



# Clone – Protocol

Solana Program Security  
Assessment

Prepared by: Halborn

Date of Engagement: August 28th, 2023 – October 9th, 2023

Visit: [Halborn.com](https://Halborn.com)

DOCUMENT REVISION HISTORY	6
CONTACTS	7
1 EXECUTIVE OVERVIEW	8
1.1 INTRODUCTION	9
1.2 ASSESSMENT SUMMARY	9
1.3 TEST APPROACH & METHODOLOGY	10
2 RISK METHODOLOGY	11
2.1 EXPLOITABILITY	12
2.2 IMPACT	13
2.3 SEVERITY COEFFICIENT	15
2.4 SCOPE	17
3 ASSESSMENT SUMMARY & FINDINGS OVERVIEW	18
4 FINDINGS & TECH DETAILS	19
4.1 (HAL-01) MISCALCULATION DURING LIQUIDITY WITHDRAWAL OF THE COMET - LOW(3.1)	21
Description	21
Code Location	21
BVSS	22
Recommendation	22
Remediation Plan	22
4.2 (HAL-02) LIQUIDATING A BORROW POSITION WITH PARTIAL DEBT SET- TLEMENT - LOW(3.1)	23
Description	23
Code Location	23
BVSS	27

Recommendation	27
Remediation Plan	27
4.3 (HAL-03) LACK OF AUTHORITY CHECK IN INITIALIZE FUNCTION - LOW(3.1)	28
Description	28
Code Location	28
BVSS	29
Recommendation	29
Remediation Plan	29
4.4 (HAL-04) MISSING SANITY CHECK TO ENSURE THE DEPOSITORY TOKEN MINT DOES NOT MATCH THE DEPOSITING TOKEN MINT - LOW(2.5)	30
Description	30
Code Location	30
BVSS	30
Recommendation	31
Remediation Plan	31
4.5 (HAL-05) CHECKED ARITHMETIC MISSING - INFORMATIONAL(1.9)	32
Description	32
Code Location	32
BVSS	33
Recommendation	33
Remediation Plan	33
4.6 (HAL-06) ORACLE CHECKS MISSING - INFORMATIONAL(0.6)	34
Description	34
Code Location	34
BVSS	35
Recommendation	35

Remediation Plan	36
4.7 (HAL-07) ADMINISTRATOR ADDRESS CANNOT BE TRANSFERRED - INFORMATIONAL(0.5)	37
Description	37
Code Location	37
BVSS	38
Recommendation	38
Remediation Plan	38
4.8 (HAL-08) OVERCOLLATERAL RATIOS CHECK MISSING - INFORMATIONAL(0.5)	39
Description	39
Code Location	39
BVSS	41
Recommendation	41
Remediation Plan	41
4.9 (HAL-09) POTENTIAL DUPLICATION OF AUTHORITIES - INFORMATIONAL(0.0)	42
Description	42
Code Location	42
BVSS	43
Recommendation	43
Remediation Plan	43
4.10 (HAL-10) ZERO AMOUNT CHECK MISSING - INFORMATIONAL(0.0)	44
Description	44
Code Location	44
BVSS	44
Recommendation	44

Remediation Plan	45
4.11 (HAL-11) MISSING CARGO OVERFLOW CHECKS - INFORMATIONAL(0.0)	46
Description	46
Code Location	46
BVSS	46
Recommendation	46
Remediation Plan	46
4.12 (HAL-12) POSSIBLE RUST PANICS DUE TO UNSAFE UNWRAP USAGE - INFORMATIONAL(0.0)	47
Description	47
Code Location	47
BVSS	50
Recommendation	50
Remediation Plan	50
5 MANUAL TESTING	51
5.1 ORACLES	52
Description	52
Results	52
5.2 WITHDRAW COLLATERAL COMET WITH UNHEALTHY SCORE	54
Description	54
Results	54
5.3 BORROWING MORE WITH UNDERCOLLATERALIZED BORROW POSITION	55
Description	55
Results	55
5.4 PAY IMPERMANENT LOSS	56
Description	56

	Results	56
6	AUTOMATED TESTING	58
6.1	AUTOMATED ANALYSIS	59
	Description	59
	Results	59
6.2	UNSAFE RUST CODE DETECTION	60
	Description	60
	Results	60

## DOCUMENT REVISION HISTORY

VERSION	MODIFICATION	DATE
0.1	Document Creation	8/28/2023
0.2	Document Updates	10/02/2023
0.3	Final Draft	10/06/2023
0.4	Draft Review	10/09/2023
0.5	Draft Review	10/09/2023
1.0	Remediation Plan	10/17/2023
1.1	Remediation Plan Updates	10/23/2023
1.2	Remediation Plan Updates	10/26/2023
1.3	Remediation Plan Review	10/26/2023
1.4	Remediation Plan Review	10/27/2023
2.0	Retest Draft	12/22/2023
2.1	Draft Review	12/22/2023
2.2	Draft Review	12/22/2023
3.0	Remediation Plan	12/28/2023
3.1	Remediation Plan Review	12/28/2023

## CONTACTS

CONTACT	COMPANY	EMAIL
Rob Behnke	Halborn	<a href="mailto:Rob.Behnke@halborn.com">Rob.Behnke@halborn.com</a>
Steven Walbroehl	Halborn	<a href="mailto:Steven.Walbroehl@halborn.com">Steven.Walbroehl@halborn.com</a>
Gabi Urrutia	Halborn	<a href="mailto:Gabi.Urrutia@halborn.com">Gabi.Urrutia@halborn.com</a>
Piotr Cielas	Halborn	<a href="mailto:Piotr.Cielas@halborn.com">Piotr.Cielas@halborn.com</a>





# EXECUTIVE OVERVIEW



## 1.1 INTRODUCTION

The Comet Liquidity System by Clone simplifies markets liquidity provision by eliminating the requirement of owning the cloned asset, known as `clAssets`, (which are referred to as `onAsset` in the code on which the assessment was made). These `clAssets` faithfully replicate the price dynamics of real-world assets, offering exposure to diverse markets. The Clone Protocol extends accessibility by allowing users to participate in liquidity provision without the need to possess the underlying asset. Instead, users can deposit collateral and select their preferred commitment level for providing liquidity to specific trading pools.

The collateral supplied by liquidity providers serves to over-collateralize potential impermanent loss, ensuring the protocol's robustness. To maintain adequate collateralization, the protocol incorporates a liquidation system designed to mitigate and eliminate risky positions.

Halborn conducted a security assessment on their Solana program, beginning on August 28th, 2023 and ending on October 9th, 2023 . The security assessment was scoped to the updates to the develop branch of the `clone-protocol` GitHub repository. Commit hashes and further details can be found in the **Scope** section of this report.

In a follow-up engagement requested by Clone, Halborn reviewed the updates introduced to the protocol in commits `from bb7d35e to c9279e4d`.

## 1.2 ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

The team at Halborn was provided six weeks for the engagement and assigned a full-time security engineer to verify the security of the Solana program. 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 assessment is to:

- Ensure that Solana program functions operate as intended
- Identify potential security issues with the Solana program

In summary, Halborn identified some security risks that should be addressed by the Clone, team.

## 1.3 TEST APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

Halborn performed a combination of a manual review of the source code and automated security testing to balance efficiency, timeliness, practicality, and accuracy in regard to the scope of the program assessment. While manual testing is recommended to uncover flaws in business logic, processes, and implementation; automated testing techniques help enhance coverage of programs 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 assessment:

- Research into the architecture, purpose, and use of the platform.
- Manual program source code review to identify business logic issues.
- 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`)
- Scanning dependencies for known vulnerabilities (`cargo audit`).
- Local runtime testing (`solana-test-framework`)

## 2. RISK METHODOLOGY

Every vulnerability and issue observed by Halborn is ranked based on **two sets of Metrics** and a **Severity Coefficient**. This system is inspired by the industry standard Common Vulnerability Scoring System.

The two **Metric sets** are: **Exploitability** and **Impact**. **Exploitability** captures the ease and technical means by which vulnerabilities can be exploited and **Impact** describes the consequences of a successful exploit.

The **Severity Coefficients** is designed to further refine the accuracy of the ranking with two factors: **Reversibility** and **Scope**. These capture the impact of the vulnerability on the environment as well as the number of users and smart contracts affected.

The final score is a value between 0-10 rounded up to 1 decimal place and 10 corresponding to the highest security risk. This provides an objective and accurate rating of the severity of security vulnerabilities in smart contracts.

The system is designed to assist in identifying and prioritizing vulnerabilities based on their level of risk to address the most critical issues in a timely manner.

## 2.1 EXPLOITABILITY

### Attack Origin (AO):

Captures whether the attack requires compromising a specific account.

### Attack Cost (AC):

Captures the cost of exploiting the vulnerability incurred by the attacker relative to sending a single transaction on the relevant blockchain. Includes but is not limited to financial and computational cost.

### Attack Complexity (AX):

Describes the conditions beyond the attacker's control that must exist in order to exploit the vulnerability. Includes but is not limited to macro situation, available third-party liquidity and regulatory challenges.

### Metrics:

Exploitability Metric ( $m_E$ )	Metric Value	Numerical Value
Attack Origin (AO)	Arbitrary (AO:A)	1
	Specific (AO:S)	0.2
Attack Cost (AC)	Low (AC:L)	1
	Medium (AC:M)	0.67
	High (AC:H)	0.33
Attack Complexity (AX)	Low (AX:L)	1
	Medium (AX:M)	0.67
	High (AX:H)	0.33

Exploitability  $E$  is calculated using the following formula:

$$E = \prod m_e$$

## 2.2 IMPACT

### Confidentiality (C):

Measures the impact to the confidentiality of the information resources managed by the contract due to a successfully exploited vulnerability. Confidentiality refers to limiting access to authorized users only.

### Integrity (I):

Measures the impact to integrity of a successfully exploited vulnerability. Integrity refers to the trustworthiness and veracity of data stored and/or processed on-chain. Integrity impact directly affecting Deposit or Yield records is excluded.

### Availability (A):

Measures the impact to the availability of the impacted component resulting from a successfully exploited vulnerability. This metric refers to smart contract features and functionality, not state. Availability impact directly affecting Deposit or Yield is excluded.

### Deposit (D):

Measures the impact to the deposits made to the contract by either users or owners.

### Yield (Y):

Measures the impact to the yield generated by the contract for either users or owners.

## Metrics:

Impact Metric ( $m_I$ )	Metric Value	Numerical Value
Confidentiality (C)	None (I:N)	0
	Low (I:L)	0.25
	Medium (I:M)	0.5
	High (I:H)	0.75
	Critical (I:C)	1
Integrity (I)	None (I:N)	0
	Low (I:L)	0.25
	Medium (I:M)	0.5
	High (I:H)	0.75
	Critical (I:C)	1
Availability (A)	None (A:N)	0
	Low (A:L)	0.25
	Medium (A:M)	0.5
	High (A:H)	0.75
	Critical	1
Deposit (D)	None (D:N)	0
	Low (D:L)	0.25
	Medium (D:M)	0.5
	High (D:H)	0.75
	Critical (D:C)	1
Yield (Y)	None (Y:N)	0
	Low (Y:L)	0.25
	Medium: (Y:M)	0.5
	High: (Y:H)	0.75
	Critical (Y:H)	1

Impact  $I$  is calculated using the following formula:

$$I = \max(m_I) + \frac{\sum m_I - \max(m_I)}{4}$$

## 2.3 SEVERITY COEFFICIENT

### Reversibility (R):

Describes the share of the exploited vulnerability effects that can be reversed. For upgradeable contracts, assume the contract private key is available.

### Scope (S):

Captures whether a vulnerability in one vulnerable contract impacts resources in other contracts.

Coefficient ( $C$ )	Coefficient Value	Numerical Value
Reversibility ( $r$ )	None (R:N)	1
	Partial (R:P)	0.5
	Full (R:F)	0.25
Scope ( $s$ )	Changed (S:C)	1.25
	Unchanged (S:U)	1

Severity Coefficient  $C$  is obtained by the following product:

$$C = rs$$



The Vulnerability Severity Score  $S$  is obtained by:

$$S = \min(10, EIC * 10)$$

The score is rounded up to 1 decimal places.

Severity	Score Value Range
Critical	9 - 10
High	7 - 8.9
Medium	4.5 - 6.9
Low	2 - 4.4
Informational	0 - 1.9

## 2.4 SCOPE

### Code repositories:

#### 1. Clone

- Repository: `clone-protocol`
- Commit ID
  - Initial Review: `ba823ee`
  - Follow Up Review: `bb7d35e..c9279e4`
- Programs in scope:
  1. `clone (programs/clone/src)`
  2. `clone-staking (programs/clone-staking/src)`

### Out-of-scope:

- third-party libraries and dependencies
- financial-related attacks

### 3. ASSESSMENT SUMMARY & FINDINGS OVERVIEW

CRITICAL	HIGH	MEDIUM	LOW	INFORMATIONAL
0	0	0	4	8

SECURITY ANALYSIS	RISK LEVEL	REMEDIATION DATE
(HAL-01) MISCALCULATION DURING LIQUIDITY WITHDRAWAL OF THE COMET	Low (3.1)	SOLVED - 10/18/2023
(HAL-02) LIQUIDATING A BORROW POSITION WITH PARTIAL DEBT SETTLEMENT	Low (3.1)	RISK ACCEPTED
(HAL-03) LACK OF AUTHORITY CHECK IN INITIALIZE FUNCTION	Low (3.1)	RISK ACCEPTED
(HAL-04) MISSING SANITY CHECK TO ENSURE THE DEPOSITORY TOKEN MINT DOES NOT MATCH THE DEPOSITING TOKEN MINT	Low (2.5)	SOLVED - 12/26/2023
(HAL-05) CHECKED ARITHMETIC MISSING	Informational (1.9)	SOLVED - 09/13/2023
(HAL-06) ORACLE CHECKS MISSING	Informational (0.6)	ACKNOWLEDGED
(HAL-07) ADMINISTRATOR ADDRESS CANNOT BE TRANSFERRED	Informational (0.5)	ACKNOWLEDGED
(HAL-08) OVERCOLLATERAL RATIOS CHECK MISSING	Informational (0.5)	SOLVED - 10/16/2023
(HAL-09) POTENTIAL DUPLICATION OF AUTHORITIES	Informational (0.0)	SOLVED - 09/14/2023
(HAL-10) ZERO AMOUNT CHECK MISSING	Informational (0.0)	SOLVED - 09/14/2023
(HAL-11) MISSING CARGO OVERFLOW CHECKS	Informational (0.0)	SOLVED - 09/12/2023
(HAL-12) POSSIBLE RUST PANICS DUE TO UNSAFE UNWRAP USAGE	Informational (0.0)	SOLVED - 10/17/2023



# FINDINGS & TECH DETAILS



## 4.1 (HAL-01) MISCALCULATION DURING LIQUIDITY WITHDRAWAL OF THE COMET - LOW (3.1)

### Description:

The `WithdrawLiquidityFromComet` instruction allows the user to withdraw the corresponding liquidity from his position, in the instruction handler various calculations are performed to update both the pool and the user account values. However, during these calculations, the clone decimal is used to apply the value of the collateral to be withdrawn instead of the corresponding one. This results in updating the `collateral_ild` and `onasset_ild` pool fields with incorrect values, as well as the user's `collateral_ild_rebate` and `onasset_ild_rebate` fields. This leaves the pool with inconsistent values and also directly affects the execution of `CollectLpRewards` instructions, as well as liquidation instructions and even `PayImpermanentLoss` since they make use of these values.

### Code Location:

Listing 1: `programs/clone/src/withdraw_liquidity_from_comet.rs` (Line 72)

```
66 let collateral_value_to_withdraw =
67     collateral_amount.min(comet_position.
    ↳ committed_collateral_liquidity);
68
69 let proportional_value = to_clone_decimal!(
    ↳ collateral_value_to_withdraw)
70     / collateral.to_collateral_decimal(pool.
    ↳ committed_collateral_liquidity)?;
71
72 let proportional_value = collateral.to_collateral_decimal(
    ↳ collateral_value_to_withdraw)?
73 / collateral.to_collateral_decimal(pool.
    ↳ committed_collateral_liquidity)?;
74
```

BVSS:

A0:A/AC:L/AX:L/C:N/I:N/A:N/D:L/Y:L/R:N/S:U (3.1)

Recommendation:

To address the issue, it is essential to ensure that the correct decimal is used during the calculation, replacing the clone decimal with the collateral decimal in `withdraw_liquidity_from_comet` instruction handler. This adjustment will ensure that accurate values are obtained, preventing discrepancies in related parameters within the pool and user accounts.

Remediation Plan:

**SOLVED:** The Clone team solved this finding in commit [c97115f](#): the proper modification was applied within the instruction handler replacing the use of the clone decimal with the collateral decimal in the calculation process. By doing so, they ensured that the calculation mechanism now operates seamlessly, yielding the precise and expected results. This refined calculation process has far-reaching implications as it rectifies discrepancies not only for the immediate concern but across various instructions impacted by the original issue.

## 4.2 (HAL-02) LIQUIDATING A BORROW POSITION WITH PARTIAL DEBT SETTLEMENT - LOW (3.1)

### Description:

It was observed that if, following the initialization of a user's loan position, the price of the `clAsset` (`onAsset` in the code) undergoes a significant fluctuation, and the position becomes undercollateralized, a liquidator could trigger the position's liquidation through `LiquidateBorrowPosition`. However, in scenarios where `min_collateral_ratio` value is not checked to ensure enough high and the price divergence is exceptionally wide, the liquidation could proceed with a notably low value.

### Listing 2

```
1 collateral_value < (1 + reward_pct) * onAsset_value
```

This situation allows the liquidator to potentially realize a profit from the entire collateral of the position, even without fully liquidating the outstanding debt. Consequently, there may be limited incentive for a liquidator to complete the liquidation, as doing so could result in an unprofitable outcome, essentially incurring a loss. In such cases, if the user does not take this action calling `PayBorrowDebt`, it falls upon the Insurance Fund to intervene.

### Code Location:

### Listing 3: programs/clone/src/liquidate\_borrow\_position.rs

```
69 pub fn execute(  
70     ctx: Context<LiquidateBorrowPosition>,  
71     user: Pubkey,  
72     borrow_index: u8,  
73     amount: u64,
```



```

74 ) -> Result<()> {
75     return_error_if_false!(amount > 0, CloneError::
↳ InvalidTokenAmount);
76     let seeds = &[&[
77         CLONE_PROGRAM_SEED.as_ref(),
78         bytemuck::bytes_of(&ctx.accounts.clone.bump),
79     ][..]];
80
81     let collateral = &ctx.accounts.clone.collateral;
82     let pools = &mut ctx.accounts.pools;
83     let oracles = &ctx.accounts.oracles;
84
85     let borrows = &mut ctx.accounts.user_account.borrows;
86     let borrow_position = borrows[borrow_index as usize];
87     let pool_index = borrow_position.pool_index as usize;
88     let pool = &pools.pools[pool_index];
89     return_error_if_false!(
90         pool.status != Status::Frozen,
91         CloneError::StatusPreventsAction
92     );
93
94     let pool_oracle = &oracles.oracles[pool.asset_info.
↳ oracle_info_index as usize];
95     let collateral_oracle = &oracles.oracles[collateral.
↳ oracle_info_index as usize];
96
97     let min_overcollateral_ratio = to_ratio_decimal!(pool.
↳ asset_info.min_overcollateral_ratio);
98     let collateralization_ratio = to_ratio_decimal!(collateral.
↳ collateralization_ratio);
99
100    let burn_amount = amount.min(borrow_position.borrowed_onasset)
↳ ;
101    let collateral_position_amount =
102        collateral.to_collateral_decimal(borrow_position.
↳ collateral_amount)?;
103
104    // This call checks that the oracles are updated
105    let is_undercollateralized = check_mint_collateral_sufficient(
106        pool_oracle,
107        collateral_oracle,
108        to_clone_decimal!(borrow_position.borrowed_onasset),
109        min_overcollateral_ratio,
110        collateralization_ratio,

```

```

111         collateral_position_amount,
112     )
113     .is_err();
114     let is_in_liquidation_mode = pool.status == Status::
115         ↳ Liquidation;
116     return_error_if_false!(
117         is_undercollateralized || is_in_liquidation_mode,
118         CloneError::BorrowPositionUnableToLiquidate
119     );
120
121     let borrow_liquidation_fee_rate = to_bps_decimal!(ctx.accounts
122         ↳ .clone.borrow_liquidator_fee_bps);
123     let pool_price = pool_oracle.get_price() / collateral_oracle.
124         ↳ get_price();
125
126     let collateral_reward = rescale_toward_zero(
127         (Decimal::one() + borrow_liquidation_fee_rate)
128         * to_clone_decimal!(burn_amount)
129         * pool_price,
130         collateral.scale.try_into().unwrap(),
131     )
132     .min(collateral_position_amount);
133
134     // Burn the onAsset from the liquidator
135     let cpi_accounts = Burn {
136         mint: ctx.accounts.onasset_mint.to_account_info().clone(),
137         from: ctx
138             .accounts
139             .liquidator_onasset_token_account
140             .to_account_info()
141             .clone(),
142         authority: ctx.accounts.liquidator.to_account_info().clone
143         ↳ (),
144     };
145     let burn_liquidator_onasset_context = CpiContext::new(
146         ctx.accounts.token_program.to_account_info().clone(),
147         cpi_accounts,
148     );
149     token::burn(burn_liquidator_onasset_context, burn_amount)?;
150
151     // Send the user the collateral reward
152     let cpi_accounts = Transfer {

```

```

151         from: ctx.accounts.vault.to_account_info().clone(),
152         to: ctx
153             .accounts
154             .liquidator_collateral_token_account
155             .to_account_info()
156             .clone(),
157         authority: ctx.accounts.clone.to_account_info().clone(),
158     };
159     let send_collateral_context = CpiContext::new_with_signer(
160         ctx.accounts.token_program.to_account_info().clone(),
161         cpi_accounts,
162         seeds,
163     );
164     token::transfer(
165         send_collateral_context,
166         collateral_reward.mantissa().try_into().unwrap(),
167     )?;
168
169     // Update data
170     borrows[borrow_index as usize].borrowed_onasset -= burn_amount
171     ↪ ;
172     //TODO:en que momento se añaden los collateral rewards al
173     ↪ collateral amount?
174     borrows[borrow_index as usize].collateral_amount -=
175     ↪ collateral_reward.mantissa() as u64;
176
177     // Remove position if empty
178     if borrows[borrow_index as usize].is_empty() {
179         borrows.remove(borrow_index as usize);
180     } else {
181         let borrowed_onasset = to_clone_decimal!(borrows[
182         ↪ borrow_index as usize].borrowed_onasset);
183         let collateral_amount = Decimal::new(
184             borrows[borrow_index as usize]
185             .collateral_amount
186             .try_into()
187             .unwrap(),
188             collateral.scale.try_into().unwrap(),
189         );
190         let max_liquidation_overcollateral_ratio =
191             to_ratio_decimal!(pool.asset_info.
192             ↪ max_liquidation_overcollateral_ratio);
193         let c_ratio = collateral_amount * collateralization_ratio
194         ↪ / (pool_price * borrowed_onasset);

```

```

189         return_error_if_false!(
190             c_ratio <= max_liquidation_overcollateral_ratio,
191             CloneError::InvalidMintCollateralRatio
192         );
193     }

```

#### BVSS:

A0:A/AC:L/AX:L/C:N/I:N/A:N/D:M/Y:M/R:P/S:U (3.1)

#### Recommendation:

To address this observed issue, it is recommended to establish a sufficiently high `min_collateral_ratio` value that ensures the collateral's worth remains significantly above the total outstanding debt, even in scenarios of considerable price divergence.

#### Remediation Plan:

**RISK ACCEPTED:** The Clone team accepted this risk, since in cases where a borrow position or a comet fails to undergo liquidation before reaching an undercollateralized state, or if the remaining liquidation reward proves insufficient to incentivize a potential liquidator, Clone DAO remains committed to executing the liquidation, even at a financial loss to our treasury. This commitment is made to guarantee that even undercollateralized positions are resolved without posing any risk to the protocol.

## 4.3 (HAL-03) LACK OF AUTHORITY CHECK IN INITIALIZE FUNCTION – LOW (3.1)

### Description:

The `initialize` function of the `depository-token` program does not contain any authority checks to ensure the caller is an expected authority. This introduces a front-running opportunity, where a malicious actor could initialize the settings account themselves with token accounts and mints of their choosing.

### Code Location:

Listing 4: `depository_token/src/lib.rs`

```

133 #[derive(Accounts)]
134 #[instruction(ratio: u64, depositing_token_mint: Pubkey)]
135 pub struct Initialize<'info> {
136     #[account(mut)]
137     pub payer: Signer<'info>,
138     #[account(
139         init,
140         space = 32 * 3 + 8 + 8,
141         seeds = [SETTINGS_SEED.as_ref()],
142         bump,
143         payer = payer
144     )]
145     pub settings: Account<'info, Settings>,
146     #[account(
147         mint::authority = settings,
148     )]
149     pub depository_token_mint: Account<'info, Mint>,
150     #[account(
151         associated_token::mint = depositing_token_mint,
152         associated_token::authority = settings,
153     )]
154     pub depositing_token_account: Account<'info, TokenAccount>,
155     pub system_program: Program<'info, System>,
156 }
```

**BVSS:**

A0:A/AC:L/AX:L/C:N/I:L/A:L/D:N/Y:N/R:N/S:U (3.1)

**Recommendation:**

Include constraint which ensures the caller of a function must be a predetermined address, such as the program's upgrade authority.

**Remediation Plan:**

**RISK ACCEPTED:** The Clone team accepted the risk of this finding.

## 4.4 (HAL-04) MISSING SANITY CHECK TO ENSURE THE DEPOSITORY TOKEN MINT DOES NOT MATCH THE DEPOSITING TOKEN MINT – LOW (2.5)

### Description:

In the `initialize` function of the `depository-token` program, the `depositing_token_mint` is set, which is used to swap against the `depository_token_mint`. However, there are no checks to ensure these two tokens are different.

### Code Location:

Listing 5: `depository_token/src/lib.rs` (Lines 16,20)

```

13     pub fn initialize(
14         ctx: Context<Initialize>,
15         ratio: u64,
16         depositing_token_mint: Pubkey,
17     ) -> Result<()> {
18         *ctx.accounts.settings = Settings {
19             ratio,
20             depositing_token_mint,
21             depositing_token_account: ctx.accounts.
↳ depositing_token_account.key(),
22             depository_token_mint: ctx.accounts.
↳ depository_token_mint.key(),
23         };
24
25         Ok(())
26     }

```

### BVSS:

A0:A/AC:L/AX:L/C:N/I:L/A:N/D:N/Y:N/R:N/S:U (2.5)

#### Recommendation:

Include check to ensure `depository_token_mint != depositing_token_mint`

#### Remediation Plan:

**SOLVED:** The Clone team solved this issue in commit [05bcbe3](#).



## 4.5 (HAL-05) CHECKED ARITHMETIC MISSING - INFORMATIONAL (1.9)

### Description:

Multiple instances of unsafe arithmetic operations, including multiplication, division, and addition, were detected in various files and functions.

Checked arithmetic operations provide error-checking mechanisms to detect and handle arithmetic overflow or underflow conditions. By using checked arithmetic operations, you can ensure that mathematical calculations do not result in unexpected values or errors due to overflow or underflow, which is crucial for maintaining the correctness and reliability of the program.

### Code Location:

- `maths.rs`
- `states.rs`
- `instructions/swap.rs`
- `instructions/liquidate_comet_collateral_ild.rs`
- `instructions/liquidate_comet_onasset_ild.rs`
- `instructions/liquidate_borrow_position.rs:125`
- `instructions/withdraw_liquidity_from_comet.rs`
- `instructions/withdraw_collateral_from_comet.rs`
- `instructions/pay_impermanent_loss_debt.rs`
- `instructions/liquidate_borrow_position.rs`
- `instructions/collect_lp_rewards.rs`
- `instructions/pay_borrow_debt.rs`
- `instructions/add_collateral_to_borrow.rs`
- `instructions/add_collateral_to_comet.rs`
- `instructions/add_liquidity_to_comet.rs`

BVSS:

A0:A/AC:L/AX:L/C:N/I:N/A:L/D:L/Y:L/R:P/S:U (1.9)

Recommendation:

To enhance the code's robustness and safety, it is advisable to replace standard arithmetic operators with checked arithmetic operations. This substitution allows for the proactive detection and management of exceptional cases that may emerge during mathematical computations.

Remediation Plan:

**SOLVED:** The Clone team solved this finding in commit [9ba9c47](#): all standard arithmetic operators have been replaced with checked arithmetic operations, following recommended best practices.

## 4.6 (HAL-06) ORACLE CHECKS MISSING – INFORMATIONAL (0.6)

### Description:

The `update_oracles` instruction handler relies on Oracle accounts, but it lacks a validation mechanism. While the administrators are responsible for providing these accounts, there is a possibility of inadvertently using incorrect oracle accounts, potentially exposing the `Clone` program to malicious price feeders.

Furthermore, it is worth emphasizing that the ownership of the account is not verified. Therefore, when the source value of the oracle is provided, there is a lack of validation to guarantee its correspondence with the specified account. This oversight could potentially result in issues during subsequent price updates.

### Code Location:

Listing 6: `programs/clone/src/update_oracles.rs` (Lines 52,54,55,56)

```

42 pub fn execute(ctx: Context<UpdateOracles>, params:
   ↳ UpdateOracleParameters) -> Result<()> {
43     let clone = &ctx.accounts.clone;
44     let clone_auth = clone.auth;
45     let auth_key = ctx.accounts.auth.key();
46     let is_admin = auth_key.eq(&clone.admin);
47     let is_auth = clone_auth.iter().any(|auth| auth_key.eq(auth));
48
49     let oracles = &mut ctx.accounts.oracles.oracles;
50
51     match params {
52         UpdateOracleParameters::Add { address, source } => {
53             return_error_if_false!(is_admin, CloneError::
   ↳ Unauthorized);
54             oracles.push(OracleInfo {
55                 source,
56                 address,
57                 status: Status::Active,

```

```

58         ..OracleInfo::default()
59     })
60 }
61 UpdateOracleParameters::Remove { index } => {
62     return_error_if_false!(is_admin, CloneError::
↳ Unauthorized);
63     oracles.remove(index.into());
64 }
65 UpdateOracleParameters::Modify {
66     index,
67     address,
68     source,
69     status,
70 } => {
71     let oracle = &mut oracles[index as usize];
72     if let Some(addr) = address {
73         return_error_if_false!(is_admin, CloneError::
↳ Unauthorized);
74         oracle.address = addr;
75     }
76     if let Some(src) = source {
77         return_error_if_false!(is_admin, CloneError::
↳ Unauthorized);
78         oracle.source = src;
79     }
80     if let Some(sts) = status {
81         return_error_if_false!(
82             is_admin || (is_auth && sts == Status::Frozen)
↳ ,
83             CloneError::Unauthorized
84         );
85         oracle.status = sts;

```

BVSS:

A0:S/AC:L/AX:L/C:N/I:N/A:H/D:H/Y:H/R:F/S:U (0.6)

Recommendation:

To address this security finding and enhance the robustness of the program, it is recommended to implement a validation mechanism for the Oracle

accounts used in the `update_oracles` instruction handler. This validation process can help prevent the inadvertent use of incorrect or unauthorized oracle accounts, which could otherwise expose the clone program to potential vulnerabilities arising from malicious price feeders.

#### Remediation Plan:

**ACKNOWLEDGED:** The Clone team acknowledged this issue since the oracle update functionality is restricted to the administrator's exclusive access, wherein only the administrator is endowed with the privilege to call the instruction for updating the oracles.

## 4.7 (HAL-07) ADMINISTRATOR ADDRESS CANNOT BE TRANSFERRED – INFORMATIONAL (0.5)

### Description:

The program currently lacks the capability to designate a new **admin** as a privileged address. In the event that the development team needs to change the administrator address for operational reasons or suspects a security breach, the program could face a substantial loss of functionality and would be necessary to redeploy.

### Code Location:

Listing 7: programs/clone/src/pay\_impermanent\_loss.rs

```

83 pub struct InitializeClone<'info> {
84     #[account(mut)]
85     pub admin: Signer<'info>,
86     #[account(
87         init,
88         seeds = [CLONE_PROGRAM_SEED.as_ref()],
89         space = 8 + 472,
90         bump,
91         payer = admin
92     )]
93     pub clone: Box<Account<'info, Clone>>,
94     pub collateral_mint: Account<'info, Mint>,
95     #[account(
96         token::mint = collateral_mint,
97         token::authority = clone,
98     )]
99     pub collateral_vault: Account<'info, TokenAccount>,
100     pub rent: Sysvar<'info, Rent>,
101     pub token_program: Program<'info, Token>,
102     pub system_program: Program<'info, System>,
103 }
104
105 pub fn execute(

```

```

106     ctx: Context<InitializeClone>,
107     comet_collateral_ild_liquidator_fee_bps: u16,
108     comet_onasset_ild_liquidator_fee_bps: u16,
109     borrow_liquidator_fee_bps: u16,
110     treasury_address: Pubkey,
111     collateral_oracle_index: u8,
112     collateralization_ratio: u8,
113 ) -> Result<()> {
114     return_error_if_false!(
115         comet_onasset_ild_liquidator_fee_bps < 10000 &&
116         ↪ borrow_liquidator_fee_bps < 10000,
117         CloneError::InvalidValueRange
118     );
119     // set manager data
120     ctx.accounts.clone.admin = *ctx.accounts.admin.to_account_info
121     ↪ ().key;
122     ctx.accounts.clone.bump = *ctx.bumps.get("clone").unwrap();
123     ctx.accounts.clone.treasury_address = treasury_address;

```

**BVSS:**

**A0:S/AC:L/AX:L/C:N/I:M/A:N/D:N/Y:N/R:P/S:U (0.5)**

**Recommendation:**

It is advisable to implement a two-step ownership transfer process. In the first step, the current owner nominates an account, and in the second step, the nominated account must confirm and accept the ownership transfer for it to be completed successfully.

**Remediation Plan:**

**ACKNOWLEDGED:** The Clone team acknowledged this issue since the Squads' functionality empowers them with the ability to efficiently modify cryptographic keys, adjust signer permissions, introduce new signers, and enact other related operational changes.

## 4.8 (HAL-08) OVERCOLLATERAL RATIOS CHECK MISSING – INFORMATIONAL (0.5)

### Description:

The `AddPool` and `UpdatePoolParameters` instructions are accessible to the administrator, who is required to furnish a set of parameters, including `max_liquidation_overcollateral_ratio` and `min_overcollateral_ratio`. These parameters dictate the maximum collateral liquidation rate and the minimum collateral rate necessary for borrowing any asset within the system.

However, it is noteworthy that the instruction handler currently lacks a validation mechanism to ensure the integrity of these values. Consequently, there is a possibility that both parameters could be set to 0, or that the `max_liquidation_overcollateral_ratio` may inadvertently possess a lower value than the `min_overcollateral_ratio`. Such scenarios could potentially give rise to liquidity inconsistencies and borrowing position settlement issues within the system.

### Code Location:

Listing 8: `programs/clone/src/add_pool.rs` (Lines 9,10)

```
7 #[instruction(  
8     min_overcollateral_ratio: u16,  
9     max_liquidation_overcollateral_ratio: u16,  
10    liquidity_trading_fee_bps: u16,  
11    treasury_trading_fee_bps: u16,  
12    il_health_score_coefficient: u16,  
13    position_health_score_coefficient: u16,  
14    oracle_info_index: u8,  
15 )]
```



Listing 9: programs/clone/src/add\_pool.rs (Lines 67,68)

```

52 pub fn execute(
53     ctx: Context<AddPool>,
54     min_overcollateral_ratio: u16,
55     max_liquidation_overcollateral_ratio: u16,
56     liquidity_trading_fee_bps: u16,
57     treasury_trading_fee_bps: u16,
58     il_health_score_coefficient: u16,
59     position_health_score_coefficient: u16,
60     oracle_info_index: u8,
61 ) -> Result<()> {
62     let asset_info = AssetInfo {
63         onasset_mint: ctx.accounts.onasset_mint.to_account_info().
        ↳ key(),
64         oracle_info_index,
65         il_health_score_coefficient,
66         position_health_score_coefficient,
67         min_overcollateral_ratio,
68         max_liquidation_overcollateral_ratio,
69         ..AssetInfo::default()
70     };

```

Listing 10: programs/clone/src/update\_pool\_parameters.rs (Lines 11,12)

```

6 pub enum PoolParameters {
7     Status { value: Status },
8     TreasuryTradingFee { value: u16 },
9     LiquidityTradingFee { value: u16 },
10    OracleInfoIndex { value: u8 },
11    MinOvercollateralRatio { value: u16 },
12    MaxLiquidationOvercollateralRatio { value: u16 },
13    IlHealthScoreCoefficient { value: u16 },
14    PositionHealthScoreCoefficient { value: u16 },
15 }

```

Listing 11: programs/clone/src/update\_pool\_parameters.rs (Lines 84,87)

```

6 PoolParameters::MinOvercollateralRatio { value } => {
7     pool.asset_info.min_overcollateral_ratio = value;
8 }
9 PoolParameters::MaxLiquidationOvercollateralRatio { value } => {
10    pool.asset_info.max_liquidation_overcollateral_ratio = value;

```

```
11 }
```

#### BVSS:

A0:S/AC:L/AX:L/C:N/I:N/A:M/D:H/Y:H/R:F/S:U (0.5)

#### Recommendation:

To enhance the security and reliability of the these instructions within the system, it is advised to implement robust input validation checks for the parameters `max_liquidation_overcollateral_ratio` and `min_overcollateral_ratio`. These validation checks should ensure that the provided values adhere to predefined constraints and do not fall into potentially problematic ranges.

#### Remediation Plan:

**SOLVED:** The Clone team solved this finding in commit [ca63cd1](#): The `is_valid_overcollateral_ratios` function has been introduced which serves the crucial role of validating the `min_overcollateral_ratio` and `max_liquidation_overcollateral_ratio` values. Specifically, it verifies that `min_overcollateral_ratio` is greater than 100 and that `max_liquidation_overcollateral_ratio` exceeds the former. This function is invoked in both the `AddPool` and `UpdatePoolParameters` instructions to ensure that the specified parameter values align with the expected criteria.

## 4.9 (HAL-09) POTENTIAL DUPLICATION OF AUTHORITIES - INFORMATIONAL (0.0)

### Description:

The Clone account allows administrators to append authorities using the `UpdateCloneParameters` call. However, it lacks a check for duplicate addresses in this array, enabling the addition of the same address multiple times. If a duplicate authority is accidentally added, it requires multiple calls to the instruction to remove each occurrence. Only the first matching address provided is removed during the elimination process.

### Code Location:

Listing 12: `programs/clone/src/update_clone_parameter.rs`

```
33 pub fn execute(ctx: Context<UpdateCloneParameters>, params:
  ↳ CloneParameters) -> Result<()> {
34     let clone = &mut ctx.accounts.clone;
35     match params {
36         CloneParameters::AddAuth { address } => {
37             let auth_array = clone.auth;
38             let empty_slot = auth_array
39                 .iter()
40                 .enumerate()
41                 .find(|(_, slot)| (**slot).eq(&Pubkey::default()))
  ↳ ;
42             return_error_if_false!(empty_slot.is_some(),
  ↳ CloneError::AuthArrayFull);
43             clone.auth[empty_slot.unwrap().0] = address;
44         }
```

Listing 13: `programs/clone/src/update_clone_parameter.rs`

```
54 CloneParameters::RemoveAuth { address } => {
55     let auth_array = clone.auth;
56     let auth_slot = auth_array
57         .iter()
58         .enumerate()
```

```

59         .find(|(_, slot)| (**slot).eq(&address));
60
61         return_error_if_false!(auth_slot.is_some(), CloneError
↳ ::AuthNotFound);
62         clone.auth[auth_slot.unwrap().0] = Pubkey::default();
63     }

```

#### BVSS:

A0:S/AC:L/AX:L/C:N/I:N/A:N/D:N/Y:N/R:F/S:U (0.0)

#### Recommendation:

To enhance the security and usability of the Clone account, it is recommended to implement a check for duplicate addresses before appending authorities. This check should ensure that the same address cannot be added multiple times. This modification will not only prevent the accidental addition of duplicate authorities but also simplify the process of removing them if necessary.

#### Remediation Plan:

**SOLVED:** The Clone team solved this finding in commit [ebd6c6c](#): a validation check has been implemented to ensure that the address intended for addition as an authority is not already present in the authority vector, thus preventing duplication.

## 4.10 (HAL-10) ZERO AMOUNT CHECK MISSING – INFORMATIONAL (0.0)

### Description:

While certain instructions like `AddCollateralToBorrow`, `AddCollateralToComet`, `BorrowMore` and `WithdrawCollateralFromComet` enable users to add collateral to reinforce their positions, borrow additional `clAssets` and withdraw collateral from comet position, they lack validation checks on the provided amount. Consequently, users can execute these actions with a zero amount.

Additionally, if these transactions trigger unnecessary computation or storage operations, it could degrade the overall performance of the program.

### Code Location:

- `add_collateral_to_borrow.rs`
- `borrow_more.rs`
- `add_collateral_to_comet.rs`
- `withdraw_collateral_from_comet.rs`

### BVSS:

A0:S/AC:L/AX:L/C:N/I:N/A:N/D:N/Y:N/R:F/S:U (0.0)

### Recommendation:

It is advisable to implement proper validation checks to ensure that provided amounts are valid and non-zero before allowing users to execute these instructions. This will enhance both the security and efficiency of the program.

#### Remediation Plan:

**SOLVED:** The Clone team solved this finding in commit [a09d8b3](#): checks have been integrated into all outstanding instructions to ensure that quantities greater than zero are verified, preventing any execution without proper action.

## 4.11 (HAL-11) MISSING CARGO OVERFLOW CHECKS - INFORMATIONAL (0.0)

### Description:

It has been observed that the changes applied to the assessment's scope do not include the implementation of the `overflow-checks=true` flag in the `Cargo.toml` files.

By default, overflow checks are disabled in optimized release builds. Consequently, any overflows occurring in release builds will remain silent, potentially causing unexpected application behavior. To ensure proper overflow handling, it is advisable to include the `overflow-checks=true` setting in the `Cargo.toml` file, even when using checked arithmetic through functions like `checked_*` or `saturating_*`.

### Code Location:

- `programs/clone/Cargo.toml`
- `programs/clone-staking/Cargo.toml`

### BVSS:

A0:S/AC:L/AX:L/C:N/I:N/A:N/D:N/Y:N/R:F/S:U (0.0)

### Recommendation:

Add `overflow-checks=true` under the release profile in the `Cargo.toml` files specified for recommended behavior.

### Remediation Plan:

**SOLVED:** The Clone team solved this finding in commit [c7c2767](#): The `Cargo.toml` file has been updated to include the implementation of the `overflow-checks=true` flag, following the recommended best practices.

## 4.12 (HAL-12) POSSIBLE RUST PANICS DUE TO UNSAFE UNWRAP USAGE – INFORMATIONAL (0.0)

### Description:

In Rust, helper methods like `unwrap` are commonly used during development and testing phases. They're designed to trigger an error (a `panic!`) when applied to `Option::None` or an unsuccessful `Result`. However, using `unwrap` in a production environment is discouraged. It can potentially cause program crashes with inadequate or misleading error messages, making it a less reliable practice for production code.

### Code Location:

#### Listing 14

```

1 ./instructions/update_clone_parameters.rs:43:           clone.
↳ auth[empty_slot.unwrap().0] = address;
2 ./instructions/update_clone_parameters.rs:62:           clone.
↳ auth[auth_slot.unwrap().0] = Pubkey::default();
3 ./instructions/update_prices.rs:44:                   (info.
↳ price, (-info.expo).try_into().unwrap())
4 ./instructions/update_prices.rs:46:                   (info.
↳ price * 10_i64.pow(info.expo.try_into().unwrap()), 0)
5 ./instructions/update_prices.rs:57:                   result.
↳ mantissa.try_into().unwrap(),
6 ./instructions/update_prices.rs:58:                   result.
↳ scale.try_into().unwrap(),
7 ./instructions/initialize_clone.rs:54:   ctx.accounts.clone.bump
↳ = *ctx.bumps.get("clone").unwrap();
8 ./instructions/withdraw_collateral_from_borrow.rs:115:
↳ pool_index: pool_index.try_into().unwrap(),
9 ./instructions/swap.rs:93:           seeds::program =
↳ clone_staking_program.clone().unwrap().key(),
10 ./instructions/swap.rs:99:           seeds::program =
↳ clone_staking_program.clone().unwrap().key(),
11 ./instructions/swap.rs:131:           let user_staking_account = ctx.
↳ accounts.user_staking_account.as_ref().unwrap();

```



```

12 ./instructions/swap.rs:132:         let clone_staking = ctx.
    ↳ accounts.clone_staking.as_ref().unwrap();
13 ./instructions/swap.rs:177:         .unwrap();
14 ./instructions/swap.rs:178:         let result_amount: u64 =
    ↳ swap_summary.result.mantissa().try_into().unwrap();
15 ./instructions/swap.rs:240:         (mint_amount +
    ↳ treasury_fees).try_into().unwrap(),
16 ./instructions/swap.rs:241:         -(TryInto::<i64>::try_into(
    ↳ transfer_amount).unwrap()),
17 ./instructions/swap.rs:298:         -(TryInto::<i64>::try_into(
    ↳ burn_amount).unwrap()),
18 ./instructions/swap.rs:299:         (transfer_amount +
    ↳ treasury_fees).try_into().unwrap(),
19 ./instructions/swap.rs:331:         .unwrap(),
20 ./instructions/swap.rs:347:         pool_price: pool_price.mantissa
    ↳ ().try_into().unwrap(),
21 ./instructions/collect_lp_rewards.rs:91:
    ↳ collateral_reward.try_into().unwrap(),
22 ./instructions/collect_lp_rewards.rs:117:
    ↳ onasset_reward.try_into().unwrap(),
23 ./instructions/withdraw_liquidity_from_comet.rs:74:
    ↳ collateral.scale.try_into().unwrap(),
24 ./instructions/withdraw_liquidity_from_comet.rs:96:
    ↳ pool_index: pool_index.try_into().unwrap(),
25 ./instructions/withdraw_liquidity_from_comet.rs:112:
    ↳ pool_index: pool_index.try_into().unwrap(),
26 ./instructions/withdraw_liquidity_from_comet.rs:116:
    ↳ pool_price: pool_price.mantissa().try_into().unwrap(),
27 ./instructions/add_liquidity_to_comet.rs:68:         collateral.
    ↳ scale.try_into().unwrap(),
28 ./instructions/add_liquidity_to_comet.rs:70:         let
    ↳ collateral_ild_delta: i64 = collateral_ild.mantissa().try_into().
    ↳ unwrap();
29 ./instructions/add_liquidity_to_comet.rs:75:         let
    ↳ onasset_ild_delta: i64 = onasset_ild.mantissa().try_into().unwrap
    ↳ ();
30 ./instructions/add_liquidity_to_comet.rs:109:
    ↳ committed_collateral_delta: collateral_amount.try_into().unwrap(),
31 ./instructions/add_liquidity_to_comet.rs:128:         pool_price:
    ↳ pool_price.mantissa().try_into().unwrap(),
32 ./instructions/initialize_borrow_position.rs:140:
    ↳ pool_index: pool_index.try_into().unwrap(),
33 ./instructions/initialize_borrow_position.rs:150:
    ↳ collateral_delta: collateral_amount.try_into().unwrap(),

```

```

34 ./instructions/initialize_borrow_position.rs:152:
   ↳ borrowed_delta: onasset_amount.try_into().unwrap()
35 ./instructions/add_collateral_to_borrow.rs:63:                                     .unwrap
   ↳ (),
36 ./instructions/add_collateral_to_borrow.rs:66:
   ↳ collateral_delta: amount.try_into().unwrap(),
37 ./instructions/pay_borrow_debt.rs:80:                                     .unwrap(),
38 ./instructions/wrap_asset.rs:59:         Decimal::new(amount.
   ↳ try_into().unwrap(), underlying_mint_scale),
39 ./instructions/liquidate_comet_collateral_ild.rs:100:         .
   ↳ unwrap();
40 ./instructions/liquidate_comet_collateral_ild.rs:106:         .
   ↳ unwrap();
41 ./instructions/borrow_more.rs:108:         pool_index: pool_index.
   ↳ try_into().unwrap(),
42 ./instructions/borrow_more.rs:113:         borrowed_delta: amount.
   ↳ try_into().unwrap()
43 ./instructions/liquidate_comet_onasset_ild.rs:118:         let
   ↳ ild_rebate_increase: i64 = burn_amount.mantissa().try_into().
   ↳ unwrap();
44 ./instructions/liquidate_comet_onasset_ild.rs:132:
   ↳ ild_rebate_increase.try_into().unwrap(),
45 ./instructions/liquidate_comet_onasset_ild.rs:148:
   ↳ collateral_reward.mantissa().try_into().unwrap(),
46 ./instructions/liquidate_borrow_position.rs:128:         collateral
   ↳ .scale.try_into().unwrap(),
47 ./instructions/liquidate_borrow_position.rs:166:
   ↳ collateral_reward.mantissa().try_into().unwrap(),
48 ./instructions/liquidate_borrow_position.rs:182:         .
   ↳ unwrap(),
49 ./instructions/liquidate_borrow_position.rs:183:
   ↳ collateral.scale.try_into().unwrap(),
50 ./instructions/liquidate_borrow_position.rs:197:         pool_index
   ↳ : pool_index.try_into().unwrap(),
51 ./instructions/pay_impermanent_loss_debt.rs:90:         let
   ↳ ild_share: u64 = ild_share.onasset_ild_share.mantissa().try_into()
   ↳ .unwrap();
52 ./instructions/pay_impermanent_loss_debt.rs:119:         .
   ↳ unwrap();
53 ./instructions/pay_impermanent_loss_debt.rs:149:         .
   ↳ unwrap();
54 ./math.rs:97:         collateral.scale.try_into().unwrap(),
55 ./math.rs:178:         .unwrap();
56 ./math.rs:181:         .unwrap();

```

```

57 ./math.rs:192:         .unwrap()
58 ./math.rs:194:         collateral.scale.try_into().unwrap(),
59 ./math.rs:205:         .unwrap(),
60 ./math.rs:206:         collateral.scale.try_into().unwrap(),
61 ./states.rs:121:        .unwrap();
62 ./states.rs:126:        .unwrap();
63 ./states.rs:231:        Ok(Decimal::new(num, self.scale.
↳ try_into().unwrap()))

```

#### BVSS:

A0:S/AC:L/AX:L/C:N/I:N/A:N/D:N/Y:N/R:F/S:U (0.0)

#### Recommendation:

In a production environment, it is best to avoid using the `unwrap` function. This function can potentially trigger a `panic!`, which may crash not only the affected module or program but also the entire runtime. Unfortunately, such crashes often lack detailed error messages, making debugging challenging. System crashes can lead to both availability loss and, in some cases, compromise private information within the system. To mitigate these risks, consider alternative approaches. You can propagate errors using the `?` operator instead of unwrapping, or use the `error-chain` crate for effective error management.

#### Remediation Plan:

**SOLVED:** The Clone team solved this finding in commit [ec94adf](#): The `unwrap` function has been entirely removed from all files in compliance with the recommended guidelines, aimed at enhancing robustness and security.



# MANUAL TESTING



In the manual testing phase, the following scenarios were simulated. The scenarios listed below were selected based on the severity of the vulnerabilities Halborn was testing the program for.

## 5.1 ORACLES

### Description:

The `UpdatePrice` instruction is accessible to any user, serving the purpose of fetching updated prices from the oracles utilized within the program. To execute this instruction successfully, it is imperative to provide the accounts of the oracles intended for updating. These oracle accounts must already exist and correspond to those previously added via the `UpdateOracles` instruction by the administrator.

It is crucial to highlight that many aspects of the program's functionality rely on updating oracle data. Therefore, keeping the oracles updated is essential for seamless program operation.

Testing has been conducted to validate the correctness of this functionality and to ensure that it poses no security risks. These tests encompass a wide range of scenarios and conditions to mitigate potential vulnerabilities and guarantee the reliability of the price update process.

### Results:

**No vulnerabilities were identified.**



# MANUAL TESTING

## 54



# MANUAL TESTING

# MANUAL TESTING

# MANUAL TESTING

# MANUAL TESTING

# MANUAL TESTING

# MANUAL TESTING

# MANUAL TESTING



# MANUAL TESTING

```

2823-18-0515:13:28.65944000Z DEBUG solana_runtime::message_processor::stable_log Program TokenkegqfeZyNwAJbN8GKPFXCMBvF9S6z23VQSDA invoke [2]
2823-18-0515:13:28.65944000Z DEBUG solana_runtime::message_processor::stable_log Program log: Instruction: Transfer
2823-18-0515:13:28.661847000Z DEBUG solana_runtime::message_processor::stable_log Program TokenkegqfeZyNwAJbN8GKPFXCMBvF9S6z23VQSDA consumed 4645 of 132553 compute units
2823-18-0515:13:28.661848000Z DEBUG solana_runtime::message_processor::stable_log Program TokenkegqfeZyNwAJbN8GKPFXCMBvF9S6z23VQSDA success
2823-18-0515:13:28.662939000Z DEBUG solana_runtime::message_processor::stable_log Program data: QM8C7CtCtAIAAAAAAAAAA8888V4L328uQDmUwJz68PQv0vzm6e7Wb7IM8568uADGQ0AAAAAAGDQAAAAAQAQAAAAAABAAAAA==
2823-18-0515:13:28.663166000Z DEBUG solana_runtime::message_processor::stable_log Program data: s8ud3G64s1eAAAAAAACwPp/////7ITMAAAAAAQETPAAAAAAVbP6AAAAAAgAAAA
2823-18-0515:13:28.665798000Z DEBUG solana_runtime::message_processor::stable_log Program F7KEvEhAqASAX0RS9HrUFS5jclXvV6S45ohMhV5tdsv consumed 7869 of 200000 compute units
2823-18-0515:13:28.666817000Z DEBUG solana_runtime::message_processor::stable_log Program F7KEvEhAqASAX0RS9HrUFS5jclXvV6S45ohMhV5tdsv success
2823-18-0515:13:28.666817000Z DEBUG solana_runtime::message_processor::stable_log [4] Swap Done
--User after adding Liquidity to Comet : User { borrows: {Borrow { pool_index: 0, borrowed_onasset: 500, collateral_amount: 60 }}, comet: Comet { collateral_amount: 1000000, positions: {LiquidityPosition { pool_index: 0, committed_collateral_liquidity: 1000000, collateral_id_rebate: 0, onasset_id_rebate: 0 } } }
--Pool data : Pool { underlying_asset_token_account: 11111112P2p5ytd0dHLPsFCBfr13s457LqLAT, committed_collateral_liquidity: 1000000, collateral_id: 2002, onasset_id: -68240, treasury_trading_fee_bps: 100, liquidity_trading_fee_bps: 500, asset_info: AssetInfo { onasset_mint: 11111112QW6Q9z2m9LGP, oracle_info_index: 1, il_health_score_coefficient: 130, position_health_score_coefficient: 110, min_overcollateral_ratio: 150, max_liquidation_overcollateral_ratio: 200 }, status: Active }
User Collateral Token Account amount: -----> 99001940
User Okekes Token Account amount: -----> 999940260
[4] collectRewards Instruction
2823-18-0515:13:28.684232000Z DEBUG solana_runtime::message_processor::stable_log Program F7KEvEhAqASAX0RS9HrUFS5jclXvV6S45ohMhV5tdsv invoke [1]
2823-18-0515:13:28.685189000Z DEBUG solana_runtime::message_processor::stable_log Program log: Instruction: CollectRewards
2823-18-0515:13:28.701959000Z DEBUG solana_runtime::message_processor::stable_log Program TokenkegqfeZyNwAJbN8GKPFXCMBvF9S6z23VQSDA invoke [2]
2823-18-0515:13:28.701959000Z DEBUG solana_runtime::message_processor::stable_log Program log: Instruction: MintTo
2823-18-0515:13:28.703886000Z DEBUG solana_runtime::message_processor::stable_log Program TokenkegqfeZyNwAJbN8GKPFXCMBvF9S6z23VQSDA consumed 4492 of 175582 compute units
2823-18-0515:13:28.704668000Z DEBUG solana_runtime::message_processor::stable_log Program TokenkegqfeZyNwAJbN8GKPFXCMBvF9S6z23VQSDA success
2823-18-0515:13:28.706464000Z DEBUG solana_runtime::message_processor::stable_log Program F7KEvEhAqASAX0RS9HrUFS5jclXvV6S45ohMhV5tdsv consumed 32092 of 200000 compute units
2823-18-0515:13:28.706598000Z DEBUG solana_runtime::message_processor::stable_log Program F7KEvEhAqASAX0RS9HrUFS5jclXvV6S45ohMhV5tdsv success
2823-18-0515:13:28.706598000Z DEBUG solana_runtime::message_processor::stable_log [4] Lohwards Collected
--User after withdrawing Liquidity from Comet : User { borrows: {Borrow { pool_index: 0, borrowed_onasset: 500, collateral_amount: 60 }}, comet: Comet { collateral_amount: 1000000, positions: {LiquidityPosition { pool_index: 0, committed_collateral_liquidity: 1000000, collateral_id_rebate: 0, onasset_id_rebate: -68240 } } }
User Collateral Token Account amount: -----> 99001940
User Okekes Token Account amount: -----> 1000000000
[4] PayPermanentLossDebt Instruction
Liquidator Collateral Token Account amount: -----> 1009980000
Wait Collateral Token Account amount: -----> 1009980000
2823-18-0515:13:28.725068000Z DEBUG solana_runtime::message_processor::stable_log Program F7KEvEhAqASAX0RS9HrUFS5jclXvV6S45ohMhV5tdsv invoke [1]
2823-18-0515:13:28.727176000Z DEBUG solana_runtime::message_processor::stable_log Program log: Instruction: PayImpermanentLossDebt
2823-18-0515:13:28.747255000Z DEBUG solana_runtime::message_processor::stable_log Program TokenkegqfeZyNwAJbN8GKPFXCMBvF9S6z23VQSDA invoke [2]
2823-18-0515:13:28.747255000Z DEBUG solana_runtime::message_processor::stable_log Program log: Instruction: Transfer
2823-18-0515:13:28.758414000Z DEBUG solana_runtime::message_processor::stable_log Program TokenkegqfeZyNwAJbN8GKPFXCMBvF9S6z23VQSDA consumed 4645 of 166940 compute units
2823-18-0515:13:28.758575000Z DEBUG solana_runtime::message_processor::stable_log Program TokenkegqfeZyNwAJbN8GKPFXCMBvF9S6z23VQSDA success
2823-18-0515:13:28.759606000Z DEBUG solana_runtime::message_processor::stable_log Program F7KEvEhAqASAX0RS9HrUFS5jclXvV6S45ohMhV5tdsv consumed 40964 of 200000 compute units
2823-18-0515:13:28.759606000Z DEBUG solana_runtime::message_processor::stable_log Program F7KEvEhAqASAX0RS9HrUFS5jclXvV6S45ohMhV5tdsv success
2823-18-0515:13:28.759606000Z DEBUG solana_runtime::message_processor::stable_log [4] ImpermanentLossDebt Collateral Paid
Liquidator Collateral Token Account amount: -----> 99997998
Wait Collateral Token Account amount: -----> 101000000
--User data: User { borrows: {Borrow { pool_index: 0, borrowed_onasset: 500, collateral_amount: 60 }}, comet: Comet { collateral_amount: 1000000, positions: {LiquidityPosition { pool_index: 0, committed_collateral_liquidity: 1000000, collateral_id_rebate: 2002, onasset_id_rebate: -68240 } } }
[4] PayImpermanentLossDebt Instruction
2823-18-0515:13:28.781754000Z DEBUG solana_runtime::message_processor::stable_log Program F7KEvEhAqASAX0RS9HrUFS5jclXvV6S45ohMhV5tdsv invoke [1]
2823-18-0515:13:28.780648000Z DEBUG solana_runtime::message_processor::stable_log Program log: Instruction: PayImpermanentLossDebt
2823-18-0515:13:28.820108000Z DEBUG solana_runtime::message_processor::stable_log Program log: InstructionError thrown in program/clone/src/instructions/pay_impermanent_loss_debt.rs:113. Error Code: InvalidPaymentType. Error Number: 6035. Error Message: Invalid Payment Type
2823-18-0515:13:28.821970000Z DEBUG solana_runtime::message_processor::stable_log Program F7KEvEhAqASAX0RS9HrUFS5jclXvV6S45ohMhV5tdsv consumed 33453 of 200000 compute units
2823-18-0515:13:28.821970000Z DEBUG solana_runtime::message_processor::stable_log Program F7KEvEhAqASAX0RS9HrUFS5jclXvV6S45ohMhV5tdsv failed: custom program error: 0x1793
thread 'poc_borrow' panicked at 'called Result::unwrap() on an Err value: TransactionError { instruction_error: 0, custom: (6035) }', programs/clone/tests/security.rs:233:40
note: run with 'RUST_BACKTRACE=1' environment variable to display a backtrace
test poc_borrow ... FAILED

[4] UpdatePrices Instruction
2823-18-0515:18:29.426910000Z DEBUG solana_runtime::message_processor::stable_log Program F7KEvEhAqASAX0RS9HrUFS5jclXvV6S45ohMhV5tdsv invoke [1]
2823-18-0515:18:29.427258000Z DEBUG solana_runtime::message_processor::stable_log Program log: Instruction: UpdatePrices
2823-18-0515:18:29.428210000Z DEBUG solana_runtime::message_processor::stable_log Program log: PRICE: 3
2823-18-0515:18:29.432150000Z DEBUG solana_runtime::message_processor::stable_log Program log: UPDATING ORACLE: OracleInfo { source: PYTH, address: 1111110Lh73Hf1HtpS9KRLV8GndWfVidqM, price: 3, expo: 7, status: Active, last_update_slot: 15625 }
2823-18-0515:18:29.432720000Z DEBUG solana_runtime::message_processor::stable_log Program F7KEvEhAqASAX0RS9HrUFS5jclXvV6S45ohMhV5tdsv consumed 14001 of 200000 compute units
2823-18-0515:18:29.432720000Z DEBUG solana_runtime::message_processor::stable_log Program F7KEvEhAqASAX0RS9HrUFS5jclXvV6S45ohMhV5tdsv success
[4] Prices Updated
Oracles with updated prices: Oracles { oracles: {OracleInfo { source: PYTH, address: 1111110Lh73Hf1HtpS9KRLV8GndWfVidqM, price: 3, expo: 7, status: Active, last_update_slot: 15625 }}, OracleInfo { source: PYTH, address: 1111110gY0u8W9WAdH3qf9YnG1WR1UAF, price: 18, expo: 6, status: Active, last_update_slot: 15625 } }
--User { borrows: {Borrow { pool_index: 0, borrowed_onasset: 500, collateral_amount: 60 }}, comet: Comet { collateral_amount: 1000000, positions: {LiquidityPosition { pool_index: 0, committed_collateral_liquidity: 1000000, collateral_id_rebate: 0, onasset_id_rebate: 0 } } }
--Pool data : Pool { underlying_asset_token_account: 11111112P2p5ytd0dHLPsFCBfr13s457LqLAT, committed_collateral_liquidity: 1000000, collateral_id: 0, onasset_id: 0, treasury_trading_fee_bps: 100, liquidity_trading_fee_bps: 500, asset_info: AssetInfo { onasset_mint: 11111112QW6Q9z2m9LGP, oracle_info_index: 1, il_health_score_coefficient: 130, position_health_score_coefficient: 110, min_overcollateral_ratio: 150, max_liquidation_overcollateral_ratio: 200 }, status: Active }
[4] PayPermanentLossDebt Instruction
2823-18-0515:18:29.449310000Z DEBUG solana_runtime::message_processor::stable_log Program F7KEvEhAqASAX0RS9HrUFS5jclXvV6S45ohMhV5tdsv invoke [1]
2823-18-0515:18:29.449310000Z DEBUG solana_runtime::message_processor::stable_log Program log: Instruction: PayImpermanentLossDebt
2823-18-0515:18:29.453457000Z DEBUG solana_runtime::message_processor::stable_log Program log: AnchorError thrown in program/clone/src/instructions/pay_impermanent_loss_debt.rs:113. Error Code: InvalidPaymentType. Error Number: 6035. Error Message: Invalid Payment Type
2823-18-0515:18:29.453720000Z DEBUG solana_runtime::message_processor::stable_log Program F7KEvEhAqASAX0RS9HrUFS5jclXvV6S45ohMhV5tdsv consumed 34761 of 200000 compute units
2823-18-0515:18:29.453880000Z DEBUG solana_runtime::message_processor::stable_log Program F7KEvEhAqASAX0RS9HrUFS5jclXvV6S45ohMhV5tdsv failed: custom program error: 0x1793
thread 'poc_borrow' panicked at 'called Result::unwrap() on an Err value: TransactionError { instruction_error: 0, custom: (6035) }', programs/clone/tests/security.rs:403:49
note: run with 'RUST_BACKTRACE=1' environment variable to display a backtrace
test poc_borrow ... FAILED

```



# AUTOMATED TESTING



## 6.1 AUTOMATED ANALYSIS

### Description:

Halborn used automated security scanners to assist with the 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:

ID	package	Short Description
<a href="#">RUSTSEC-2022-0093</a>	ed25519-dalek	Double Public Key Signing Function Oracle Attack on 'ed25519-dalek'

## 6.2 UNSAFE RUST CODE DETECTION

### Description:

Halborn used automated security scanners to assist with the detection of well-known security issues and vulnerabilities. Among the tools used was `cargo-geiger`, a security tool that lists statistics related to the usage of unsafe Rust code in a core Rust codebase and all its dependencies.

### Results:

No unsafe code blocks were identified in the packages in scope and their dependencies.



THANK YOU FOR CHOOSING

// HALBORN

