

Entangle -Blockchain

Cosmos Security Assessment

Prepared by: Halborn

Date of Engagement: December 21st, 2023 - January 15th, 2024

Visit: Halborn.com

DOCH	MENT REVISION HISTORY	5
CONT	ACTS	5
1	EXECUTIVE OVERVIEW	6
1.1	INTRODUCTION	7
1.2	ASSESSMENT SUMMARY	7
1.3	TEST APPROACH & METHODOLOGY	8
2	RISK METHODOLOGY	9
2.1	EXPLOITABILITY	10
2.2	IMPACT	11
2.3	SEVERITY COEFFICIENT	13
2.4	SCOPE	15
3	ASSESSMENT SUMMARY & FINDINGS OVERVIEW	16
4	FINDINGS & TECH DETAILS	17
4.1	(HAL-01) MISSING CODEC HANDLER FOR DISTRIBUTOR MESSAGES - CR	
	ICAL(10)	19
	Description	19
	Code Location	19
	BVSS	20
	Recommendation	20
	Remediation Plan	20
4.2	(HAL-02) MISSING VALIDATION FOR END TIME IN ADDDISTRIBUTOR FUI TION LEADS TO EXPIRED DISTRIBUTOR - HIGH(7.5)	NC- 21
	Description	21
	Code Location	21
	Proof Of Concept	22

	BVSS	23
	Recommendation	24
	Remediation Plan	24
4.3	(HAL-03) UNHANDLED RETURN IN REMOVEADMIN FUNCTION IMPLEMENTION - HIGH(8.1)	TA- 25
	Description	25
	Code Location	25
	BVSS	25
	Recommendation	26
	Remediation Plan	26
4.4	(HAL-04) ERROR HANDLING IN ADDADMIN METHOD OF KEEPER MODULI HIGH(8.1)	E – 27
	Description	27
	Code Location	27
	BVSS	28
	Recommendation	28
	Remediation Plan	28
4.5	(HAL-05) ERROR HANDLING IN REMOVEDISTRIBUTOR METHOD OF GSERVER - HIGH(8.1)	MS- 29
	Description	29
	Code Location	29
	BVSS	30
	Recommendation	30
	Remediation Plan	30
4.6	(HAL-06) END DATE IS NOT CHECKED ON THE PROPOSALS - MEDIUM(5	.0)
	Description	31

	Code Location	31
	Proof Of Concept	32
	BVSS	33
	Recommendation	33
	Remediation Plan	33
4.7	(HAL-07) DOCKER IMAGE RUNNING AS ROOT - LOW(3.8)	34
	Description	34
	Code Location	34
	BVSS	35
	Recommendation	35
	Remediation Plan	35
4.8	(HAL-08) LACK OF SENTRY NODE INFRASTRUCTURE - LOW(3.8)	37
	Description	37
	Code Location	37
	BVSS	38
	Recommendation	38
	Remediation Plan	38
4.9	(HAL-09) LACK OF SPEC ON THE MODULE - INFORMATIONAL(0.0)	39
	Description	39
	Code Location	39
	BVSS	39
	Recommendation	39
	Remediation Plan	39
4.10	(HAL-10) OUT OF DATE GO-ETHEREUM - INFORMATIONAL(0.0)	40

	Description	40
	Code Location	40
	BVSS	41
	Recommendation	41
	Remediation Plan	41
4.11	(HAL-11) LACK OF DEBUG TRACE CALL SUPPORT - INFORMATIONAL(0. 42	0)
	Description	42
	BVSS	42
	Recommendation	42
	Remediation Plan	42
5	AUTOMATED TESTING	43
	Description	44
	Gosec - Analysis Output Sample	45
	Semgrep - Security Analysis Output Sample	45

DOCUMENT REVISION HISTORY

VERSION	MODIFICATION	DATE
0.1	Document Creation	01/12/2024
0.2	Document Updates	01/14/2024
0.3	Draft Review	01/16/2024
1.0	Remediation Plan	02/08/2024
1.1	Remediation Plan Review	02/09/2024

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

EXECUTIVE OVERVIEW

1.1 INTRODUCTION

Entangle engaged Halborn to conduct a security assessment on their modules, beginning on December 21st, 2023 and ending on January 15th, 2024. The security assessment was scoped to the sections of code that pertain to the Cosmos Appchain.

1.2 ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

The team at Halborn was provided one month for the engagement and assigned one full-time security engineer to verify the security of the merge requests. 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 the Entangle Modules operate as intended.
- Identify potential security issues with the custom modules used in the Cosmos AppChain.

In summary, Halborn identified some improvements to reduce the likelihood and impact of risks that were mostly addressed by the Entangle 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 the custom modules. While manual testing is recommended to uncover flaws in logic, process, and implementation; automated testing techniques help enhance coverage of structures 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 architecture and purpose.
- Static Analysis of security for scoped repository, and imported functions. (e.g., staticcheck, gosec, unconvert, codeql, ineffassign and semgrep)
- Manual Assessment for discovering security vulnerabilities on codebase.
- Ensuring correctness of the codebase.
- Dynamic Analysis on files and modules related to the Cosmos AppChain.

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 (AU)	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

This review was scoped to the entangle-blockchain repository.

- 1. IN-SCOPE TREE & COMMIT:
 - entangle-blockchain

Commit ID : cf6116a40ada252b2561d4e9f9d8023b4378e4fe

REMEDIATION COMMIT IDs :

- 2f9e924f95040782816d9d915d9ada0861e075ae
- dda8d04e01c0e03f2eaa221b5242379640a1e758
- 026a2a82718060c8b1034a3bf675d5fbe039f4bf
- 5312ceac9a843e782d5d892e0d52e8dd8b1f8368

3. ASSESSMENT SUMMARY & FINDINGS OVERVIEW

CRITICAL	HIGH	MEDIUM	LOW	INFORMATIONAL
1	4	1	2	3

SECURITY ANALYSIS	RISK LEVEL	REMEDIATION DATE
(HAL-01) MISSING CODEC HANDLER FOR DISTRIBUTOR MESSAGES	Critical (10)	SOLVED - 01/12/2024
(HAL-02) MISSING VALIDATION FOR END TIME IN ADDDISTRIBUTOR FUNCTION LEADS TO EXPIRED DISTRIBUTOR	High (7.5)	SOLVED - 01/12/2024
(HAL-03) UNHANDLED RETURN IN REMOVEADMIN FUNCTION IMPLEMENTATION	High (8.1)	SOLVED - 02/08/2024
(HAL-04) ERROR HANDLING IN ADDADMIN METHOD OF KEEPER MODULE	High (8.1)	SOLVED - 02/08/2024
(HAL-05) ERROR HANDLING IN REMOVEDISTRIBUTOR METHOD OF MSGSERVER	High (8.1)	SOLVED - 02/08/2024
(HAL-06) END DATE IS NOT CHECKED ON THE PROPOSALS	Medium (5.0)	SOLVED - 01/12/2024
(HAL-07) DOCKER IMAGE RUNNING AS ROOT	Low (3.8)	SOLVED - 01/12/2024
(HAL-08) LACK OF SENTRY NODE INFRASTRUCTURE	Low (3.8)	SOLVED - 02/08/2024
(HAL-09) LACK OF SPEC ON THE MODULE	Informational (0.0)	ACKNOWLEDGED
(HAL-10) OUT OF DATE GO-ETHEREUM	Informational (0.0)	ACKNOWLEDGED
(HAL-11) LACK OF DEBUG TRACE CALL SUPPORT	Informational (0.0)	ACKNOWLEDGED

FINDINGS & TECH DETAILS

4.1 (HAL-01) MISSING CODEC HANDLER FOR DISTRIBUTOR MESSAGES - CRITICAL(10)

Description:

The implementation lacks a codec handler registration for the all distributor message in the amino codec. This will lead to issues when encoding or decoding messages related to the distributor messages. To address this issue, the distributor messages should be registered in the RegisterInterfaces function. This ensures that the amino codec has the necessary handler for encoding and decoding this message type.

Code Location:

/x/distributorsauth/types/codec.go

```
Listing 1

1 package types
2
3 import (
4    "github.com/cosmos/cosmos-sdk/codec"
5    cdctypes "github.com/cosmos/cosmos-sdk/codec/types"
6    govtypes "github.com/cosmos/cosmos-sdk/x/gov/types/v1beta1"
7
8    // this line is used by starport scaffolding # 1
9    "github.com/cosmos/cosmos-sdk/types/msgservice"
10 )
11
12 func RegisterCodec(cdc *codec.LegacyAmino) {
13    // this line is used by starport scaffolding # 2
14 }
15
16 func RegisterInterfaces(registry cdctypes.InterfaceRegistry) {
17    // this line is used by starport scaffolding # 3
18
19    msgservice.RegisterMsgServiceDesc(registry, &_Msg_serviceDesc)
```

```
registry.RegisterImplementations((*govtypes.Content)(nil), & L, AddDistributorProposal{})

21

22 }

23 
24 var (

25    Amino = codec.NewLegacyAmino()

26    ModuleCdc = codec.NewProtoCodec(cdctypes.NewInterfaceRegistry L, ())

27 )
```

BVSS:

AO:A/AC:L/AX:L/C:N/I:M/A:C/D:N/Y:N/R:N/S:U (10)

Recommendation:

To address this issue, the distributor messages should be registered in the RegisterInterfaces function. This ensures that the amino codec has the necessary handler for encoding and decoding this message type.

Remediation Plan:

SOLVED: The Entangle team solved the issue by registering the codecs.

Commit ID: 2f9e924f95040782816d9d915d9ada0861e075ae

4.2 (HAL-02) MISSING VALIDATION FOR END TIME IN ADDDISTRIBUTOR FUNCTION LEADS TO EXPIRED DISTRIBUTOR - HIGH (7.5)

Description:

The AddDistributor function in the current implementation lacks validation for the EndDate parameter of a distributor. This omission can lead to scenarios where a distributor is added with an already expired EndDate, potentially causing issues in the management and operation of distributors. Without proper validation, the system might incorrectly process or recognize these distributors, leading to inconsistencies or errors in the distribution process. – Introduce a check to verify that the EndDate for a new distributor is in the future relative to the current block time.

This can be achieved by comparing msg.EndDate with ctx.BlockTime() within the AddDistributor function.

Code Location:

/x/distributorsauth/keeper/msg_server.go#L23

```
Listing 2

1 func (s msgServer) AddDistributor(goCtx context.Context, msg *
Lypes.MsgAddDistributor) (*types.MsgAddDistributorResponse, error)
Ly {
2    ctx := sdk.UnwrapSDKContext(goCtx)
3
4    err := s.checkSenderHaveAdminsWrights(ctx, msg.Sender, false)
5    if err != nil {
6        return nil, err
7    }
8
9    var DistributorInfo = types.DistributorInfo{
```

```
Address: msg.DistributorAddress,
EndDate: msg.EndDate,

ctx.BlockTime()

s.Keeper.AddDistributor(ctx, DistributorInfo)

return &types.MsgAddDistributorResponse{}, nil

19 }
```

Proof Of Concept:

```
Listing 3
 1 func (suite *KeeperTestSuite) TestAddDistributor() {
     testCases := []struct {
                        func(string)
                        string
        distributor_address string
                        uint64
     }{
           func(addr string) {
              suite.app.DistributorsAuthKeeper.AddAdmin(suite.
"ethm1cdsdkvxydypnhtec5y880qdtdexcu2ehf01pv8",
           uint64(1234),
           true,
        },
           func(addr string) {
              suite.app.DistributorsAuthKeeper.AddDistributor(
→ })
```

```
},
               uint64(1234),
               false,
           },
           {
               func(addr string) {},
               uint64(1234),
               false,
          },
       for _, tc := range testCases {
           suite.Run(tc.name, func() {
               suite.SetupTest()
               tc.malleate(tc.sender)
               _, add_err := suite.msgServer.AddDistributor(suite.ctx

↓ , &types.MsgAddDistributor{Sender: tc.sender, DistributorAddress:

  tc.distributor_address, EndDate: tc.end_date})
  GetDistributor(suite.ctx, tc.distributor_address)
               if !tc.success {
                   suite.Require().Error(err)
                   return
               }
               suite.Require().NoError(err)
               suite.Require().NoError(add_err)
               suite.Require().Equal(distr, types.DistributorInfo{

    Address: tc.distributor_address, EndDate: tc.end_date})

           })
       }
58 }
```

BVSS:

AO:A/AC:L/AX:L/C:N/I:H/A:N/D:N/Y:N/R:N/S:U (7.5)

Recommendation:

To address this issue, consider adding validation on the end date.

Remediation Plan:

SOLVED: The Entangle team solved the issue by adding validation.

Commit ID: dda8d04e01c0e03f2eaa221b5242379640a1e758

4.3 (HAL-03) UNHANDLED RETURN IN REMOVEADMIN FUNCTION IMPLEMENTATION - HIGH (8.1)

Description:

The RemoveAdmin function is currently set up to remove an admin, but it does not handle a specific error scenario adequately. This oversight could lead to silent failures in certain cases. In the event of an error in address conversion, the function exits silently, leading to a lack of clarity about whether the operation succeeded or failed.

Code Location:

/x/distributorsauth/keeper/msg_server.go#L74

```
Listing 4

1 func (s msgServer) RemoveAdmin(goCtx context.Context, msg *types.
L, MsgRemoveAdmin) (*types.MsgRemoveAdminResponse, error) {
2   ctx := sdk.UnwrapSDKContext(goCtx)
3
4   err := s.checkSenderHaveAdminsWrights(ctx, msg.Sender, true)
5   if err != nil {
6     return nil, err
7   }
8
9   s.Keeper.RemoveAdmin(ctx, msg.AdminAddress)
10
11   return &types.MsgRemoveAdminResponse{}, nil
12 }
```

BVSS:

AO:A/AC:L/AX:L/C:N/I:H/A:L/D:N/Y:N/R:N/S:U (8.1)

Recommendation:

Update the RemoveAdmin function to effectively handle any relay errors.

Remediation Plan:

SOLVED: The Entangle team solved the issue by adding return value.

Commit ID: 5312ceac9a843e782d5d892e0d52e8dd8b1f8368

4.4 (HAL-04) ERROR HANDLING IN ADDADMIN METHOD OF KEEPER MODULE - HIGH (8.1)

Description:

A potential oversight in the error handling mechanism has been observed in the AddAdmin method within our Keeper module. While the Keeper's AddAdmin function correctly handles errors, its caller method in the msgServer struct does not properly handle the error that might be returned.

The error returned by Keeper.AddAdmin is not handled in msgServer.AddAdmin. This could lead to scenarios where the function fails silently, and the admin is not added, but the caller is unaware of the failure.

Code Location:

/x/distributorsauth/keeper/msg_server.go#L69

```
Listing 5

1 func (s msgServer) AddAdmin(goCtx context.Context, msg *types.

L, MsgAddAdmin) (*types.MsgAddAdminResponse, error) {
2   ctx := sdk.UnwrapSDKContext(goCtx)
3
4   err := s.checkSenderHaveAdminsWrights(ctx, msg.Sender, true)
5   if err != nil {
6     return nil, err
7   }
8
9   var AdminInfo = types.Admin{
10     Address: msg.AdminAddress,
11     EditOption: msg.EditOption,
12   }
13
14   s.Keeper.AddAdmin(ctx, AdminInfo)
15
16   return &types.MsgAddAdminResponse{}, nil
17 }
```

BVSS:

AO:A/AC:L/AX:L/C:N/I:H/A:L/D:N/Y:N/R:N/S:U (8.1)

Recommendation:

Modify the msgServer.AddAdmin method to handle and propagate the error returned by Keeper.AddAdmin. This can be achieved by checking the error and returning it if not nil.

Remediation Plan:

SOLVED: The Entangle team solved the issue by adding return value.

Commit ID: 5312ceac9a843e782d5d892e0d52e8dd8b1f8368

4.5 (HAL-05) ERROR HANDLING IN REMOVEDISTRIBUTOR METHOD OF MSGSERVER - HIGH (8.1)

Description:

An issue has been identified in the RemoveDistributor method within the msgServer struct. The method is designed to remove a distributor from the system. However, there is a lack of error handling for the response from the RemoveDistributor function of the Keeper.

The primary concern is the absence of error handling for the Keeper. RemoveDistributor call. If an error occurs during the removal process, it is not captured or relayed back to the caller. This can lead to silent failures, where the caller is not informed if the distributor was not successfully removed.

Code Location:

/x/distributorsauth/keeper/msg_server.go#L51

```
Listing 6

1 func (s msgServer) RemoveDistributor(goCtx context.Context, msg *
L, types.MsgRemoveDistributor) (*types.MsgRemoveDistributorResponse,
L, error) {
2   ctx := sdk.UnwrapSDKContext(goCtx)
3
4   err := s.checkSenderHaveAdminsWrights(ctx, msg.Sender, false)
5   if err != nil {
6     return nil, err
7   }
8
9   s.Keeper.RemoveDistributor(ctx, msg.DistributorAddress)
10
11   return &types.MsgRemoveDistributorResponse{}, nil
12 }
```

BVSS:

AO:A/AC:L/AX:L/C:N/I:H/A:L/D:N/Y:N/R:N/S:U (8.1)

Recommendation:

Amend the msgServer.RemoveDistributor method to capture and return any errors that occur during the call to Keeper.RemoveDistributor. This involves checking for an error after the call and, if present, returning it to the caller.

Remediation Plan:

SOLVED: The Entangle team solved the issue by adding return value.

Commit ID: 5312ceac9a843e782d5d892e0d52e8dd8b1f8368

4.6 (HAL-06) END DATE IS NOT CHECKED ON THE PROPOSALS - MEDIUM (5.0)

Description:

The AddDistributor function in our existing system currently lacks critical validation for the EndDate parameter of a distributor. This gap in the validation process can lead to a situation where distributors are added with an EndDate that has already passed.

Code Location:

/x/distributorsauth/keeper/msg_server.go#L23

```
Listing 7

1 func (s msgServer) AddDistributor(goCtx context.Context, msg *
L, types.MsgAddDistributor) (*types.MsgAddDistributorResponse, error)
L, {
2    ctx := sdk.UnwrapSDKContext(goCtx)
3
4    err := s.checkSenderHaveAdminsWrights(ctx, msg.Sender, false)
5    if err != nil {
6       return nil, err
7    }
8
9    var DistributorInfo = types.DistributorInfo{
10       Address: msg.DistributorAddress,
11       EndDate: msg.EndDate,
12    }
13
14    ctx.BlockTime()
15
16    s.Keeper.AddDistributor(ctx, DistributorInfo)
17
18    return &types.MsgAddDistributorResponse{}, nil
19 }
```

Proof Of Concept:

```
Listing 8
 1 func (suite *KeeperTestSuite) TestAddDistributor() {
      testCases := []struct {
                          string
                          func(string)
                          string
         distributor_address string
                          uint64
      }{
         {
            func(addr string) {
                suite.app.DistributorsAuthKeeper.AddAdmin(suite.
"ethm1cdsdkvxydypnhtec5y880qdtdexcu2ehf01pv8",
            uint64(1234),
            true,
         },
            func(addr string) {
                suite.app.DistributorsAuthKeeper.AddDistributor(
→ })
            },
            "ethm1cdsdkvxydypnhtec5y880qdtdexcu2ehf01pv8",
            uint64(1234),
            false,
         },
            func(addr string) {},
            uint64(1234),
            false,
         },
```

```
for _, tc := range testCases {
           suite.Run(tc.name, func() {
               suite.SetupTest()
               tc.malleate(tc.sender)
               _, add_err := suite.msgServer.AddDistributor(suite.ctx

↓ , &types.MsgAddDistributor{Sender: tc.sender, DistributorAddress:

  tc.distributor_address, EndDate: tc.end_date})

    GetDistributor(suite.ctx, tc.distributor_address)

               if !tc.success {
                   suite.Require().Error(err)
                   return
               suite.Require().NoError(err)
               suite.Require().NoError(add_err)
               suite.Require().Equal(distr, types.DistributorInfo{
→ Address: tc.distributor_address, EndDate: tc.end_date})
          })
58 }
```

BVSS:

AO:A/AC:L/AX:L/C:N/I:M/A:N/D:N/Y:N/R:N/S:U (5.0)

Recommendation:

To address this issue, consider adding validation on the end date for the proposals.

Remediation Plan:

SOLVED: The Entangle team solved the issue by adding validation.

Commit ID: dda8d04e01c0e03f2eaa221b5242379640a1e758

4.7 (HAL-07) DOCKER IMAGE RUNNING AS ROOT - LOW (3.8)

Description:

Docker containers generally run with root privileges by default. This allows for unrestricted container management, meaning a user could install system packages, edit configuration files, bind privileged ports, etc. During static analysis, it was observed that the docker image is maintained through the root user.

Code Location:

Dockerfile

```
Listing 9: Dockerfile

1 FROM golang:alpine AS build-env
2
3 # Set up dependencies
4 ENV PACKAGES git build-base
5
6 # Set working directory for the build
7 WORKDIR /node
8
9 # Install dependencies
10 RUN apk add --update $PACKAGES
11 RUN apk add linux-headers
12
13 RUN apk add go
14 RUN apk add make
15
16 # ARG key_password
17
18
19 # Add source files
20 COPY . .
21
22 # Make the binary
23 RUN make build
```

```
24
25 # Final image
26 FROM alpine:3.18.5
27
28 # Install ca-certificates
29 RUN apk add --update ca-certificates jq
30 WORKDIR /node
31
32 # Copy over binaries from the build-env
33 COPY --from=build-env /node/build/entangled /usr/bin/entangled
34
35 WORKDIR /
36
37 COPY . .
38
39 RUN chmod +x run_node.sh
40
41 ENTRYPOINT ["/run_node.sh"]
```

BVSS:

AO:A/AC:L/AX:M/C:M/I:L/A:N/D:N/Y:N/R:N/S:U (3.8)

Recommendation:

It is recommended to build the Dockerfile and run the container as a non-root user.

```
Listing 10: Reference

1 USER 1001: this is a non-root user UID, and here it is assigned to the image to run the current container as an unprivileged user.

Lyappy By doing so, the added security and other restrictions mentioned to above are applied to the container.
```

Remediation Plan:

SOLVED: The Entangle team solved the issue by adding non-root user.

4.8 (HAL-08) LACK OF SENTRY NODE INFRASTRUCTURE - LOW (3.8)

Description:

The Sentry Node Architecture is an infrastructure example for DDoS mitigation on validator nodes. To mitigate the issue, multiple distributed nodes (sentry nodes) are deployed in cloud environments. With the possibility of easy scaling, it is harder to make an impact on the validator node. New sentry nodes can be brought up during a DDoS attack, and using the gossip network they can be integrated into the transaction flow.

Code Location:

Dockerfile

```
Listing 11: Dockerfile

1 FROM golang:alpine AS build-env
2
3 # Set up dependencies
4 ENV PACKAGES git build-base
5
6 # Set working directory for the build
7 WORKDIR /node
8
9 # Install dependencies
10 RUN apk add --update $PACKAGES
11 RUN apk add linux-headers
12
13 RUN apk add go
14 RUN apk add make
15
16 # ARG key_password
17
18
19 # Add source files
20 COPY . .
21
22 # Make the binary
```

```
23 RUN make build
24
25 # Final image
26 FROM alpine:3.18.5
27
28 # Install ca-certificates
29 RUN apk add --update ca-certificates jq
30 WORKDIR /node
31
32 # Copy over binaries from the build-env
33 COPY --from=build-env /node/build/entangled /usr/bin/entangled
34
35 WORKDIR /
36
37 COPY . .
38
39 RUN chmod +x run_node.sh
40
41 ENTRYPOINT ["/run_node.sh"]
```

BVSS:

AO:A/AC:L/AX:M/C:M/I:L/A:N/D:N/Y:N/R:N/S:U (3.8)

Recommendation:

Consider adding sentry node infrastructure for app-chain.

Remediation Plan:

SOLVED: The Entangle team solved the issue by designing sentry node infrastructure.

4.9 (HAL-09) LACK OF SPEC ON THE MODULE - INFORMATIONAL (0.0)

Description:

The spec file is intended to outline the common structure for the specifications within this directory. Specifications are missing from **distributor** module. This documentation is segmented into messages focused on the developer and messages directed at the end user. These messages can be displayed to the end user (the human) at the time they will interact with the module.

Code Location:

distributorsauth

BVSS:

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

Recommendation:

It is recommended that modules be fully annotated using specifications for all available functionality.

Remediation Plan:

ACKNOWLEDGED: The Entangle team acknowledged this finding.

4.10 (HAL-10) OUT OF DATE GO-ETHEREUM - INFORMATIONAL (0.0)

Description:

During the code review, It has been noticed that Go-ethereum version is not updated with the recent versions.

Example update can be seen from the following link.

Code Location:

go.mod

Listing 12: Dockerfile 1 FROM golang:alpine AS build-env 2 3 # Set up dependencies 4 ENV PACKAGES git build-base 5 6 # Set working directory for the build 7 WORKDIR /node 8 9 # Install dependencies 10 RUN apk add --update \$PACKAGES 11 RUN apk add linux-headers 12 13 RUN apk add go 14 RUN apk add make 15 16 # ARG key_password 17 18 19 # Add source files 20 COPY . . 21 22 # Make the binary 23 RUN make build 24

```
25 # Final image
26 FROM alpine:3.18.5
27
28 # Install ca-certificates
29 RUN apk add --update ca-certificates jq
30 WORKDIR /node
31
32 # Copy over binaries from the build-env
33 COPY --from=build-env /node/build/entangled /usr/bin/entangled
34
35 WORKDIR /
36
37 COPY . .
38
39 RUN chmod +x run_node.sh
40
41 ENTRYPOINT ["/run_node.sh"]
```

BVSS:

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

Recommendation:

It is recommended to update go-ethereum version.

Remediation Plan:

ACKNOWLEDGED: The Entangle team acknowledged this finding.

4.11 (HAL-11) LACK OF DEBUG TRACE CALL SUPPORT - INFORMATIONAL (0.0)

Description:

The debug_traceCall method is commonly used for transaction simulation and plays a critical role in providing detailed insights into transaction execution, especially for wallet applications. It allows users to preview the outcome of a transaction before actual execution, enhancing transparency and predictability.

BVSS:

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

Recommendation:

Consider implementing a debug trace call. A sample implementation can be seen from below :

• Debug trace call support

Remediation Plan:

ACKNOWLEDGED: The Entangle team acknowledged this finding.

AUTOMATED TESTING

Description:

Halborn used automated testing techniques to enhance coverage of certain areas of the scoped component. Among the tools used were **staticcheck**, **gosec**, **semgrep**, **unconvert**, **codeql** and **nancy**. After Halborn verified all the code and scoped structures in the repository and was able to compile them correctly, these tools were leveraged on scoped structures. With these tools, Halborn can statically verify security related issues across the entire codebase.

Gosec - Analysis Output Sample:

Semgrep - Security Analysis Output Sample:

Command:

```
Listing 13

1 semgrep --config configFile
```

Output:

```
Listing 14
     server/json_rpc.go
           receive in select block
           101 go func() {
           102
                   ctx.Logger.Info("Starting JSON-RPC server", "
 → address", config.JSONRPC.Address)
           103
                   if err := httpSrv.Serve(ln); err != nil {
                       if err == http.ErrServerClosed {
           104
                           close(httpSrvDone)
           105
           106
                           return
           107
           108
           109
```

```
    server", "error", err.Error())

         110
             [hid 8 additional lines, adjust with --max-lines-per-

    finding

          receive in select block
          440 go func() {
          441
                if err := indexerService.Start(); err != nil {
          442
          443
          444 }()
          445
          446 select {
          447 case err := <-errCh:
          448
               return err
          449 case <-time.After(types.ServerStartTime): // assume
          512 go func() {
          if err := apiSrv.Start(config.Config); err != nil {
          514
          515
          516 }()
          517
          518 select {
          519 case err := <-errCh:
                 return err
          521 case <-time.After(types.ServerStartTime): // assume</pre>
→ server started successfully
          631 go func() {
          if err := rosettaSrv.Start(); err != nil {
          633
          634
          635 }()
          636
          637 select {
```

```
638 case err := <-errCh:
         639
               return err
         640 case <-time.After(types.ServerStartTime): // assume
    testutil/network/network.go
       halborn.go.missing-unlock-before-return.missing-unlock-before

    -return

         Details: https://sg.run/18Bk
         238 return nil, fmt.Errorf("invalid chain-id: %s", cfg.
→ ChainID)
         290 return nil, err
         297 return nil, err
         306 return nil, err
         316 return nil, err
         324 return nil, err
         334 return nil, err
           _____
         357 return nil, err
         362 return nil, err
         371 return nil, err
         377 return nil, err
         385 return nil, err
         392 return nil, err
         398 return nil, err
           _____
         403 return nil, err
```

```
415 return nil, err
      421 return nil, err
      438 return nil, err
      450 return nil, err
      455 return nil, err
      463 return nil, err
      477 return nil, err
      482 return nil, err
      486 return nil, err
      497 return nil, err
      529 return nil, err
      533 return nil, err
      540 return nil, err
      550 return network, nil
testutil/network/util.go
     Details: https://sg.run/Dw8o
     110 go func() {
             if err := apiSrv.Start(val.AppConfig.Config); err
     111
     112
     113
      114 }()
      115
```

THANK YOU FOR CHOOSING

