

BASE PROTOCOL Smart Contract Security Audit

Prepared by: **Halborn**Date of Engagement: November 25th, 2020

Visit: Halborn.com

| Document Revision History | 3 |
|---|----------|
| Contacts | 3 |
| 1 Executive Summary | 4 |
| 1.1 Introduction | 4 |
| 1.2 Test Approach and Methodology | 5 |
| 1.3 SCOPE | 5 |
| 2 Assessment Summary And Findings Overview | 6 |
| 3 Findings & Technical Details | 7 |
| 3.1 Reentrancy - Critical | 8 |
| Description | 8 |
| Code Location | 8 |
| Recommendation | 9 |
| 3.2 For loop over dynamic array - Informational | 9 |
| Description | 9 |
| Code Location | 9 |
| Recommendation | 10 |
| 3.3 Use of TX.ORIGIN - Low | 10 |
| Description | 10 |
| Code Location | 10 |
| Recommendation | 10 |
| 3.4 Avoid Using Now - Low | 11 |
| Description | 11 |
| Code Location | 11 |
| Recommendation | 11 |
| 3.5 State Variable Shadowing - Informational | 12 |
| Description | 12 |
| Results | 12 |
| 3.6 Static Analysis - Critical | 12 |
| Description | 12 |
| Results | 13 |
| 3.7 Automated Security Scan - Informational | 14 |
| Description Results | 14 14 |
| | |

DOCUMENT REVISION HISTORY

| VERSION | MODIFICATION | DATE | AUTHOR |
|---------|-------------------|------------|--------------|
| 0.1 | Document Creation | 11/26/2020 | Gabi Urrutia |
| 0.2 | Document Edits | 11/28/2020 | Gabi Urrutia |
| 1.0 | Final Version | 11/30/2020 | Gabi Urrutia |
| 1.1 | Remediations | 12/01/2020 | Gabi Urrutia |

CONTACTS

| CONTACT | COMPANY | EMAIL |
|------------------|---------|------------------------------|
| Steven Walbroehl | Halborn | Steven.Walbroehl@halborn.com |
| Rob Behnke | Halborn | Rob.Behnke@halborn.com |
| Gabi Urrutia | Halborn | Gabi.Urrutia@halborn.com |

1.1 INTRODUCTION

Base Protocol engaged Halborn to conduct a security assessment on their smart contracts that implement the protocol on the Ethereum blockchain. Base Protocol is a decentralized elastic supply protocol for creating indices of other tokens. It maintains a price peg by adjusting supply directly to and from wallet holders based on a data feed generated by off-chain oracles. The security assessment was scoped to the contract BaseToken,

BaseTokenMonetaryPolicy, BaseTokenOrchestrator, Cascade and an audit of the security risk and implications regarding the changes introduced by the development team at Base Protocol prior to its production release shortly following the assessments deadline.

The most important security finding was the re-entrancy vulnerability in Cascade.sol due to the order of the calls into functions. This vulnerability was immediately fixed by Base Protocol Team and tested it again by Halborn auditors.

Overall, the smart contract code is extremely well documented, follows a high-quality software development standard, contains many utilities and automation scripts to support continuous deployment / testing / integration, and does NOT contain any obvious exploitation vectors that Halborn was able to leverage within the timeframe of testing allotted.

Though the outcome of this security audit is satisfactory; due to time and resource constraints, only testing and verification of essential properties were performed to achieve objectives and deliverables set in the scope. It is important to remark the use of the best practices for secure smart contract development. Halborn recommends performing further testing to validate extended safety and correctness in context to the whole set of contracts. External threats, such as economic attacks, oracle attacks, and inter-contract functions and calls should be validated for expected logic and state.

1.2 TEST APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

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

- Research into architecture and purpose
- Smart Contract manual code read 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.
- Scanning of solidity files for vulnerabilities, security hotspots, or bugs. (MythX)
- Static Analysis of security for scoped contract, and imported functions. (Slither)
- Testnet deployment (Localhost npx)
- Smart Contract Fuzzing and dynamic state exploitation (Echidna) Symbolic Execution / EVM bytecode security assessment (limited time)

1.3 SCOPE

Code related to:

- BaseToken.sol
- BaseTokenMonetaryPolicy.sol
- BaseTokenOrchestrastor.sol
- Cascade.sol

Specific commit of contract: Commit ID: 48d71fb86d4667c90d2f03fce8a07cce2d7d4b7e

OUT-OF-SCOPE:

External contracts, External Oracles, other smart contracts in the repository or imported by BASE protocol contracts, economic attacks

2. ASSESSMENT SUMMARY & FINDINGS OVERVIEW

| CRITICAL | HIGH | MEDIUM | LOW |
|----------|------|--------|-----|
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |

| SECURITY ANALYSIS | RISK LEVEL | Remediation Date |
|---------------------------------|---------------|-------------------|
| RE-ENTRANCY | Critical | 12/30/2020 |
| FOR LOOP OVER DYNAMIC ARRAY | Informational | - |
| USE OF TX.ORIGIN | Low | - |
| AVOID USING NOW | Low | - |
| STATE VARIABLE SHADOWING | Informational | - |
| STATIC ANALYSIS | Critical | 12/30/2020 LOW |
| AUTOMATED SECURITY SCAN RESULTS | Informational | - |

FINDINGS & TECH DETAILS

3.1 RE-ENTRANCY - CRITICAL

Description

Calling external contracts is dangerous if some functions and variables are called after the external call. An attacker could use a malicious contract to perform a recursive call before calling function and take over the control flow. **transferFrom** and **transfer** are external calls. Values are set and burn only after checking is both are the msg.sender. Thus, an attacker could perform a recursive call to execute malicious code.

Reference:

https://swcregistry.io/docs/SWC-107

Code Location

Cascade.sol Lines #76-96

```
function deposit(uint256 amount)
   public

{
   updateDepositSeconds();

uint256 allowance = lpToken.allowance(msg.sender, address(this));
   require(amount <= allowance, "allowance");

bool ok = lpToken.transferFrom(msg.sender, address(this), amount);
   require(ok, "transferFrom");

if (deposits_multiplierLevel[msg.sender] > 1) {
        burnDepositSeconds(msg.sender);
   }

totalDepositedLevel1 = totalDepositedLevel1.add(amount);

deposits_lpTokensDeposited[msg.sender] = deposits_lpTokensDeposited[msg.sender].add(amount);
   deposits_depositTimestamp[msg.sender] = now;
   deposits_multiplierLevel[msg.sender] = 1;
}
```

Cascade.sol Lines #125-138

```
function claimBASE()
public

public

updateDepositSeconds();

require(deposits_multiplierLevel[msg.sender] > 0, "doesn't exist");
require(now > deposits_mostRecentBASEWithdrawal[msg.sender].add(minTimeBetweenWithdrawals), "too soon");

uint256 owed = owedTo(msg.sender);
require(BASE.balanceOf(address(this)) >= owed, "available tokens");

bool ok = BASE.transfer(msg.sender, owed);
require(ok, "transfer");

}
```

Cascade.sol Lines #140-158

```
function withdrawLPTokens()

public

updateDepositSeconds();

claimBASE();

require(deposits_multiplierLevel[msg.sender] > 0, "doesn't exist");

require(deposits_tpTokensDeposited[msg.sender] > 0, "no stake");

bool ok = lpToken.transfer(msg.sender, deposits_lpTokensDeposited[msg.sender]);

require(ok, "transfer");

burnDepositSeconds(msg.sender);

delete deposits_lpTokensDeposited[msg.sender];

delete deposits_depositTimestamp[msg.sender];

delete deposits_multiplierLevel[msg.sender];

delete deposits_multiplierLevel[msg.sender];

delete deposits_multiplierLevel[msg.sender];

delete deposits_mostRecentBASEWithdrawal[msg.sender];

delete deposits_mostRecentBASEWithdrawal[msg.sender];

}
```

Recommendation:

As possible, external calls should be at the end of the function in order to avoiding an attacker take over the control flow.

3.2 FOR LOOP OVER DYNAMIC ARRAY

INFORMATIONAL

Description

Calls inside a loop might lead to a denial-of-service attack. The function discovered is a for loop on variable `i` that iterates up to the charityRecipients variable. If this integer is evaluated at extremely large numbers, or `i` is reset by external calling functions, this can cause a DoS.

Code Location

BaseTokenMonetaryPolicy.sol Line #170

```
for (uint256 i = 0; i < charityRecipients.length; i++) {
    address recipient = charityRecipients[i];
    uint256 recipientPercent = supplyDelta < 0 ? charityPercentOnContraction[recipient]
    if (recipientPercent == 0) {
        continue;
    }
}</pre>
```

BaseTokenOrchestrator.sol Line #57

```
for (uint i = 0; i < transactionEnabled.length; i++) {
    // Transaction storage t = transactions[i];
    if (transactionEnabled[i]) {
        bool result = externalCall(transactionDestination[i], transactionData[i]);
    if (!result) {
        emit TransactionFailed(transactionDestination[i], i, transactionData[i]);
        revert("Transaction Failed");
    }
    }
    }
    }
}</pre>
```

Recommendation:

If possible, use pull over push strategy for external calls.

3.3 USE OF TX.ORIGIN - LOW

Description

BaseTokenOrchestrator.sol uses tx.origin so that rebase() function can be called by anybody. It is recommended that you use msg.sender instead of tx.origin because if a transaction is made to a malicious wallet, when you check it you will have the origin address and you will not be able to know the address of the malicious wallet. Nevertheless, the use of tx.origin is semilegitimized for recording who calls the contract most. Furthermore, tx.origin could be used to prevent an address from interacting with your contract because the owner of the address cannot use the contract as an intermediary to circumvent your blocking. Finally, it is important to remark that the use of tx.origin will be deprecated.

Reference:

https://consensys.net/blog/blockchain-development/solidity-bestpractices-for-smart-contract-security/

Code Location

BaseTokenOrchestrator.sol Line #53

```
function rebase()
functio
```

Recommendation:

It is recommended not to use tx.origin because a malicious wallet could receive funds and cannot be tracked. However, its use is semi-legitimate in some cases with caution.

3.4 AVOID USING NOW - LOW

Description:

The use of "now" can be influenced by miners to some degree. Miners can manipulate "now" to exploit the contract. Here in BaseTokenMonetaryPolicy.sol contract, "now" is being used in inRebaseWindow() and rebase() methods.

Code Location:

Cascade.sol Lines #167, 1721, 178, 224

BaseTokenMonetaryPolicy.sol Lines #112,115

BaseTokenMonetaryPolicy.sol Line #147

BaseTokenMonetaryPolicy.sol Lines #336-337

```
function inRebaseWindow() public view returns (bool) {

return (

return (
```

Recommendation:

Avoid getting relied on use of "now" in require methods because it

could be manipulated by miners.

3.5 STATE VARIABLE SHADOWING - INFORMATIONAL

Description:

There are few state variables are getting shadowed by the child contract BaseToken.sol (_totalSupply variable) and ERC20UpgradeSafe.sol (__gap variable).

Code Location:

BaseToken.sol Line #185

```
184    __totalShares = INITIAL_SHARES;
185    __totalSupply = INITIAL_SUPPLY;
186    __shareBalances[owner()] = _totalShares;
187    __sharesPerBASE = _totalShares.div(_totalSupply);
```

ERC20UpgradeSafe.sol Line #41

```
uint256 private _totalSupply;

string private _name;

string private _symbol;

uint8 private _decimals;
```

ERC20UpgradeSafe.sol Line #317

```
317 | uint256[44] private gap;
318 }
319
```

Recommendation:

It is recommended to carefully review the variable storage design in the contracts to avoid possible ambiguities.

3.6 STATIC ANALYSIS - CRITICAL

Halborn used automated testing techniques to enhance coverage of certain areas of the scoped contract. Among the tools used was Slither, a Solidity static analysis framework. After Halborn verified all the contracts in the repository and was able to compile them correctly into their abi and binary formats, Slither was run on all contracts (BaseToken.sol, BaseTokenMonetaryPolicy.sol, BaseTokenOrchestrator.sol, Cascade.sol).

Results:

BaseToken.sol

Cascade.sol

BaseTokenMonetaryPolicy.sol

```
INFO:Detectors:
Ounbleleignedeside.__gap (monflat.sols182) shadows:
- ContextUppradeside.__gap (monflat.sols182)
ENC20Uppradeside.__gap (monflat.sols182)
ENC20Uppradeside.__gap (monflat.sols182)
Baseloken._totalsuppl (monflat.sols182)
Baseloken._totalsuppl (monflat.sols183)
Baseloken._
```

BaseTokenOrchestrator.sol

3.7 AUTOMATED SECURITY SCAN - INFORMATIONAL

Description:

Halborn used automated security scanners to assist with detection of well-known security issues, and to identify low-hanging fruit on the targets for this engagement. Among the tools used was MythX, a security analysis service for Ethereum smart contracts. MythX performed a scan on the testers machine and sent the compiled results to the analyzers to locate any vulnerabilities. Security Detections are only in scope, and the analysis was pointed towards issues with BaseTokenOrchestrator.sol and ERC20UpgradeSafe.sol.

Results:

MythX detected 0 High findings, 3 Medium, and 7 Low.

| o High | | Jh 3 Me | edium | 7 Low | |
|---------|----------|--|---------------------------|--------------|--|
| D | SEVERITY | NAME | FILE | LOCATION | |
| SWC-128 | Medium | Loop over unbounded data structure. | BaseTokenOrchestrator.sol | L: 50 C: 25 | |
| SWC-128 | Medium | Implicit loop over unbounded data structure. | BaseTokenOrchestrator.sol | L: 53 C: 70 | |
| SWC-128 | Medium | Implicit loop over unbounded data structure. | BaseTokenOrchestrator.sol | L: 89 C: 12 | |
| SWC-108 | Low | State variable visibility is not set. | BaseTokenOrchestrator.sol | L: 18 C: 11 | |
| SWC-108 | Low | State variable visibility is not set. | BaseTokenOrchestrator.sol | L: 19 C: 14 | |
| SWC-108 | Low | State variable visibility is not set. | BaseTokenOrchestrator.sol | L: 20 C: 12 | |
| SWC-115 | Low | Use of "tx.origin" as a part of authorization control. | BaseTokenOrchestrator.sol | L: 46 C: 30 | |
| SWC-131 | Low | Unused function parameter "from". | ERC20UpgradeSafe.sol | L: 315 C: 34 | |
| SWC-131 | Low | Unused function parameter "to". | ERC20UpgradeSafe.sol | L: 315 C: 48 | |
| SWC-131 | Low | Unused function parameter "amount". | ERC20UpgradeSafe.sol | L: 315 C: 60 | |

THANK YOU FOR CHOOSING

