LI.FI Security Review

Permit2Proxy

Independent Review By:

Sujith Somraaj (somraajsujith@gmail.com)

Contents

1	About Researcher	2
2	Disclaimer	2
3	Scope	2
4	Risk classification 4.1 Impact	
5	Executive Summary	3
6	6.2 Low Risk 6.2.1 Permit2Proxy is in-compatible with multiple facets that refunds native tokens to the msg.sender 6.2.2 Refund unused tokens in callDiamondWithPermit2Witness, callDiamondWithPermit2 and callDiamondWithEIP2612Signature functions	4 4 4 5
	6.3 Informational	5 5

1 About Researcher

Sujith Somraaj is a distinguished security researcher and protocol engineer with over seven years of comprehensive experience in the Web3 ecosystem.

In addition to working as an external auditor/security researcher with LI.FI, Sujith is a protocol engineer and security researcher at Superform and Spearbit.

Learn more about Sujith on sujithsomraaj.xyz

2 Disclaimer

Note that this security audit is not designed to replace functional tests required before any software release, and does not give any warranties on finding all possible security issues of that given smart contract(s) or blockchain software. i.e., the evaluation result does not guarantee against a hack (or) the non existence of any further findings of security issues. As one audit-based assessment cannot be considered comprehensive, I always recommend proceeding with several audits and a public bug bounty program to ensure the security of smart contract(s). Lastly, the security audit is not an investment advice.

This review is done independently by the reviewer and is not entitled to any of the security agencies the researcher worked / may work with.

3 Scope

· src/Periphery/Permit2Proxy.sol

4 Risk classification

Severity level	Impact: High	Impact: Medium	Impact: Low
Likelihood: high	Critical	High	Medium
Likelihood: medium	High	Medium	Low
Likelihood: low	Medium	Low	Low

4.1 Impact

High leads to a loss of a significant portion (>10%) of assets in the protocol, or significant

harm to a majority of users.

Medium global losses <10% or losses to only a subset of users, but still unacceptable.

Low losses will be annoying but bearable — applies to things like griefing attacks that can

be easily repaired or even gas inefficiencies.

4.2 Likelihood

High almost certain to happen, easy to perform, or not easy but highly incentivized

Medium only conditionally possible or incentivized, but still relatively likely

Low requires stars to align, or little-to-no incentive

4.3 Action required for severity levels

Critical Must fix as soon as possible (if already deployed)

High Must fix (before deployment if not already deployed)

Medium Should fix

Low Could fix

5 Executive Summary

Over the course of 1 days in total, LI.FI engaged with the researcher to audit the contracts described in section 3 of this document ("scope").

In this period of time a total of 4 issues were found.

Project Summary				
Project Name	LI.FI			
Repository	lifinance/contracts			
Commit Hashes	0e3debb78abcd8b611e16b039a0			
	26f54d441154841c825757fc18			
Type of Project				
Audit Timeline	September 16, 2024			
Methods	Manual Review			

Issues Found			
Critical Risk	0		
High Risk	1		
Medium Risk	0		
Low Risk	2		
Gas Optimizations	0		
Informational	1		
Total Issues	4		

6 Findings

6.1 High Risk

6.1.1 Frontrunning callDiamondWithEIP2612Signature leads to permanent loss of user funds

Context: Permit2Proxy.sol#L64

Description: The callDiamondWithEIP2612Signature function is susceptible to a frontrunning attack. Frontrunning occurs when an attacker observes a pending transaction in the transaction pool and attempts to execute their transaction with a higher gas price, effectively "frontrunning" the original transaction.

Here's the relevant code snippet:

```
function callDiamondWithEIP2612Signature(
   address tokenAddress,
   address owner,
   uint256 amount,
   uint256 deadline,
   uint8 v,
   bytes32 r,
   bytes32 s,
   address diamondAddress,
   bytes calldata diamondCalldata
) public payable {
    // ...
}
```

The callDiamondWithEIP2612Signature function allows users to bridge tokens through the LI.FI diamond contract using an EIP2612 gasless permit. However, the function parameters diamondAddress and diamondCalldata are not signed by the user and can be modified by an attacker.

An attacker can observe a pending transaction that calls <code>callDiamondWithEIP2612Signature</code> and extract the <code>tokenAddress</code>, <code>owner</code>, <code>amount</code>, <code>deadline</code>, <code>v</code>, <code>r</code>, and <code>s</code> parameters. The attacker can then create their transaction with the same parameters but modify the <code>diamondAddress</code> and <code>diamondCalldata</code> to execute a different action or transfer the tokens to a different address.

By submitting the attacker's transaction with a higher gas price, the attacker can potentially frontrun the original transaction and execute their malicious action before it is processed.

Recommendation: Consider accepting a signature from the owner approving the diamondAddress / diamond-CallData.

LI.FI: Fixed in 0e3debb78abcdf9a9f934115338b611e16b039a0

Researcher: Verified.

6.2 Low Risk

6.2.1 Permit2Proxy is in-compatible with multiple facets that refunds native tokens to the msg. sender

Context: Permit2Proxy.sol#L17

Description: The Permit2Proxy contract does not have a receive() function to accept native refunds from the Diamond contract. Therefore, the contract might be incompatible with some facets that refund excess native.

Facets that refund native tokens to msg.sender include, DeBridgeDlnFacet, DeBridgeFacet, MakerTeleport-Facet, MultichainFacet, NXTPFacet, SynapseBridgeFacet, WormholeFacet, AcrossFacet, AllBridgeFacet, ArbitrumBridgeFacet, CBridgeFacet, CelerCircleBridgeFacet, CircleBridgeFacet, GenericSwapFacet, GnosisBridgeFacet, GnosisBridgeL2Facet, HopFacet, HyphenFacet, LIFuelFacet, MayanFacet, OmniBridgeFacet, PolygonBridgeFacet, SquidFacet, StargateFacet, StargateFacetV2, SymbiosisFacet, ThorSwapFacet and SwapperV2.

Hence, the user's native token estimates should be 100% accurate for using the Permit2Proxy contract rather than the built-in refunding mechanism of the Diamond contract.

Recommendation: Consider adding a receive() function and forward the refunded native tokens to the user.

LI.FI: Fixed in 976966de7ba14d1782904ebe7bad1b3fd2e79281

Researcher: Verified. The refunding mechanism added can help retrieve refunded tokens & also accept refunds from the diamond contract.

6.2.2 Refund unused tokens in callDiamondWithPermit2Witness, callDiamondWithPermit2 **and** callDiamondWithEIP2612Signature **functions**

Context: Permit2Proxy.sol#L72, Permit2Proxy.sol#L115, Permit2Proxy.sol#L147

Description: The Permit2Proxy contract transfers assets from the users to themselves before forwarding arbitrary call data to the LI.FI diamond. However, the contract doesn't account for the dust left in it, which a new user could steal.

Recommendation: Consider refunding any dust after the execution of calldata to all the functions mentioned above.

```
function callDiamondWithEIP2612Signature(
   address tokenAddress,
   uint256 amount,
   uint256 deadline,
   uint8 v,
   bytes32 r,
   bytes32 s,
   bytes calldata diamondCalldata
) public payable returns (bytes memory) {
+ uint256 balanceBefore = IERC20(tokenAddress).balanceOf(address(this));
   .....
+ uint256 balanceAfter = IERC20(tokenAddress).balanceOf(address(this));
+ IERC20(tokenAddress).transfer(msg.sender, balanceAfter - balanceBefore);
}
```

LI.FI: Acknowledged.

6.3 Informational

6.3.1 Remove unused imports in Permit2Proxy

Context: Permit2Proxy.sol#L5, Periphery/Permit2Proxy.sol#L8

Description: The Permit2Proxy contract imports two contracts, TransferrableOwnership andSafeERC20, but is not used anywhere in the code.

Recommendation: Consider removing the unused import.

LI.FI: Fixed in 3eaf8ba32972a9bfd78ab0c16d6998bfa97a46c0

Researcher: Verified.