

Composable Finance - Pablo Substrate Pallet Security Audit

Prepared by: Halborn

Date of Engagement: Jul 30th, 2022 - Aug 17th, 2022

Visit: Halborn.com

DOCU	MENT REVISION HISTORY	4
CONT	ACTS	5
1	EXECUTIVE OVERVIEW	6
1.1	INTRODUCTION	7
1.2	AUDIT SUMMARY	7
1.3	TEST APPROACH & METHODOLOGY	7
	RISK METHODOLOGY	8
1.4	SCOPE	10
2	ASSESSMENT SUMMARY & FINDINGS OVERVIEW	11
3	FINDINGS & TECH DETAILS	12
3.1	(HAL-01) USERS CAN CREATE SAME PAIR POOLS WITHOUT LIMITS -	HIGH 14
	Description	14
	Code Location	14
	Proof Of Concept	15
	Risk Level	16
	Recommendation	16
	Remediation Plan	16
3.2	(HAL-02) MISSING PAUSABLE FUNCTIONALITY - LOW	17
	Description	17
	Risk Level	17
	Recommendation	17
	Remediation Plan	17
3.3	(HAL-03) ZERO AMOUNT BUY-SELL-SWAP - LOW	18
	Description	1 2

	Code Location	18
	Proof Of Concept	20
	Risk Level	21
	Recommendation	21
	Remediation Plan	21
3.4	(HAL-04) ZERO AMOUNT REMOVE LIQUIDITY - LOW	22
	Description	22
	Code Location	22
	Proof Of Concept	23
	Risk Level	24
	Recommendation	24
	Remediation Plan	24
3.5	(HAL-05) CREATING STABLE SWAP WITH NON-STABLE TOKENS - INFO	OR- 25
	Description	25
	Code Location	25
	Proof Of Concept	26
	Risk Level	27
	Recommendation	27
	Remediation Plan	28
3.6	(HAL-06) MISLEADING ERROR - INFORMATIONAL	29
	Description	29
	Code Location	29
	Risk Level	30
	Recommendation	30
	Remediation Plan	30

3.7	(HAL-07) CREATING POOLS ON BEHALF OF OTHER ACCOUNTS - INFO	RMA- 31
	Description	31
	Code Location	31
	Risk Level	32
	Recommendation	32
	Remediation Plan	32
4	AUTOMATED TESTING	33
4.1	AUTOMATED ANALYSIS	34
	Description	34
	Results	34

DOCUMENT REVISION HISTORY

VERSION	MODIFICATION	DATE	AUTHOR
0.1	Document Creation	08/08/2022	Alpcan Onaran
0.2	Document Edits	08/18/2022	Alpcan Onaran
0.3	Document Edits	08/19/2022	Alpcan Onaran
0.4	Draft Review	08/20/2022	Timur Guvenkaya
0.5	Draft Review	08/22/2022	Gabi Urrutia
1.0	Remediation Plan	11/25/2022	Alpcan Onaran
1.1	Remediation Plan Review	11/25/2022	Timur Guvenkaya
1.2	Remediation Plan Review	11/25/2022	Piotr Cielas
1.3	Remediation Plan Review	11/25/2022	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		
Piotr Cielas	Halborn	Piotr.Cielas@halborn.com		
Timur Guvenkaya	Halborn	Timur.Guvenkaya@halborn.com		
Alpcan Onaran	Halborn	Alpcan.Onaran@halborn.com		

EXECUTIVE OVERVIEW

1.1 INTRODUCTION

Composable engaged Halborn to conduct a security assessment on their Pablo DEX pallet on July 30th, 2022 and ending August 17th, 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 2.5 weeks for the engagement and assigned one full-time security engineer to audit the security of the assets in scope. The engineer is a blockchain and smart contract security expert with advanced penetration testing, smart-contract hacking, and in-depth knowledge of multiple blockchain protocols.

The purpose of this audit is to achieve the following:

• Identify potential security issues within the Pablo pallet.

In summary, Halborn identified few security risks that were mostly acknowledged. Most of them will be fixed in a future release by the Composable Finance 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 Bridge Substrate pallet. 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 <u>vulnerabilities</u>.
- 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 frame/pablo directory using 495faa2a132654cafb10ed55bf4eee0446261ef0 commit-id in ComposableFi/composable repository.

- Pallets
 - Pablo
 - Helper pallet functions

IMPACT

2. ASSESSMENT SUMMARY & FINDINGS OVERVIEW

CRITICAL	HIGH	MEDIUM	LOW	INFORMATIONAL
0	1	0	3	3

LIKELIHOOD

		(HAL-01)	
(HAL-05)	(HAL-02) (HAL-03) (HAL-04)		
(HAL-06) (HAL-07)			

SECURITY ANALYSIS	RISK LEVEL	REMEDIATION DATE
HAL-01 ACCOUNTS CAN CREATE SAME PAIR POOLS WITHOUT LIMITS	High	NOT APPLICABLE
HAL-02 MISSING PAUSABLE FUNCTIONALITY	Low	FUTURE RELEASE
HAL-03 ZERO AMOUNT BUY-SELL-SWAP	Low	FUTURE RELEASE
HAL-04 ZERO AMOUNT REMOVE LIQUIDITY	Low	FUTURE RELEASE
HAL-05 CREATING STABLE SWAP WITH NON-STABLE TOKENS	Informational	ACKNOWLEDGED
HAL-06 MISLEADING ERROR	Informational	ACKNOWLEDGED
HAL-07 CREATING POOLS ON BEHALF OF OTHER ACCOUNTS	Informational	ACKNOWLEDGED

FINDINGS & TECH DETAILS

3.1 (HAL-01) USERS CAN CREATE SAME PAIR POOLS WITHOUT LIMITS - HIGH

Description:

It was observed that, an account can create configured pools without any limitation, it was also observed that there are not any functionality to remove pools for StableSwap and ConstantProduct Pools, attackers can use this functionality to create pools with same configuration in a loop and fill up the PoolCount u16 variable, which will prevent further pool creation for other users.

It was calculated that attacker can perform this attack using 327670000 weight.

Code Location:

```
    pair, fee, base_weight } ⇒ {
                       let pool_id = Uniswap::<T>::do_create_pool(
                           &owner,
                           FeeConfig::default_from(fee),
                       )?;
                       Self::create_staking_reward_pool(&pool_id,
→ pair)?;
                       (owner, pool_id, pair)
                   },
                   PoolInitConfiguration::LiquidityBootstrapping(
→ pool_config) => {
                       let validated_pool_config =
                           Validated::new(pool_config.clone()).

    map_err(DispatchError::Other)?;

    do_create_pool(validated_pool_config)?,
                       )
                   },
               };
               Self::deposit_event(Event::<T>::PoolCreated { owner,

    pool_id, assets: pair });
               Ok(pool_id)
```

Proof Of Concept:

```
for i in 0..u16::MAX {

let pool_id = Pablo::do_create_pool(pool_init_config.clone
L, ()).expect("pool creation failed");

//Pool creation stops after this for other users because
L, PoolCount overflows.

};

};
```

Risk Level:

Likelihood - 4 Impact - 4

Recommendation:

It is recommended to ensure that an account cannot create a same type pool with same pairs. It is also recommended to add a function to remove pools while returning the liquidity to users.

Remediation Plan:

NOT APPLICABLE: The issue was marked as not applicable, the Composable Finance team stated that The function used to create pools for the possible exploit is an internal function of the pallet rather than an extrinsic one. The actual pool creation extrinsic of the pallet is protected by a validation on the **origin(PoolCreationOrigin)**. For the **dali** and **picasso** runtimes, this origin would be root or half council at the launch.

3.2 (HAL-02) MISSING PAUSABLE FUNCTIONALITY - LOW

Description:

It was observed that, pools does not have a pausable functionality to protect the users from possible abnormal situations.

Risk Level:

Likelihood - 2 Impact - 2

Recommendation:

It is recommended to add an admin controlled pausable functionality to pools to protect users from unexpected situations.

Remediation Plan:

PENDING: The Composable Finance team stated that This audit will be superseded by the upcoming audit on the DEX refactor. The issue was added to the backlog for the future version of the Pablo DEX.

3.3 (HAL-03) ZERO AMOUNT BUY-SELL-SWAP - LOW

Description:

It was observed that, buy, sell and swap functions does not check if the amount equals to zero. Zero amount of wrappings can be abused if someone constantly calls these functions with zero amount and fill the block space, which may delay or halt other user transactions.

Code Location:

```
Listing 3: frame/pablo/src/lib.rs (Line 453)
           pub fn buy (
               origin: OriginFor<T>,
               pool_id: T::PoolId,
               asset_id: T::AssetId,
               amount: T::Balance,
               min_receive: T::Balance,
               keep_alive: bool,
           ) -> DispatchResult {
               let who = ensure_signed(origin)?;
               let _ = <Self as Amm>::buy(&who, pool_id, asset_id,
→ amount, min_receive, keep_alive)?;
               0k(())
           pub fn sell(
               origin: OriginFor<T>,
               asset_id: T::AssetId,
```

```
amount: T::Balance,
               keep_alive: bool,
          ) -> DispatchResult {
               let who = ensure_signed(origin)?;
               let _ = <Self as Amm>::sell(&who, pool_id, asset_id,
→ amount, min_receive, keep_alive)?;
              0k(())
          pub fn swap(
              origin: OriginFor<T>,
               pool_id: T::PoolId,
               pair: CurrencyPair<T::AssetId>,
               keep_alive: bool,
          ) -> DispatchResult {
               let who = ensure_signed(origin)?;
               let _ = <Self as Amm>::exchange(
                   &who,
              )?;
               0k(())
          }
```

Proof Of Concept:

```
Listing 4: Zero-Amount-Buy-Sell-Swap (Lines 29,30,31)
 2 fn zero_buy_sell_swap_stableswap() {
       new_test_ext().execute_with(|| {
           let pool_init_config = PoolInitConfiguration::StableSwap {
               pair: CurrencyPair::new(USDC, USDT),
               amplification_coefficient: 100_u16,
               fee: Permill::from_percent(10),
           };
           let pool_id = Pablo::do_create_pool(pool_init_config).
 → expect("pool creation failed");
           let pool = Pablo::pools(pool_id).expect("pool not found");
           let pool = match pool {
               StableSwap(pool) => pool,
               _ => panic!("expected stable_swap pool"),
           };
           assert_ok!(Tokens::mint_into(USDC, &ALICE, 1));
           assert_ok!(Tokens::mint_into(USDT, &ALICE, 1));
           assert_ok!(Pablo::add_liquidity(
               Origin::signed(ALICE),
               1,
               0,
               false
           ));
           Pablo::sell(Origin::signed(BOB), pool_id, USDC, 0, 0_u128,
    false).expect("sell failed");
           Pablo::buy(Origin::signed(BOB), pool_id, USDC, 0, 0_u128,

    false).expect("sell failed");
           assert_ok!(Pablo::swap(Origin::signed(BOB), pool_id,

    CurrencyPair::new(USDC, USDT), 0, 0, false));
       });
34 }
```

Risk Level:

Likelihood - 2

Impact - 2

Recommendation:

It is recommended to ensure that input parameter amount is higher than zero.

Remediation Plan:

PENDING: The Composable Finance team stated that This audit will be superseded by the upcoming audit on the DEX refactor. The issue was added to the backlog for the future version of the Pablo DEX.

3.4 (HAL-04) ZERO AMOUNT REMOVE LIQUIDITY - LOW

Description:

It was observed that, remove_liquidity function does not check if the lp_amount equals to zero. Zero amount of wrappings can be abused if someone constantly calls remove_liquidity with zero amount and fill the block space, which may delay or halt other user transactions.

Code Location:

```
Listing 5: frame/pablo/src/lib.rs
           fn remove_liquidity(
               who: &Self::AccountId,
               pool_id: Self::PoolId,
               min_quote_amount: Self::Balance,
           ) -> Result<(), DispatchError> {
               let currency_pair = Self::currency_pair(pool_id)?;
               let redeemable_assets = Self::

    redeemable_assets_for_lp_tokens(
                   pool_id,
                   BTreeMap::from([
                        (currency_pair.base, min_base_amount),
                        (currency_pair.quote, min_quote_amount),
                   ]),
               )?;
               let pool = Self::get_pool(pool_id)?;
               let pool_account = Self::account_id(&pool_id);
               match pool {
```

Proof Of Concept:

```
Listing 6: Zero-Amount-RemoveLiquidity (Line 33)
 2 fn zero_amount_remove_liquidity() {
       new_test_ext().execute_with(|| {
 owner: ALICE,
              pair: CurrencyPair::new(BTC, USDT),
               fee: Permill::zero(),
              base_weight: Permill::from_percent(50),
           };
           let pool_id = Pablo::do_create_pool(pool_init_config).
 let pool = get_pool(pool_id);
           let current_product = |a| {
               let balance_btc = Tokens::balance(BTC, &a);
               let balance_usdt = Tokens::balance(USDT, &a);
           };
           assert_ok!(Tokens::mint_into(BTC, &ALICE, 1));
           assert_ok!(Tokens::mint_into(USDT, &ALICE, 1));
           assert_ok! (<Pablo as Amm>::add_liquidity()
              &ALICE,
              0,
              false
           assert_ok!(<Pablo as Amm>::remove_liquidity(&ALICE,
 \rightarrow pool_id, 0, 0, 0);
       });
35 }
```

Risk Level:

Likelihood - 2

Impact - 2

Recommendation:

It is recommended to ensure input parameter lp_amount is higher than zero in remove_liquidity function.

Remediation Plan:

PENDING: The Composable Finance team stated that This audit will be superseded by the upcoming audit on the DEX refactor. The issue was added to the backlog for the future version of the Pablo DEX.

3.5 (HAL-05) CREATING STABLE SWAP WITH NON-STABLE TOKENS - INFORMATIONAL

Description:

It was observed that users can start stable swap pools using any pair, including non-stable tokens (Example: wBTC-USDT).

Code Location:

```
Listing 7: frame/pablo/src/stable_swap.rs (Line 24)
       pub fn do_create_pool(
           who: &T::AccountId,
           amp_coeff: u16,
           fee: FeeConfig,
       ) -> Result<T::PoolId, DispatchError> {
           ensure!(amp_coeff > 0, Error::<T>::
 → AmpFactorMustBeGreaterThanZero);
           ensure!(pair.base != pair.quote, Error::<T>::InvalidPair);
           ensure!(fee.fee_rate < Permill::one(), Error::<T>::
 let lp_token = T::CurrencyFactory::create(RangeId::

    LP_TOKENS, T::Balance::default())?;
           let pool_id =
               PoolCount::<T>::try_mutate(|pool_count| -> Result<T::</pre>
 → PoolId, DispatchError> {
                   let pool_id = *pool_count;
                   Pools::<T>::insert(
                       pool_id,
                       PoolConfiguration::StableSwap(
                           owner: who.clone(),
```

Proof Of Concept:

```
Listing 8: StableSwap-NonStableTokens (Line 6)
 2 fn stableswap_with_nonstabletokens() {
       new_test_ext().execute_with(|| {
           let pool_init_config = PoolInitConfiguration::StableSwap {
               pair: CurrencyPair::new(BTC, USDT),
               amplification_coefficient: 100_u16,
               fee: Permill::zero(),
           };
           let pool_id = Pablo::do_create_pool(pool_init_config).
 → expect("pool creation failed");
           let pool = Pablo::pools(pool_id).expect("pool not found");
           let pool = match pool {
               StableSwap(pool) => pool,
               _ => panic!("expected stable_swap pool"),
           };
           let btc_price = 23200;
           let nb_of_btc = 100;
           let nb_of_usdt = 1000000;
```

```
assert_ok!(Tokens::mint_into(BTC, &ALICE, initial_btc));
           assert_ok!(Tokens::mint_into(USDT, &ALICE, initial_usdt));
           assert_ok!(Pablo::add_liquidity(
               Origin::signed(ALICE),
               0,
               false
          ));
           let ratio = <Pablo as Amm>::get_exchange_value(pool_id,
→ BTC , 1)
               .expect("get_exchange_value failed");
           println!("{:?}", ratio);
           assert_ok!(Tokens::mint_into(BTC, &ALICE, initial_btc));
           let ratio = <Pablo as Amm>::get_exchange_value(pool_id,
→ BTC, 1)
               .expect("get_exchange_value failed");
          println!("{:?}", ratio);
      });
48 }
```

Risk Level:

Likelihood - 1 Impact - 2

Recommendation:

Our team does not find any direct impact thought this functionality but since StableSwap pools are used for stable token swaps, it is recommended to restrict the non-stable token assets in StablePools.

Remediation Plan:

ACKNOWLEDGED: The Composable Finance team acknowledged the issue.

3.6 (HAL-06) MISLEADING ERROR - INFORMATIONAL

Description:

Inside composable-maths/src/dex/constant_product.rs, it was observed that compute_out_given_in and compute_out_given_out functions are using a misleading error message, the functions throwing a ArithmeticError::Overflow message when the sum of wi and wo variables exceeds the expected amount. ArithmeticError::Overflow should be used when an integer overflow/underflow vulnerability gets detected.

Code Location:

```
Listing 10: composable-maths/src/dex/constant_product.rs (Line 110)

96 pub fn compute_in_given_out<T: PerThing>(
97 wi: T,
98 wo: T,
```

Risk Level:

Likelihood - 1

Impact - 1

Recommendation:

It is recommended to change the error message to prevent possible misleading errors.

Remediation Plan:

ACKNOWLEDGED: The Composable Finance team acknowledged the issue.

3.7 (HAL-07) CREATING POOLS ON BEHALF OF OTHER ACCOUNTS - INFORMATIONAL

Description:

It was observed that users can start pool on behalf of other accounts.

Code Location:

```
Listing 11: frame/pablo/src/lib.rs (Line 748)
           pub fn do_create_pool(
                        fee,
                        let pool_id = StableSwap::<T>:::do_create_pool(
                            &owner,
                            amplification_coefficient,
                            FeeConfig::default_from(fee),
                        )?;
                        Self::create_staking_reward_pool(&pool_id,

  pair)?;
                        (owner, pool_id, pair)
                    },
                    PoolInitConfiguration::ConstantProduct { owner,

    pair, fee, base_weight } ⇒ {
                        let pool_id = Uniswap::<T>::do_create_pool(
                            &owner,
                            FeeConfig::default_from(fee),
                            base_weight,
```

```
)?;
                       Self::create_staking_reward_pool(&pool_id,
→ pair)?;
                       (owner, pool_id, pair)
                   },
                   PoolInitConfiguration::LiquidityBootstrapping(
→ pool_config) => {
                       let validated_pool_config =
                           Validated::new(pool_config.clone()).
  map_err(DispatchError::Other)?;

    do_create_pool(validated_pool_config)?,
                       )
                   },
               };
               Self::deposit_event(Event::<T>:::PoolCreated { owner,

    pool_id, assets: pair });
               Ok(pool_id)
          }
```

Risk Level:

Likelihood - 1 Impact - 1

Recommendation:

Even this functionality will be used to transfer pools to ComposableFi side for them to manage, it is recommended to limit the parameter owner to specific accounts only to prevent possible griefing attacks.

Remediation Plan:

ACKNOWLEDGED: The Composable Finance team acknowledged the issue.

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: chrono Version: 0.4.19

Title: Potential segfault in localtime_r invocations

Date: 2020-11-10

ID: RUSTSEC-2020-0159

URL: https://rustsec.org/advisories/RUSTSEC-2020-0159

Solution: Upgrade to >=0.4.20

Crate: hyper

Version: 0.10.16

Title: Lenient hyper header parsing of Content-Length could allow request smuggling & Integer overflow in hyper's parsing of the

Transfer-Encoding header leads to data loss

Date: 2021-07-07

ID: RUSTSEC-2021-0078 & RUSTSEC-2021-0079

URL: https://rustsec.org/advisories/RUSTSEC-2021-0078 & https://rustsec.org/advisori

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 >=0.7.1

Dependency tree:

lru 0.6.6

Crate: rocksdb Version: 0.18.0

Title: Out-of-bounds read when opening multiple column families with TTL

Date: 2022-05-11

ID: RUSTSEC-2022-0046

URL: https://rustsec.org/advisories/RUSTSEC-2022-0046

Solution: Upgrade to >=0.19.0

Crate: websocket Version: 0.24.0

Title: Unbounded memory allocation based on untrusted length

Date: 2022-08-01

ID: RUSTSEC-2022-0035

URL: https://rustsec.org/advisories/RUSTSEC-2022-0035

Solution: Upgrade to >=0.26.5

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: ansi_term
Version: 0.12.1

Warning: unmaintained

Title: ansi_term is Unmaintained

Date: 2021-08-18

ID: RUSTSEC-2021-0139

URL: https://rustsec.org/advisories/RUSTSEC-2021-0139

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

THANK YOU FOR CHOOSING

