUATION} & \text{frames} & \text{flood} & \text{vulnerability} & \text{in} \\ \text{x/net allows attackers to DoS the node} \\ \end{array} $	Major	Resolved
4	Incorrect mempool initialization height leads to discarded transactions	Major	Resolved
5	Submitting blocks to the data availability and settlement layer can result in a deadlock	Major	Resolved
6	Invalid blocks can be received via p2p gossip	Major	Resolved
7	Non-atomic batch submission to data availability and settlement layers causes repayment for the same data and potential indefinite failure	Major	Resolved
8	Applying blocks concurrently can lead to unexpected errors	Major	Resolved
9	Stopped block production is immediately resumed after receiving a health status event from the data availability or settlement layer	Minor	Resolved
10	Pending blocks are repeatedly gossiped	Minor	Acknowledged
11	Validating gossiped transactions may block the libp2p validator queue	Minor	Resolved
12	Mempool is initialized at genesis without the preCheck and postCheck functions, leading to not validating the transaction's size and wanted gas until the first block is committed	Minor	Resolved
13	Maximum number of peer IDs can potentially be reached, preventing gossiped transactions from being added to the mempool	Minor	Acknowledged
14	Incomplete validation of configuration parameters	Minor	Resolved
15	Node can be started without providing the genesis	Minor	Resolved

16	Suboptimal data retrieval due to static configurations	Minor	Acknowledged
17	Occurrence of "Tendermint" instead of "Dymint"	Informational	Acknowledged
18	Non-sequencer nodes unnecessarily register health status event listener	Informational	Resolved
19	Use of magic numbers decreases maintainability	Informational	Resolved

### **Detailed Findings**

#### Peer nodes could receive blocks that are not applied by the sequencer

#### **Severity: Critical**

The produceBlock function, defined in block/produce.go:75-161, is responsible for producing and distributing new blocks to peers.

However, since in block/produce.go:148, the gossipBlock function is optimistically invoked before the block is actually applied via the applyBlock function, there is a risk of gossiping blocks to peers even if applying the block errors or if the process stops for any reason after the execution of gossipBlock but before the execution of applyBlock.

Such an error will lead to peers storing and applying a block that the proposer will not apply, leading to an inconsistent block and transaction execution.

#### Recommendation

We recommend applying the block before initiating the P2P gossip.

**Status: Resolved** 

#### 2. HTTP server misconfiguration allows Slowloris DoS attacks

#### **Severity: Major**

The serve function in rpc/server.go:177-184 instantiates an HTTP server and enables listening for incoming requests on the listener address.

However, since there is no ReadHeaderTimeout to handle idle connections, the server is vulnerable to Slowloris Denial-of-Service (DoS) attacks.

This attack method operates by transmitting large amounts of data slowly, which succeeds in keeping the connection alive in the event of a timeout, ultimately resulting in a DoS of the node.

#### Recommendation

We recommend defining the ReadHeaderTimeout for the HTTP server.

Status: Resolved

3. CONTINUATION frames flood vulnerability in x/net allows attackers to DoS the node

**Severity: Major** 

The <u>golang.org/x/net</u> package used in Dymint is vulnerable to CONTINUATION frames flood, as reported in <a href="https://pkg.go.dev/vuln/GO-2024-2687">https://pkg.go.dev/vuln/GO-2024-2687</a>.

"An attacker may cause an HTTP/2 endpoint to read arbitrary amounts of header data by sending an excessive number of CONTINUATION frames. Maintaining HPACK state requires parsing and processing all HEADERS and CONTINUATION frames on a connection. When a request's headers exceed MaxHeaderBytes, no memory is allocated to store the excess headers, but they are still parsed. This permits an attacker to cause an HTTP/2 endpoint to read arbitrary amounts of header data, all associated with a request which is going to be rejected. These headers can include Huffman-encoded data which is significantly more expensive for the receiver to decode than for an attacker to send."

Consequently, attackers can leverage this vulnerability to perform a DoS attack against the RPC server.

Recommendation

We recommend updating the golang.org/x/net package to v0.23.0 and go to version go1.22.2 or later, as recommended in the CVE.

**Status: Resolved** 

4. Incorrect mempool initialization height leads to discarded transactions

**Severity: Major** 

In node/node.go:177, during the execution of the NewNode function, the NewTxMempool function is called to instantiate a new mempool.

However, since the mempool height is set to zero, incoming transactions would get incorrectly assigned a height of zero. As a consequence, the mempool would incorrectly and prematurely purge valid transactions in the purgeExpiredTxs function defined in mempool/v1/mempool.go:762.

Recommendation

We recommend initializing the mempool with the actual height.

**Status: Resolved** 

### 5. Submitting blocks to the data availability and settlement layer can result in a deadlock

#### **Severity: Major**

In block/submit.go:13-57, the SubmitLoop function, running in a goroutine, submits blocks to the data availability layer (DA) and settlement layer (SL). A mutex, batchInProcess, is used to ensure that only a single batch is processed at a time.

However, if the submitNextBatch function in line 46 errors, the mutex is not released, preventing the next batch from being processed and resulting in a deadlock.

#### Recommendation

We recommend releasing the mutex in case of an error.

**Status: Resolved** 

### 6. Invalid blocks can be received via p2p gossip, potentially preventing block syncing

#### **Severity: Major**

In block/manager.go:256-278, the applyBlockCallback callback function is called whenever a new block is received via libp2p gossip. If the received block height is equal to the next expected height, the block is applied via the applyBlock function in line 269. Otherwise, if the block height is for a future height, the block and the corresponding commit are stored in prevBlock and prevCommit, respectively.

However, at this point, the block is not yet validated by verifying the signature to ensure the sequencer has produced it. This stateful check is only performed later in the <code>executeBlockfunction</code> in block/block.go:180-182 via the Validate function.

As a result, invalid blocks can be received and processed by nodes, leading to potential issues such as:

- 1. If the block height is equal to the next expected height, it is attempted to be applied. Before any stateful validations, the block is saved via the SaveBlock function in block/block.go:38. While the block is ultimately dismissed and not applied due to not passing the signature verification check, it remains stored, wasting disk space of the node. An attacker could exploit this behavior by spamming invalid blocks to nodes.
- 2. If the received block is for a future height, the block and commit are stored in prevBlock and prevCommit, potentially overwriting a valid block and commit. As a result, nodes can be prevented from syncing via this mechanism. Please note that nodes also synchronize via the settlement layer (Dymension Hub), which mitigates this issue to some extent.

Additionally, it should be noted that the sequencer does not receive blocks via libp2p gossip, only regular nodes do.

#### Recommendation

We recommend executing the stateful block validation in the <code>applyBlockCallback</code> function before proceeding.

**Status: Resolved** 

## 7. Non-atomic batch submission to data availability and settlement layers causes repayment for the same data and potential indefinite failure

#### **Severity: Major**

In block/submit.go:89-103, in the submitNextBatch function, a batch is submitted to the data availability (DA) layer by calling SubmitBatch, followed by an attempt to submit the same batch to the settlement layer (SL) using m.settlementclient.submitbatch.

If the SL submission fails due to reasons such as insufficient gas or censorship at the settlement layer, the transaction remains in the mempool awaiting inclusion. The system then retries to submit the same batch to both layers after the waiting period ends. Since syncTarget remains unchanged, the DA layer accepts the redundant batch, leading to unnecessary payments for already existing data. If the original transaction eventually gets included in the SL before the new transaction, the SL rejects the resubmitted transaction due to a height check requirement.

Consequently, this cycle of failing settlement attempts and redundant payments perpetuates indefinitely and incurs unnecessary costs for the system.

#### Recommendation

We recommend checking whether data is already submitted to the DA layer before resubmitting it.

Status: Resolved

#### 8. Applying blocks concurrently can lead to unexpected errors

#### **Severity: Major**

The applyBlock function executes the current block by calling the executeBlock function in block/block.go:44. As part of the execution, the application's BeginBlock, EndBlock, and DeliverTx are called for every included transaction.

However, applying the block to the store and the ABCI application is not atomic, shared state is not locked between processes, such as the goroutine that processes libp2p gossiped blocks and the sync goroutine that syncs the node with blocks from the settlement layer.

In the rare case that a block for the same height is simultaneously processed by both goroutines, both processes will attempt to execute the block, leading to unexpected errors such as a panic in the ABCI application when <u>checking the header's validity</u>.

#### Recommendation

We recommend adding a synchronization lock to the manager state to prevent concurrent block processing.

**Status: Resolved** 

### 9. Stopped block production is immediately resumed after receiving a health status event from the data availability or settlement layer

#### **Severity: Minor**

In block/produce.go:17-73, the ProduceBlockLoop function produces new blocks unless the shouldProduceBlocksCh channel receives a false value. In this case, block production is stopped, and the channel waits for a true value again.

There are three causes that may stop the block production:

- 1. the data availability (DA) layer is unhealthy,
- 2. the settlement layer (SL) is unhealthy, or
- 3. block production encounters an error.

The DA and SL's current health status is continuously reported to the healthStatusEventCallback health listener function, defined in block/manager.go:250-254. This function sends the received health boolean value into the shouldProduceBlocksCh channel.

However, if block production was previously stopped due to erroneous block production, the health listener will enable block production again as soon as the DA or SL health status is reported as true, even if the error that caused the block production to stop has not been resolved.

#### Recommendation

We recommend not enabling block production when receiving a health status event if the block production was previously stopped by a block production error.

**Status: Resolved** 

10. Pending blocks are repeatedly gossiped

**Severity: Minor** 

In block/produce.go:148, the produceBlock function gossips a newly produced block to its peers. However, if the sequencer picks up a pending block that has already been

gossiped, it will be gossiped again, which is unnecessary.

We classify this issue as minor, as repeatedly gossiped blocks do not harm the network

besides causing networking inefficiencies.

Recommendation

We recommend only gossiping new blocks.

Status: Acknowledged

11. Validating gossiped transactions may block the libp2p validator

queue

**Severity: Minor** 

In p2p/validator.go:43-69, the TxValidator libp2p validator function calls the mempool's CheckTx function to validate the gossiped transaction prior to adding it to the

mempool.

However, if the CheckTx function returns an error that does not match any of the switch cases, i.e., the default case, the function will attempt to read from the checkTxResCh channel to receive the ABCI response. As  ${\tt CheckTx}$  may have errored before initiating an

ABCI CheckTx request, the channel will not receive any response, causing the goroutine to

block and clog the libp2p validator queue.

Recommendation

We recommend handling all other errors and returning false in this case. Additionally,

consider setting a timeout for the transaction validator.

**Status: Resolved** 

12. Mempool is initialized at genesis without the preCheck and postCheck functions, leading to not validating the transaction's

size and wanted gas until the first block is committed

**Severity: Minor** 

In state/executor.go:301, the commit function calls the mempool's Update function

to update the preCheck and postCheck functions with the new maxBytes and maxGas

consensus parameters received from the underlying application. Those functions are used to additionally validate that the transaction's size (in bytes) is less than the maximum and that the transaction's wanted gas does not exceed the block gas limit. This validation occurs before

and after a transaction is added to the mempool.

However, at genesis, the mempool is not initialized with those preCheck and postCheck functions, even though both consensus parameters, maxBytes, and maxGas, are made

available after executing InitChain in block/initchain.go:45.

As a result, transactions will not be validated until the first block is committed.

Recommendation

We recommend initializing the mempool after executing InitChain.

Status: Resolved

13. Maximum number of peer IDs can potentially be reached, preventing gossiped transactions from being added to the

mempool

**Severity: Minor** 

In node/mempool/mempool.go:35-48, the nextPeerID function returns the next unused peer ID to use and panic if the number of active IDs exceeds the maximum threshold,

maxActiveIDs = math.MaxUint16.

However, over time, as more and more peer IDs are utilized, and unused IDs are not reclaimed via the Reclaim function, the maximum threshold can potentially be reached at some point. As a result, the libp2p transaction validator function, TxValidator, will be unable to claim an ID for a new peer and panics, preventing incoming transactions from being

added to the mempool.

We classify this issue as minor as it requires a total number of 65,535 unique peers to have

been connected to the node at some point.

Recommendation

We recommend using the Reclaim function to reclaim unused peer IDs.

Status: Acknowledged

14. Incomplete validation of configuration parameters

**Severity: Minor** 

In config/config.go:137-144, the Validate function is executed by the

GetViperConfig function execution to validate the NodeConfig.

However, the validation process is incomplete, as only BlockManagerConfig and

SettlementLayer are currently checked.

Consequently, the node may use an invalid configuration, possibly leading to unintended

behaviors and node halt.

Recommendation

include validation for recommend updating the Validate function to Instrumentation, DALayer, DAConfig, alongside and DAGrpc

BlockManagerConfig and SettlementLayer.

Status: Resolved

15. Node can be started without providing the genesis

**Severity: Minor** 

In cmd/dymint/commands/start.go:128-135, the checkGenesisHash function is

executed during the node initialization to verify that the provided genesisHash and the

SHA-256 hash of the genesis file are equal.

However, if the Genesis file or the genesisHash is not provided, it does not generate an

error, thus permitting the node to start even without providing the genesis.

Recommendation

We recommend triggering an error in case the genesis is not provided and halting the node

startup process.

**Status: Resolved** 

16. Suboptimal data retrieval due to static configurations

**Severity: Minor** 

The fetchBatch function in block/retriever.go:106 retrieves data batches using a

retriever instance (m.retriever) initialized at node startup. However, this approach leads to suboptimal data retrieval due to static configurations. For instance, if sequencer 1 uses Celestia as the DA layer and sequencer 2 uses Avail, parsing data would fail for one another.

This static configuration presents a significant issue, as nodes submitting to Celestia or Avail

may face difficulties syncing data. Since m.retriever is statically configured based on the daregsitry settings, the syncing node might encounter situations where it's unable to parse both sets of data.

When data is submitted to the settlement layer, it includes a DASubmitMetaData.client field to validate the data availability from the client. Retrievers are configured to use only one DA client. If the settlement has data from mixed clients, the retriever can only parse data for its configured client. If the data is only on another client, this static configuration would prevent processing the data.

We classify this issue as minor because, at the time of the audit, only one sequencer node is used. Once further sequencer nodes are introduced, it becomes a serious issue.

#### Recommendation

We recommend parsing the data on a per-blob basis.

Status: Acknowledged

#### 17. Occurrence of "Tendermint" instead of "Dymint"

#### **Severity: Informational**

In rpc/client/client.go:168, the BroadcastTxCommit function uses the error reason "Tendermint exited". This error message might be misleading as the client is called "Dymint".

#### Recommendation

We recommend amending the error message to use "Dymint" instead of "Tendermint".

**Status: Acknowledged** 

### 18. Non-sequencer nodes unnecessarily register health status event listener

#### **Severity: Informational**

In block/manager.go:243, the EventListener function subscribes to the EventQueryHealthStatus event and registers the corresponding healthStatusEventCallback callback function. Whenever this event is emitted, the event's Healthy value is sent to the shouldProduceBlocksCh channel, potentially enabling or disabling block production.

However, this mechanism is only relevant for the sequencer node, as it is currently the only node that is producing blocks. For other regular nodes, the <code>shouldProduceBlocksCh</code> channel is not relevant, rendering the event listener and callback function unnecessary.

#### Recommendation

We recommend only registering the healthStatusEventCallback callback function for the sequencer, i.e., if isAggregator is true.

**Status: Resolved** 

#### 19. Use of magic numbers decreases maintainability

#### **Severity: Informational**

In rpc/json/service.go:107-108 and rpc/client/client.go:315, hard-coded number literals without context or a description are used. Using such "magic numbers" goes against best practices as they reduce code readability and maintenance as developers are unable to understand their use easily and may make inconsistent changes across the codebase.

#### Recommendation

We recommend defining magic numbers as constants with descriptive variable names and comments, where necessary.

**Status: Resolved**