



AAVE

Aave Delivery Infrastructure Contract Review

Version: 4.2

October, 2023

Contents

Introduction	2
Disclaimer	2
Document Structure	2
Overview	2
Security Assessment Summary	3
Findings Summary	3
Detailed Findings	4
Summary of Findings	5
The SameChainAdapter Cannot Forward Messages	6
Discrepancy Between Documentation & Implementation	8
Miscellaneous General Comments	9
A Test Suite	11
B Vulnerability Severity Classification	12

Introduction

Sigma Prime was commercially engaged to perform a time-boxed security review of the Aave smart contracts. The review focused solely on the security aspects of the Solidity implementation of the contract, though general recommendations and informational comments are also provided.

Disclaimer

Sigma Prime makes all effort but holds no responsibility for the findings of this security review. Sigma Prime does not provide any guarantees relating to the function of the smart contract. Sigma Prime makes no judgements on, or provides any security review, regarding the underlying business model or the individuals involved in the project.

Document Structure

The first section provides an overview of the functionality of the Aave smart contracts contained within the scope of the security review. A summary followed by a detailed review of the discovered vulnerabilities is then given which assigns each vulnerability a severity rating (see [Vulnerability Severity Classification](#)), an *open/closed/resolved* status and a recommendation. Additionally, findings which do not have direct security implications (but are potentially of interest) are marked as *informational*.

Outputs of automated testing that were developed during this assessment are also included for reference (in the Appendix: [Test Suite](#)).

The appendix provides additional documentation, including the severity matrix used to classify vulnerabilities within the Aave smart contracts.

Overview

The Aave CrossChain Infrastructure is the new cross-chain communication layer for Aave. It is the system responsible for the communication across different networks for Aave Governance V3. It enables the communication using different bridges that allow the system to receive and forward messages to and from different chains.

The CrossChain Infrastructure has also an emergency mode. If the cross chain communication and execution infrastructure breaks, this mode is triggered and gives the permissions to the *Guardian* to replace bridges and change other configurations.

Security Assessment Summary

This review was conducted on the files hosted on the [Aave Devlivery Infrastructure repository](#) and were assessed at commit `a85bc4c`.

Specifically, the files in scope are as follows:

- `BaseCrossChainController.sol`
- `CrossChainController.sol`
- `CrossChainControllerWithEmergencyMode.sol`
- `CrossChainForwarder.sol`
- `CrossChainReceiver.sol`
- `EmergencyConsumer.sol`
- `EmergencyRegistry.sol`
- `ChainIds.sol`
- `EncodingUtils.sol`
- `Erros.sol`
- `SameChainAdapter.sol`
- `BaseAdapter.sol`

Interfaces of the previous contract are included in the scope too.

Note: the OpenZeppelin and Solidity Utils libraries and dependencies were excluded from the scope of this assessment.

The manual code review section of the report is focused on identifying any and all issues/vulnerabilities associated with the business logic implementation of the contracts. This includes their internal interactions, intended functionality and correct implementation with respect to the underlying functionality of the Ethereum Virtual Machine (for example, verifying correct storage/memory layout). Additionally, the manual review process focused on all known Solidity anti-patterns and attack vectors. These include, but are not limited to, the following vectors: re-entrancy, front-running, integer overflow/underflow and correct visibility specifiers. For a more thorough, but non-exhaustive list of examined vectors, see [1, 2].

To support this review, the testing team used the following automated testing tools:

- Mythril: <https://github.com/ConsenSys/mythril>
- Slither: <https://github.com/trailofbits/slither>
- Surya: <https://github.com/ConsenSys/surya>

Output for these automated tools is available upon request.

Findings Summary

The testing team identified a total of 3 issues during this assessment. Categorised by their severity:

- High: 1 issue.
- Informational: 2 issues.

Detailed Findings

This section provides a detailed description of the vulnerabilities identified within the Aave smart contracts. Each vulnerability has a severity classification which is determined from the likelihood and impact of each issue by the matrix given in the Appendix: [Vulnerability Severity Classification](#).

A number of additional properties of the contracts, including gas optimisations, are also described in this section and are labelled as “informational”.

Each vulnerability is also assigned a **status**:

- **Open:** the issue has not been addressed by the project team.
- **Resolved:** the issue was acknowledged by the project team and updates to the affected contract(s) have been made to mitigate the related risk.
- **Closed:** the issue was acknowledged by the project team but no further actions have been taken.

Summary of Findings

ID	Description	Severity	Status
CCI-01	The SameChainAdapter Cannot Forward Messages	High	Resolved
CCI-02	Discrepancy Between Documentation & Implementation	Informational	Resolved
CCI-03	Miscellaneous General Comments	Informational	Resolved

CCI-01	The SameChainAdapter Cannot Forward Messages		
Asset	adapters/sameChain/SameChainAdapter.sol & CrossChainForwarder.sol		
Status	Resolved: See Resolution		
Rating	Severity: High	Impact: Medium	Likelihood: High

This issue was found and fixed independently during the course of the review.

Description

Due to the mismatch between the bytes parameter `message` of the function `SameChainAdapter.forwardMessage()` and the input `encodedTransaction.data` used to call the bridge adapter function `forwardMessage()` in `CrossChainForwarder._bridgeTransaction()`, the `SameChainAdapter` cannot forward messages to the intended destination.

In fact, in `SameChainAdapter.forwardMessage()`, the `message` parameter, which is the 4th parameter of this function, is decoded in line [25-27] decoded to `(uint256, address, address, bytes)`.

```

17 function forwardMessage(
18     address,
19     uint256,
20     uint256 destinationChainId,
21     bytes calldata message
22 ) external returns (address, uint256) {
23     require(destinationChainId == getChainID(), Errors.DESTINATION_CHAIN_NOT_SAME_AS_CURRENT_CHAIN);
24
25     (, address msgOrigin, address msgDestination, bytes memory decodedMessage) = abi.decode(
26         message,
27         (uint256, address, address, bytes)
28     );

```

However, in the function `CrossChainForwarder._bridgeTransaction()`, the 4th parameter that is used to make a delegatecall to the function `forwardMessage` of the `currentBridgeAdapter` is `encodedTransaction.data`.

```

265 (bool success, bytes memory returnData) = bridgeAdapters[i]
266     .currentChainBridgeAdapter
267     .delegatecall(
268         abi.encodeWithSelector(
269             IBaseAdapter.forwardMessage.selector,
270             bridgeAdapters[i].destinationBridgeAdapter,
271             gasLimit,
272             destinationChainId,
273             encodedTransaction.data
274         )
275     );

```

`encodedTransaction.data` is `abi.encode(Transaction)` which would be :

- 0x20: nonce
- 0x40: encodedEnvelope pointer
- 0x60: encodedEnvelope length
- 0x80: encodedEnvelope - nonce
- 0x0100: encodedEnvelope - origin
- ...

As a result, the `encodeTransaction.data` doesn't match with the expected bytes parameter in `SameChainAdapter.forwardMessage()`, and the delegatecall to this function in `CrossChainForwarder._bridgeTransaction()` will always revert, hence the `SameChainAdapter` cannot forward messages.

Recommendations

Add the necessary decoding function in `SameChainAdapter.forwardMessage()` so that the message can be decoded properly.

Resolution

This issue has been fixed on an internal commit by using the `decode()` function from the library `TransactionUtils` to properly decode the `encodeTransaction.data` input sent in `CrossChainForwarder._bridgeTransaction()` and then get the envelope from the decoded transaction using the function `TransactionUtils.getEnvelope()`.

CCI-02	Discrepancy Between Documentation & Implementation	
Asset	contracts/*	
Status	Resolved: See Resolution	
Rating	Informational	

Description

There are discrepancies between the documentation in the [README.md](#) and the implementation of the project.

In fact, it is mentioned in the `README.md` under the section [CrossChain Contracts](#) that the `CrossChainForwarder` and `CrossChainReceiver` contracts are `abstract`, while in the implementation these contracts are not abstract.

Added to that, the sub-section [Permissions](#) of the section *Aave Governance Emergency Mode* indicates that the call to `setEmergency` can be done by anyone, but, in the implementation the function `setEmergency()` has the `onlyOwner` modifier.

Recommendations

Ensure that the documentation matches with the implementation of the project.

Resolution

The documentation and implementation have been patched internally.

CCI-03	Miscellaneous General Comments
Asset	contracts/*
Status	Resolved: See Resolution
Rating	Informational

Description

This section details miscellaneous findings discovered by the testing team that do not have direct security implications:

1. Misplaced comments.

- The comments in line [53-56] in the `CrossChainController.initialize()` function are misplaced because as it is indicated in the comments that *"by strictly following this update order we can ensure that the state after the emergency is solved"*, while the function here is `initialize()` and it doesn't have a relation with the emergency mode.
- In `EncodingUtils.sol`, the `@notice` in line [123] of the `decode()` function in the `TransactionUtils` library does not match with the function as this comment indicates that *method that encodes a Transaction and generates its id* which is not correct.
- In `EncodingUtils.sol`, the `@return` in line [125] of the `decode()` function in the `TransactionUtils` library does not match with the function as this comment indicates that the return value is an *object containing the encoded transaction and the transaction id* which is not correct because this function returns the object `Transaction` which contains the nonce of the transaction and the associated encoded envelope.
- In `crosschain-infra/adapters/hyperLane/HyperLaneAdapter.sol` line [76] the refunded address is not `msg.sender` which does not match the comment *refunds go to msg.sender, who paid the msg.value*.

2. Typos and grammar

- `CrossChainForwarder.sol` line [280] "doesnt" should be "doesn't".
- `CrossChainForwarder.sol` line [320] "dont" should be "don't".
- `ICrossChainForwarder.sol` line [202] "adateprs" should be "adapters".
- `ICrossChainForwarder.sol` line [117] "ore" should be "or".
- `CrossChainReceiver.sol` line [165] "did't" should be "didn't".
- `EncodingUtils.sol` line [132] "an transaction id" should be "a transaction id".

3. Unused errors.

The following errors are not used and may be safely deleted.

- `INCORRECT_ORIGIN_CHAIN_ID`
- `BRIDGE_ADAPTER_NOT_SET_FOR_ANY_CHAIN`
- `ENVELOPE_DELIVERY_FAILED`
- `SYSTEM_NEEDS_AT_LEAST_ONE_CONFIRMATION`
- `INVALID_CONFIRMATIONS_FOR_ALLOWED_ADAPTERS`

4. Add storage gaps to proxied contracts.

The contract `CrossChainController` is intended to be a proxy contract. Adding new storage variables to inherited contracts would not be possible under the current setup as it would modify the slot ordering for other contracts. Consider adding an empty array of storage slots which may be decremented if new variables are required e.g. `uint256[50] __gap; .`

These may be added to each of the following inherited contracts:

- `CrossChainForwarder`
- `CrossChainReceiver`
- `EmergencyConsumer`

5. Additional issues in comments.

- `MetisAdapter.sol` line [16] "note that this adapter inherits from Optimism adapter and overrides only supported chain" is not true as it also overrides `forwardMessage()`.
- `ArbAdapter.sol` line [17] "note that this adapter is can only be used for ..." should remove "is".

Recommendations

Ensure that the comments are understood and acknowledged, and consider implementing the suggestions above.

Resolution

The development team have acknowledged these findings, addressing them where appropriate.

Appendix A Test Suite

A non-exhaustive list of tests were constructed to aid this security review and are provided alongside this document. The `brownie` framework was used to perform these tests and the output is given below.

test_constructor	PASSED	[2%]
test_get_trusted_remote_by_chain_id	PASSED	[4%]
test_register_received_message	PASSED	[6%]
test_register_received_message_delegatecall	PASSED	[8%]
test_basic	PASSED	[10%]
test_constructor	PASSED	[12%]
test_initialize	PASSED	[14%]
test_forward_message	PASSED	[16%]
test_forward_message_no_bridge_adapter	PASSED	[18%]
test_forward_message_wrong_caller	PASSED	[20%]
test_retry_envelope	PASSED	[22%]
test_retry_envelope_non_registered_envelope	PASSED	[24%]
test_retry_envelope_no_bridge	PASSED	[26%]
test_retry_transaction	PASSED	[28%]
test_retry_transaction_no_bridge	PASSED	[30%]
test_retry_transaction_not_prev_forwarded_transaction	PASSED	[32%]
test_retry_transaction_use_the_same_bridge_twice	PASSED	[34%]
test_approve_senders	PASSED	[36%]
test_remove_senders	PASSED	[38%]
test_enable_bridge_adapters	PASSED	[40%]
test_enable_bridge_adapters_zero_address	PASSED	[42%]
test_disable_bridge_adapters	PASSED	[44%]
test_receive_cross_chain_message_case_1	PASSED	[46%]
test_receive_cross_chain_message_case_2	PASSED	[48%]
test_receive_cross_chain_message_case_3	PASSED	[51%]
test_deliver_envelope	PASSED	[53%]
test_deliver_envelope_invalid_state	PASSED	[55%]
test_allow_receiver_bridge_adapters	PASSED	[57%]
test_allow_receiver_bridge_adapters_same_adapter_same_chain	PASSED	[59%]
test_allow_receiver_bridge_adapters_zero_address_bridge	PASSED	[61%]
test_disable_receiver_bridge_adapters	PASSED	[63%]
test_update_confirmations	PASSED	[65%]
test_update_confirmations_incorrect_nb_confirmation	PASSED	[67%]
test_update_messages_validity_timestamp	PASSED	[69%]
test_update_messages_validity_timestamp_invalid_timestamp	PASSED	[71%]
test_update_cl_emergency_oracle	PASSED	[73%]
test_update_cl_emergency_oracle_not_owner	PASSED	[75%]
test_update_cl_emergency_oracle_zero_address	PASSED	[77%]
test_solve_emergency	PASSED	[79%]
test_solve_emergency_not_in_emergency	PASSED	[81%]
test_emergency_token_transfer	PASSED	[83%]
test_emergency_ether_transfer	PASSED	[85%]
test_set_emergency	PASSED	[87%]
test_set_emergency_same_chain	PASSED	[89%]
test_set_emergency_wrong_caller	PASSED	[91%]
test_forward_message	PASSED	[93%]
test_native_to_infra_chain_id	PASSED	[95%]
test_infra_to_native_chain_id	PASSED	[97%]
test_get_trusted_remote_by_chain_id	PASSED	[100%]

Appendix B Vulnerability Severity Classification

This security review classifies vulnerabilities based on their potential impact and likelihood of occurrence. The total severity of a vulnerability is derived from these two metrics based on the following matrix.

Impact				
High		Medium	High	Critical
Medium		Low	Medium	High
Low		Low	Low	Medium
		Low	Medium	High
		Likelihood		

Table 1: Severity Matrix - How the severity of a vulnerability is given based on the *impact* and the *likelihood* of a vulnerability.

References

- [1] Sigma Prime. Solidity Security. Blog, 2018, Available: <https://blog.sigmaprime.io/solidity-security.html>. [Accessed 2018].
- [2] NCC Group. DASP - Top 10. Website, 2018, Available: <http://www.dasp.co/>. [Accessed 2018].

σ'