

Orion - Liquidity Aggregator

Smart Contract Security Assessment

Prepared by: Halborn

Date of Engagement: August 18th, 2023 - October 13th, 2023

Visit: Halborn.com

DOCU	MENT REVISION HISTORY	5
CONT	ACTS	6
1	EXECUTIVE OVERVIEW	7
1.1	INTRODUCTION	8
1.2	ASSESSMENT SUMMARY	8
1.3	TEST APPROACH & METHODOLOGY	9
2	RISK METHODOLOGY	10
2.1	EXPLOITABILITY	11
2.2	IMPACT	12
2.3	SEVERITY COEFFICIENT	14
2.4	SCOPE	16
3	ASSESSMENT SUMMARY & FINDINGS OVERVIEW	17
4	FINDINGS & TECH DETAILS	18
4.1	(HAL-01) INCORRECT PRICES ARE FETCHED DURING LIQUIDATION - CRI ICAL(9.4)	T- 20
	Description	20
	Code Location	20
	BVSS	20
	Recommendation	21
	Remediation Plan	21
4.2	(HAL-02) USERS WITH NO ORN STAKED CAN NOT BE LIQUIDATED HIGH(8.8)	- 22
	Description	22
	BVSS	25
	Recommendation	26

	Remediation Plan	26
4.3	(HAL-03) SELF-SIGNED ORDERS CAN BE REUSED IN OTHER CHAINS HIGH(8.8)	27
	Description	27
	BVSS	28
	Recommendation	28
	Remediation Plan	28
4.4	(HAL-04) SWAPS COULD SET INACCURATE FILLORDERS - MEDIUM(5.6)	29
	Description	29
	Code location	29
	BVSS	30
	Recommendation	30
	Remediation Plan	31
4.5	(HAL-05) MISSING STALENESS CHECKS IN THE CHAILINK.LATESTROUNDDATA() CALLS - LOW(2.5)	IN- 32
	Description	32
	Code location	32
	BVSS	32
	Recommendation	32
	Remediation Plan	33
4.6	(HAL-06) LACK OF DISABLEINITIALIZERS CALL TO PREVENT UNINITIALIZED CONTRACTS - LOW(2.5)	AL- 34
	Description	34
	BVSS	34
	Recommendation	35
	Remediation Plan	35
4.7	(HAL-07) HARDCODED DOMAIN SEPARATOR - LOW(2.5)	36

	Description	36
	BVSS	36
	Recommendation	36
	Remediation Plan	36
4.8	(HAL-08) HARDCODED CHAINID - LOW(2.5)	37
	Description	37
	BVSS	37
	Recommendation	37
	Remediation Plan	37
4.9	(HAL-09) SECRET VALUES CAN BE RETRIEVED FROM MEMPOOL - INFOR	MA-
	TIONAL(0.0)	38
	Description	38
	Code location	38
	BVSS	39
	Recommendation	39
	Remediation Plan	39
4.16	0 (HAL-10) LACK OF A DOUBLE-STEP TRANSFEROWNERSHIP PATTERN - FORMATIONAL(0.0)	IN- 40
	Description	40
	Code Location	40
	BVSS	40
	Recommendation	41
	Remediation Plan	42
4.11	(HAL-11) USE CUSTOM ERRORS INSTEAD OF REVERT STRINGS TO S GAS - INFORMATIONAL(0.0)	AVE 43
	Description	43

	BVSS	43
	Recommendation	43
	Remediation Plan	43
5	AUTOMATED TESTING	44
5.1	STATIC ANALYSIS REPORT	45
	Description	45
	Results	46

DOCUMENT REVISION HISTORY

VERSION	MODIFICATION	DATE
0.1	Document Creation	10/09/2023
0.2	Document Updates	10/13/2023
0.3	Draft Review	10/13/2023
0.4	Draft Review	10/13/2023
1.0	Remediation Plan	11/03/2023
1.1	Remediation Plan Updates	11/06/2023
1.2	Remediation Plan Review	11/06/2023
1.3	Remediation Plan Review	11/06/2023

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
Gokberk Gulgun	Halborn	Gokberk.Gulgun@halborn.com

EXECUTIVE OVERVIEW

1.1 INTRODUCTION

Orion engaged Halborn to conduct a security assessment on their smart contracts beginning on August 18th, 2023 and ending on October 13th, 2023. The security assessment was scoped to the smart contracts provided to the Halborn team.

1.2 ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

The team at Halborn was provided two weeks for the engagement and assigned a full-time security engineer to verify 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 assessment is to:

- Ensure that smart contract functions operate as intended.
- Identify potential security issues with the smart contracts.

In summary, Halborn identified some security risks that were addressed and accepted by the Orion team.

1.3 TEST APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

Halborn performed a combination of manual and automated security testing to balance efficiency, timeliness, practicality, and accuracy in regard to the scope of this assessment. 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 the security best practices. The following phases and associated tools were used during the assessment:

- Research into architecture and purpose.
- Smart contract manual code review and walkthrough.
- Graphing out functionality and contract logic/connectivity/functions. (solgraph)
- Manual assessment of use and safety for the critical Solidity variables and functions in scope to identify any arithmetic related vulnerability classes.
- Manual testing by custom scripts.
- Static Analysis of security for scoped contract, and imported functions. (Slither)
- Testnet deployment. (Brownie, Anvil, Foundry)

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
Actack Origin (AO)	Specific (AO:S)	0.2
	Low (AC:L)	1
Attack Cost (AC)	Medium (AC:M)	0.67
	High (AC:H)	0.33
	Low (AX:L)	1
Attack Complexity (AX)	Medium (AX:M)	0.67
	High (AX:H)	0.33

Exploitability ${\it E}$ 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
	None (I:N)	0
	Low (I:L)	0.25
Confidentiality (C)	Medium (I:M)	0.5
	High (I:H)	0.75
	Critical (I:C)	1
	None (I:N)	0
	Low (I:L)	0.25
Integrity (I)	Medium (I:M)	0.5
	High (I:H)	0.75
	Critical (I:C)	1
	None (A:N)	0
	Low (A:L)	0.25
Availability (A)	Medium (A:M)	0.5
	High (A:H)	0.75
	Critical	1
	None (D:N)	0
	Low (D:L)	0.25
Deposit (D)	Medium (D:M)	0.5
	High (D:H)	0.75
	Critical (D:C)	1
	None (Y:N)	0
	Low (Y:L)	0.25
Yield (Y)	Medium: (Y:M)	0.5
	High: (Y:H)	0.75
	Critical (Y:H)	1

Impact ${\it I}$ 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	
	None (R:N)	1	
Reversibility (r)	Partial (R:P)	0.5	
	Full (R:F)	0.25	
Scono (a)	Changed (S:C)	1.25	
Scope (s)	Unchanged (S:U)	1	

Severity Coefficient C is obtained by the following product:

C = rs

The Vulnerability Severity Score ${\cal S}$ 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

IN-SCOPE CODE & COMMITS:

- Repository: orion-exchange-private
 - Commit ID: 45c67b084b957ca9203e397402885aeee1fb09f7
 - Smart contracts **in scope**:
 - All smart contracts under /contracts folder **except** the ones located under /contracts/dexes.

OUT-OF-SCOPE:

- Third-party libraries and dependencies.
- Economic attacks.

REMEDIATION COMMITS:

- Repository: orion-exchange-private
 - Commit IDs:
 - af075b821a966f058bfc5ab1aa8ee70c67953d6d
 - b206e0f56153cd0625dcaebb264066fdbe4993a1

3. ASSESSMENT SUMMARY & FINDINGS OVERVIEW

CRITICAL	HIGH	MEDIUM	LOW	INFORMATIONAL
1	2	1	4	3

SECURITY ANALYSIS	RISK LEVEL	REMEDIATION DATE
(HAL-01) INCORRECT PRICES ARE FETCHED DURING LIQUIDATION	Critical (9.4)	SOLVED - 11/06/2023
(HAL-02) USERS WITH NO ORN STAKED CAN NOT BE LIQUIDATED	High (8.8)	SOLVED - 11/03/2023
(HAL-03) SELF-SIGNED ORDERS CAN BE REUSED IN OTHER CHAINS	High (8.8)	SOLVED - 11/03/2023
(HAL-04) SWAPS COULD SET INACCURATE FILLORDERS	Medium (5.6)	RISK ACCEPTED
(HAL-05) MISSING STALENESS CHECKS IN THE CHAINLINK.LATESTROUNDDATA() CALLS	Low (2.5)	RISK ACCEPTED
(HAL-06) LACK OF DISABLEINITIALIZERS CALL TO PREVENT UNINITIALIZED CONTRACTS	Low (2.5)	RISK ACCEPTED
(HAL-07) HARDCODED DOMAIN SEPARATOR	Low (2.5)	RISK ACCEPTED
(HAL-08) HARDCODED CHAINID	Low (2.5)	RISK ACCEPTED
(HAL-09) SECRET VALUES CAN BE RETRIEVED FROM MEMPOOL	Informational (0.0)	ACKNOWLEDGED
(HAL-10) LACK OF A DOUBLE-STEP TRANSFEROWNERSHIP PATTERN	Informational (0.0)	ACKNOWLEDGED
(HAL-11) USE CUSTOM ERRORS INSTEAD OF REVERT STRINGS TO SAVE GAS	Informational (0.0)	ACKNOWLEDGED

FINDINGS & TECH DETAILS

4.1 (HAL-01) INCORRECT PRICES ARE FETCHED DURING LIQUIDATION - CRITICAL(9.4)

Description:

In the commit af075b821a966f058bfc5ab1aa8ee70c67953d6d, during the remediation plan, some lines of code were added to allow a liquidator to specify the collateral asset that will be used to cover the debt instead of only ORN as it was implemented before these changes. However, when collateralAsset is not the address of ORN token, the code tries to fetch the collateral's price but instead of it, the getAssetPrice function uses as argument the redeemedAsset address. Therefore, both tokens will always have the same price in the following operations.

Code Location:

In the MarginalFunctionality.partiallyLiquidate() function:

BVSS:

AO:A/AC:L/AX:L/C:N/I:H/A:N/D:H/Y:N/R:N/S:U (9.4)

Recommendation:

It is recommended to use the collateral Asset argument instead of redeemed Asset to fetch prices of the collateral token.

Remediation Plan:

SOLVED: The Orion team solved the issue by fetching prices from the collateral token instead of the one to redeem in the following commit ID:

b206e0f56153cd0625dcaebb264066fdbe4993a1.

4.2 (HAL-02) USERS WITH NO ORN STAKED CAN NOT BE LIQUIDATED - HIGH (8.8)

Description:

In the Exchange contract, the function partiallyLiquidate() can be called by any user to cover some of overdue broker liabilities and get ORN in exchange:

```
Listing 2: Exchange.sol (Line 391)

382 /**

383 * @dev method to cover some of overdue broker liabilities and get
L, ORN in exchange

384 same as liquidation or margin call

385 * @param broker - broker which will be liquidated

386 * @param redeemedAsset - asset, liability of which will be
L, covered

387 * @param amount - amount of covered asset

388 */

389 function partiallyLiquidate(address broker, address redeemedAsset,
L, uint112 amount) public {

390 MarginalFunctionality.UsedConstants memory constants =
L, getConstants(broker);

391 MarginalFunctionality.partiallyLiquidate(

392 collateralAssets,
393 liabilities,
394 assetBalances,
395 assetRisks,
396 constants,
397 redeemedAsset,
398 amount

399 );
400 }
```

This function internally called MarginalFunctionality.partiallyLiquidate ():

Listing 3: MarginalFunctionality.sol (Lines 281-289) 248 function partiallyLiquidate(address[] storage collateralAssets, mapping(address => Liability[]) storage liabilities, mapping(address => mapping(address => int192)) storage assetBalances. mapping(address => uint8) storage assetRisks, UsedConstants memory constants, address redeemedAsset, 256) public { Position memory initialPosition = calcPosition(collateralAssets. assetBalances, assetRisks,); require(initialPosition.state == PositionState.NEGATIVE ||); address liquidator = msg.sender; require(assetBalances[liquidator][redeemedAsset] >= int192(uint192(amount)), "E8"); require(assetBalances[constants.user][redeemedAsset] < 0, "E15</pre> → "); assetBalances[liquidator][redeemedAsset] -= int192(uint192(assetBalances[constants.user][redeemedAsset] += int192(uint192 (amount)); if (assetBalances[constants.user][redeemedAsset] >= 0) removeLiability(constants.user, redeemedAsset, liabilities →); (uint64 price, uint64 timestamp) = getAssetPrice(redeemedAsset

```
require((timestamp + constants.priceOverdue) > block.timestamp
);
      Position memory finalPosition = calcPosition(
          collateralAssets,
          assetBalances.
          assetRisks,
      );
      require(
          uint(finalPosition.state) < 3 && //POSITIVE, NEGATIVE or</pre>
              (finalPosition.weightedPosition > initialPosition.

    weightedPosition),
      ); //Incorrect state position after liquidation
      if (finalPosition.state == PositionState.POSITIVE)
          require(finalPosition.weightedPosition < 10e8, "Can not</pre>
→ liquidate to very positive state");
305 }
```

The liquidator is rewarded with ORN. This functionality is implemented in the reimburseLiquidator() function:

```
Listing 4: MarginalFunctionality.sol (Lines 325-327)
310 function reimburseLiquidator(
       uint112 amount,
       uint64 price,
       address liquidator,
       mapping(address => mapping(address => int192)) storage

    assetBalances,

       uint8 liquidationPremium,
       address user,
       address orionTokenAddress
318 ) internal {
       int192 _orionAmount = int192((int256(uint256(amount)) * int256
_orionAmount += uint8Percent(_orionAmount, liquidationPremium)
       require(_orionAmount == int64(_orionAmount), "E11");
       int192 onBalanceOrion = assetBalances[user][orionTokenAddress
↳ ];
       require(onBalanceOrion >= _orionAmount, "E10");
       assetBalances[user][orionTokenAddress] -= _orionAmount;
       assetBalances[liquidator][orionTokenAddress] += _orionAmount;
328 }
```

Although, if the user being liquidated does not have any ORN in his balances, his position can never be liquidated.

BVSS:

AO:A/AC:L/AX:L/C:N/I:H/A:N/D:M/Y:N/R:N/S:U (8.8)

Recommendation:

It is recommended to update the partiallyLiquidate() implementation, so users cannot avoid liquidation in this scenario.

Remediation Plan:

SOLVED: The Orion team solved the issue by letting users choose which collateral asset to use for his liquidation reward in the following commit IDs:

- af075b821a966f058bfc5ab1aa8ee70c67953d6d.
- b206e0f56153cd0625dcaebb264066fdbe4993a1.

4.3 (HAL-03) SELF-SIGNED ORDERS CAN BE REUSED IN OTHER CHAINS - HIGH (8.8)

Description:

The buy/sell orders are implemented with the following struct:

```
Listing 5: LibValidator.sol (Line 35)

struct Order {

a address senderAddress;

a address matcherAddress;

a address baseAsset;

a address quoteAsset;

u address matcherFeeAsset;

u int64 amount;

u uint64 price;

uint64 price;

uint64 nonce;

uint64 expiration;

uint8 buySide; // buy or sell

bool isPersonalSign;

bytes signature;

49 }
```

These buy/sell orders can be self-signed if isPersonalSign is set to true. As such, the sender will have to provide a signature which is built as:

```
__order.quoteAsset,

__order.matcherFeeAsset,

__order.amount,

__order.price,

__order.matcherFee,

__order.nonce,

__order.expiration,

__order.buySide

__order.buySide

__order.sageHash();

__order.sageHash();
```

chain.id and as the Orion protocol is supposed to be deployed in multiple chains, this signature could be used to perform a cross-chain signature replay attack. For example:

- 1. Alice creates a personal signed order to buy 1000 DAI on the Ethereum mainnet.
- 2. This signature is replayed by a malicious user to send an order on behalf of Alice in the Arbitrum blockchain.

BVSS:

AO:A/AC:L/AX:L/C:N/I:H/A:N/D:M/Y:N/R:N/S:U (8.8)

Recommendation:

It is recommended to include a domain separator with a chain.id to the getEthSignedOrderHash() function in order to prevent signature replay attacks.

Remediation Plan:

SOLVED: The Orion team solved the issue by removing self-signed orders in the following commit ID:

af075b821a966f058bfc5ab1aa8ee70c67953d6d.

4.4 (HAL-04) SWAPS COULD SET INACCURATE FILLORDERS - MEDIUM (5.6)

Description:

Every time an order is modified or filled, the filledAmounts mapping must be modified according to the amount of assets that will be covered regarding an order. The updateFilledAmount function is responsible for updating this mapping to track the current amount of assets already filled in an existing order.

However, there is a case where this mapping is not being updated accordingly. Since a swap can return an undetermined amount of tokens, the fillThroughPools function updates the filledAmounts mapping right before the swap is performed, taking as reference for the amount of tokens to fill to the desc.minReturnAmount variable used as slippage. Therefore, the protocol won't be able to track the correct amount of tokens filled in case more tokens are returned after the swap's execution.

Code location:

```
Listing 7: contracts/ExchangeWithGenericSwap.sol (Lines 50,55)

49 LibValidator.checkOrderSingleMatch(order, desc, filledAmount, block.timestamp);
50 updateFilledAmount(order, filledAmount);
51 // stack to deep
52 {
53 address senderAddress = order.senderAddress;
54 uint256 matcherFee = order.matcherFee;
55 (returnAmount, spentAmount, gasLeft) = _swap(senderAddress, executor, desc, permit, data, matcherFee);
56 }
57 LibExchange._updateBalance(order.matcherAddress, order.

L. matcherFeeAsset, int(uint(order.matcherFee)), assetBalances,
L. liabilities);
```

Listing 8: contracts/libs/LibValidator.sol (Line 180) uint256 amountQuote = uint256(filledAmount) * order.price / 169 if (order.buySide == 1) { require(order.quoteAsset == address(desc.srcToken) && order. baseAsset == address(desc.dstToken), "E3As"); (amount_spend, amount_receive) = (amountQuote, filledAmount); 172 } else { require(order.baseAsset == address(desc.srcToken) && order. (amount_spend, amount_receive) = (filledAmount, → amountQuote); 175 } require(order.senderAddress == desc.dstReceiver, " require(amount_spend == desc.amount, "IncorrectAmount"); require(order.matcherFeeAsset == address(desc.dstToken), " require(amount_receive >= desc.minReturnAmount, " IncorrectAmount");

BVSS:

AO:A/AC:L/AX:L/C:N/I:N/A:L/D:M/Y:N/R:N/S:U (5.6)

Recommendation:

It is recommended to update the filledAmounts mapping with the amount obtained from swapping assets. For example, the following LOC could be added right after the swap:

```
Listing 9

1 updateFilledAmount(order, returnAmount - filledAmount);
```

Remediation Plan:

RISK ACCEPTED: The Orion team accepted the risk of this issue and stated that:

This situation occurs when a trader creates a buy order that is filled through decentralized exchanges (dexes). Some dexes may not be able to execute exact receive trades, leading to the transformation of the trader's buyOrder into a sellOrder. While this approach may result in a final filledAmount greater than the initial order.amount, we prioritize ensuring that the trade's price is always better or at least equal to what the user initially signed in their order. We understand that there may be a slight discrepancy in the stored filledAmount value due to this process, but we maintain the commitment to ensuring that the settlement price is not worse than what the user expected.

4.5 (HAL-05) MISSING STALENESS CHECKS IN THE CHAINLINK.LATESTROUNDDATA() CALLS LOW (2.5)

Description:

In the PriceOracle contract, the latestRoundData() function of Chainlink price feeds is called to retrieve the price of different assets.

Although, this call is performed without any kind of staleness checks. If there is a problem with Chainlink starting a new round and finding consensus on the new value for the oracle (e.g. Chainlink nodes abandoning the oracle, chain congestion, vulnerability/attacks on the Chainlink system) consumers of these contracts may continue using obsolete data.

```
PriceOracle.sol
- Line 176:
```

(, int _basePrice, , uint timestamp,)= AggregatorV3Interface(
baseAggregator).latestRoundData();

- Line 198:

Code location:

(, int _aPrice, , uint aTimestamp,)= AggregatorV3Interface(
currentAggregator).latestRoundData();

BVSS:

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

Recommendation:

It is recommended to use Chainlink's latestRoundData() function with checks on the return data with proper revert messages if the price is

stale or the round is incomplete, for example:

```
Listing 10: latestRoundData example call (Line 2)

1 uint256 private constant GRACE_PERIOD_TIME = 7200; // 2 hours
2 (uint80 roundId, int256 price, uint256 startedAt, uint256

↓ updatedAt, uint80 answeredInRound) = AggregatorV3Interface(

↓ baseAggregator).latestRoundData();;
3 require(answeredInRound >= roundID, "Stale price");
4 require(price > 0, "invalid price");
5 require(block.timestamp <= updatedAt + GRACE_PERIOD_TIME, "Stale

↓ price");
```

If in the case that we are dealing with Price Feeds in Arbitrum, the sequencer state should be validated, ensuring that is up before accepting any price as valid.

Remediation Plan:

RISK ACCEPTED: The Orion team accepted the risk of this issue.

4.6 (HAL-06) LACK OF DISABLEINITIALIZERS CALL TO PREVENT UNINITIALIZED CONTRACTS - LOW (2.5)

Description:

The Exchange contract uses the Initializable module from OpenZeppelin. In order to prevent leaving the contract uninitialized OpenZeppelin's documentation recommends adding the _disableInitializers function in the constructor to automatically lock the contract when it is deployed:

BVSS:

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

Recommendation:

Consider calling the _disableInitializers function in the Exchange contract's constructor:

```
Listing 12: Constructor preventing uninitialized contracts

1 /// @custom:oz-upgrades-unsafe-allow constructor
2 constructor() {
3 __disableInitializers();
4 }
```

Remediation Plan:

RISK ACCEPTED: The Orion team accepted the risk of this issue.

4.7 (HAL-07) HARDCODED DOMAIN SEPARATOR - LOW (2.5)

Description:

The variable DOMAIN_SEPARATOR in the LibValidator library is defined as a constant and will not change after the contract deployment. However, if a hard fork happens, the DOMAIN_SEPARATOR would become invalid on one of the forked chains as the block.chainid would have changed.

BVSS:

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

Recommendation:

Consider using the implementation from OpenZeppelin, which recalculates the domain separator if the current block.chainid is not the cached chain ID.

Remediation Plan:

RISK ACCEPTED: The Orion team accepted the risk of this issue.

4.8 (HAL-08) HARDCODED CHAINID -LOW (2.5)

Description:

The variable CHAIN_ID in the LibValidator library is defined as a constant and hardcoded to 1.

```
Listing 14: LibValidator.sol

12 uint256 public constant CHAIN_ID = 1;
```

BVSS:

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

Recommendation:

It is recommended to use chain.id to set the CHAIN_ID state variable. This can be done in the constructor during the contract deployment.

Remediation Plan:

RISK ACCEPTED: The Orion team accepted the risk of this issue.

4.9 (HAL-09) SECRET VALUES CAN BE RETRIEVED FROM MEMPOOL - INFORMATIONAL (0.0)

Description:

The ExchangeWithAtomic smart contract allows users to perform operations over different orders, locking them as atomic. These atomic orders require a hash associated to a secret that only the user who locks the order knows. This secret should be provided when the user wants to perform any of the available atomic operations.

However, since the secret is revealed when a function is executed over the locked order, during a period of time the secret remains readable for every user who is watching the mempool which receives the associated transaction. Therefore, these atomic operations do not give any kind of defense against front-run attacks, for example.

Code location:

```
Listing 15: contracts/libs/LibAtomic.sol (Lines 82,90,91)

80 function doRedeemAtomic(
81    LibAtomic.RedeemOrder calldata order,
82    bytes calldata secret,
83    mapping(bytes32 => bool) storage secrets,
84    mapping(address => mapping(address => int192)) storage
14    assetBalances,
85    mapping(address => MarginalFunctionality.Liability[]) storage
14    liabilities
86 ) public {
87       require(!secrets[order.secretHash], "E17R");
88       require(getEthSignedAtomicOrderHash(order).recover(order.
14    signature) == order.sender, "E2");
89       require(order.expiration / 1000 >= block.timestamp, "E4A");
90       require(order.secretHash] = true;
```

```
Listing 16: contracts/libs/LibAtomic.sol (Lines 100,108,109)

98 function doClaimAtomic(
99 address receiver,

100 bytes calldata secret,

101 bytes calldata matcherSignature,

102 address allowedMatcher,

103 mapping(bytes32 => LockInfo) storage atomicSwaps,

104 mapping(address => mapping(address => int192)) storage

L, assetBalances,

105 mapping(address => MarginalFunctionality.Liability[]) storage

L, liabilities

106 ) public returns (LockInfo storage swap) {

107 bytes32 secretHash = keccak256(secret);

108 bytes32 coHash = getEthSignedClaimOrderHash(ClaimOrder(

L, receiver, secretHash));

109 require(coHash.recover(matcherSignature) == allowedMatcher, "

L, E2");

110
```

BVSS:

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

Recommendation:

It is not recommended to use this kind of mechanism to prevent of frontrun attacks since, as it was explained, secret values can be retrieved from mempools.

Remediation Plan:

ACKNOWLEDGED: The Orion team acknowledged the risk of this issue.

4.10 (HAL-10) LACK OF A DOUBLE-STEP TRANSFEROWNERSHIP PATTERN - INFORMATIONAL (0.0)

Description:

The current ownership transfer process for all the contracts inheriting from Ownable or OwnableUpgradeable involves the current owner calling the transferOwnership() function:

```
Listing 17: Ownable.sol

97 function transferOwnership(address newOwner) public virtual
L, onlyOwner {
98    require(newOwner != address(0), "Ownable: new owner is the
L, zero address");
99    _setOwner(newOwner);
100 }
```

If the nominated EOA account is not a valid account, it is entirely possible that the owner may accidentally transfer ownership to an uncontrolled account, losing the access to all functions with the onlyOwner modifier.

Code Location:

Contracts using the Ownable/OwnableUpgradeable library

PriceOracle

BVSS:

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

Recommendation:

It is recommended to implement a two-step process where the owner nominates an account and the nominated account needs to call an acceptOwnership() function for the transfer of the ownership to fully succeed. This ensures the nominated EOA account is a valid and active account. This can be easily achieved by using OpenZeppelin's Ownable2Step contract instead of Ownable:

```
Listing 18: Ownable2Step.sol (Lines 52-56)
 4 pragma solidity ^0.8.0;
 6 import "./Ownable.sol";
19 abstract contract Ownable2Step is Ownable {
       event OwnershipTransferStarted(address indexed previousOwner,

    address indexed newOwner);
```

```
function pendingOwner() public view virtual returns (address)
↓ {
          return _pendingOwner;
      }
      function transferOwnership(address newOwner) public virtual

    override onlyOwner {
          emit OwnershipTransferStarted(owner(), newOwner);
      function _transferOwnership(address newOwner) internal virtual
          delete _pendingOwner;
          super._transferOwnership(newOwner);
      }
      function acceptOwnership() external {
          address sender = _msgSender();
          require(pendingOwner() == sender, "Ownable2Step: caller is
   not the new owner");
          _transferOwnership(sender);
57 }
```

Remediation Plan:

ACKNOWLEDGED: The Orion team acknowledged the risk of this issue.

4.11 (HAL-11) USE CUSTOM ERRORS INSTEAD OF REVERT STRINGS TO SAVE GAS - INFORMATIONAL (0.0)

Description:

Failed operations in several contracts are reverted with an accompanying message selected from a set of hard-coded strings.

In the EVM, emitting a hard-coded string in an error message costs ~50 more gas than emitting a custom error. Additionally, hard-coded strings increase the gas required to deploy the contract.

BVSS:

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

Recommendation:

Custom errors are available from Solidity version 0.8.4 up. Consider replacing all revert strings with custom errors. Usage of custom errors should look like this:

```
Listing 19

1 error CustomError();
2
3 // ...
4
5 if (condition)
6 revert CustomError();
```

Remediation Plan:

ACKNOWLEDGED: The Orion team acknowledged the risk of this issue.

AUTOMATED TESTING

5.1 STATIC ANALYSIS REPORT

Description:

Halborn used automated testing techniques to enhance the coverage of certain areas of the smart contracts in scope. Among the tools used was Slither, a Solidity static analysis framework. After Halborn verified the smart contracts in the repository and was able to compile them correctly into their ABIs and binary format, Slither was run against the contracts. This tool can statically verify mathematical relationships between Solidity variables to detect invalid or inconsistent usage of the contracts' APIs across the entire code-base.

Results:

```
https://github.com/crytic/slither/viki/Detector-Documentation#unchecked-transfer
ion-get Diutr256[]_init226] (contracts/vatemions/our-estranton-os-slePa.104] performs a multiplication on the result of a division:

P = (0 P * 0) / (spfi) * N COURS| (contracts/setumions/our-estranton-os-slePa.104]

= (can * S * P = N COURS| (spfi) * N (dim * 1) * 0 * N (COURS| (contracts/setumions/our-veExtension-sole) * N (dim * 1) * 0 * N (cours) * N (dim * 1) * 0 * N (cours) * N (dim * 1) * 0 * N (cours) * N (dim * 1) * 0 * N (cours) * N (dim *
```

- Arbitrary from in transferFrom issue does not pose any risk since the contract controls this value.
- Flagged ignored/unused return value does not pose any risk.
- No major issues found by Slither.

THANK YOU FOR CHOOSING

