

Arbitrum

Security assessment by HashEye · prepared for Blockchain

HASHEYE AUDITED

PROJECT	Arbitrum
CLIENT	Blockchain
CATEGORY	Offchain Labs
PUBLISHED	September 1, 2021
REPORT ID	research-arbitrum-2021-09-01-xp7016

This report was produced under HashEye's layered review process – **automated detection**, **pattern correlation**, and **senior manual verification** – with every finding signed off by a human reviewer. Full findings detail and on-chain attestation are available on the report page at hashey.io/audits/research-arbitrum-2021-09-01-xp7016.

ArbitrumTokenBridgeCreator SecurityAssessment(SummaryReport) July29,2024 Preparedfor:
HarryKalodner,StevenGoldfeder,andEdFelten OffchainLabs
Preparedby:JaimeIglesias,TroySargent,GustavoGrieco,andKurtWillis

About hashey Founded in 2012 and headquartered in New York, hashey provides technical security assessment and advisory services to some of the world's most targeted organizations. We combine high-end security research with a real-world attacker mentality to reduce risk and fortify code. With 100+ employees around the globe, we've helped secure critical software elements that support billionsofendusers, including Kubernetes and the Linux kernel. We maintain an exhaustive list of publications at <https://github.com/hashey-io/publications>, with links to papers, presentations, public audit reports, and podcast appearances. In recent years, hashey consultants have showcased cutting-edge research through presentations at CanSecWest, HCSS, Devcon, Empire Hacking, GrrCon, LangSec, NorthSec, the O'Reilly Security Conference, PyCon, REcon, Security BSides, and SummerCon. We specialize in software testing and code review projects, supporting client organizations in the technology, defense, and finance industries, as well as government entities. Notable clients include HashiCorp, Google, Microsoft, Western Digital, and Zoom. hashey also operates a center of excellence with regard to blockchain security. Notable projects include audits of Algorand, Bitcoin SV, Chainlink, Compound, Ethereum 2.0, MakerDAO, Matic, Uniswap, Web3, and Zcash.

To keep up to date with our latest news and announcements, please follow hashey on Twitter and explore our public repositories at <https://github.com/hashey-io>. To engage us directly, visit our "Contact" page at <https://www.hashey.io/contact>, or email us at info@hashey.io. hashey, Inc. 497 Carroll St., Space 71, Seventh Floor Brooklyn, NY 11215 <https://www.hashey.io> info@hashey.io hashey 10ffchainLabsSecurityAssessment PUBLIC

Notices and Remarks Copyright and Distribution ©2024 by hashey, Inc.

All rights reserved. hashey hereby asserts its right to be identified as the creator of this report in the United Kingdom.

This report is considered by hashey to be public information; it is licensed to Offchain Labs under the terms of the project statement of work and has been made public at Offchain Labs' request. Material within this report may not be reproduced or distributed in part or in whole without the express written permission of hashey.

This is the sole canonical source for hashey publications; the hashey Publications page.

Reports accessed through any source other than that page may have been modified and should not be considered authentic. Test Coverage Disclaimer

All activities undertaken by hashey in association with this project were performed in accordance with a statement of work and agreed upon project plan. Security assessment projects are time-boxed and often reliant on information that may be

provided by a client, its affiliates, or its partners. As a result, the findings documented in this report should not be considered a comprehensive list of security issues, flaws, or defects in the target system or codebase.

hashey uses automated testing techniques to rapidly test the controls and security properties of software. These techniques augment our manual security review work, but each has its limitations: for example, a tool may not generate a random edge case that violates a property or may not fully complete its analysis during the allotted time. Their use is also limited by the time and resource constraints of a project. hashey 20ffchainLabsSecurityAssessment PUBLIC

Table of Contents About hashey 1 Notices and Remarks 2 Table of Contents 3 Project Summary 4 Project Targets 5 Executive Summary 6 Summary of Findings 7 Detailed Findings 8

1. L2 runtime code does not contain constructor code 8 2. L2 token bridge contract deployment can be griefed 10

3. Incorrect L2 Multicall address predicted 13 4. Rollup owner is assumed to be an EOA 15

5. Depositing before the token bridge is fully deployed can result in loss of funds 17

6. Dangerous aliasing assumption 19 7. Unclear decimal unit of provided amounts 21

8. Token values in DeployHelper are not adjusted to token decimals 23 A. Vulnerability Categories 24

B. Fix Review Results 27 Detailed Fix Review Results 28 hashey 30ffchainLabsSecurityAssessment PUBLIC

Project Summary Contact Information The following project manager was associated with this project:

Mary O'Brien, Project Manager mary.obrien@hashey.io

The following engineering director was associated with this project:

Josselin Feist, Engineering Director, Blockchain josselin.feist@hashey.io

The following consultants were associated with this project: Troy Sargent, Consultant Kurt Wilis, Consultant troy.sargent@hashey.io, kurt.wilis@hashey.io, Gustavo Grieco, Consultant Jaime Iglesias, Consultant gustavo.grieco@hashey.io, jaime.iglesias@hashey.io

Project Timeline
The significant events and milestones of the project are listed below.

Date	Event
December 4, 2023	Pre-project kickoff call
December 18, 2023	Delivery of report draft
December 18, 2023	Report readout meeting
July 29, 2024	Delivery of summary report

Project Targets The engagement involved a review and testing of the targets listed below.

Token	Bridge	Contracts	Private PR#	Repository	Version	PR#	Type	Solidity	Platform	EVM	Assessment	Public																									
token-bridge-contracts-private	PR#16	Repository	https://github.com/OffchainLabs/token-bridge-contracts-private/pull/16	Version	PR#16	(ca71072...ed24e1e)	Type	Solidity	Platform	EVM	token-bridge-contracts-private	PR#21	Repository	https://github.com/OffchainLabs/token-bridge-contracts-private/pull/21	Version	PR#21	(b2e62e1...3c90260)	Type	Solidity	Platform	EVM	nitro-contracts	PR#100	Repository	https://github.com/OffchainLabs/nitro-contracts/pull/100	Version	PR#100	(b455c31...645e51d)	Type	Solidity	Platform	EVM	hashey	50	OffchainLabs	Security Assessment	PUBLIC

Executive Summary: Engagement Overview

Offchain Labs engaged Hashey to review the security of its Token Bridge Creator. From December 4 to December 12, 2023, a team of three consultants began a security review of the Token Bridge Creator's source code. From December 13 to December 15, 2023, a team of three consultants began a security review of a PR to the Nitro contract's codebase.

Observations and Impact
Token Bridge Creator is a set of smart contracts used for the atomic and permissionless deployment of token bridge contracts on top of an existing rollup. Its main use-case is to make deployment and/or configuration of Orbit L3 chains more convenient. The contract can be used for both L1 > L2 and L2 > L3 setups.

Additionally, we reviewed a number of small changes to the Nitro Contracts codebase. In total, we uncovered eight issues, most of which are related to assumptions made by the design of the protocol. One high-severity issue, TOB-ARB-TBC-002, could allow a malicious actor to grieve the deployment of a bridge. This issue and others were resolved during the fix review.

Summary of Findings The table below summarizes the findings of the review, including type and severity details.

ID	Title	Type	Severity
1	L2 runtime code does not contain constructor code	Access Controls	Informational
2	L2 token bridge contract deployment can be grieved	Denial of Service	High
3	Incorrect L2 Multicall address predicted	Configuration	Low
4	Rollup owner is assumed to be an EOA	Data Validation	Informational
5	Depositing before the token bridge is fully deployed can result in loss of funds	Data Validation	Medium
6	Dangerous aliasing assumption	Data Validation	Low
7	Unclear decimal units of provided amounts	Data Validation	Low
8	Token values in DeployHelper are not adjusted to token decimals	Data Validation	Medium

Detailed Findings

1. L2 runtime code does not contain constructor code. Severity: Informational Difficulty: High
Type: Access Controls Finding ID: TOB-ARB-TBC-001 Target: contracts/tokenbridge/arbitrum/L2AtomicTokenBridgeFactory.sol

Description: Contracts that are being deployed to L2 via retryable ticket on L1 do not include information on their creation code. This can be dangerous and lead to inconsistencies in state. The contracts deployed to L2 are encoded in the L1TokenBridgeRetryableSender's sendRetryable function.

```
bytes memory data = abi.encodeCall(L2AtomicTokenBridgeFactory.deployL2Contracts, (L2RuntimeCode(L2.routerTemplate.code, L2.standardGatewayTemplate.code, L2.customGatewayTemplate.code, L2.wethGatewayTemplate.code, L2.wethTemplate.code, L2.upgradeExecutorTemplate.code, L2.multicallTemplate.code), L1.router, L1.standardGateway, L1.customGateway, L1.wethGateway, L1.weth, L2.standardGatewayAddress, rollupOwner, aliasedL1UpgradeExecutor));
```

Figure 1.1: The L2 contracts' template code is included in a retryable TX. (L1TokenBridgeRetryableSender.sol)

In order to deploy the code on the L2 side, a generic constructor code is used to deploy the given runtime code.

```
// create L2 router logic and upgrade address router logic = create2.deploy(0, OrbitSalts.UNSALTED, CreationCodeHelper.getCreationCodeFor(runtimeCode));
```

Figure 1.2: The L1 provided runtime code is wrapped with a generic constructor code. (L2AtomicTokenBridgeFactory.sol)

The effect is that the original constructor is stripped away, which can be dangerous and lead to errors. For example, this could result in the removal of disabling initializers for proxy implementations, or it could lead to referencing invalid addresses on L2 due to immutable addresses included in the runtime code that were valid on L1 (e.g., corrupting the DelegateCallAware's onlyDelegated modifier).

Exploit Scenario
In another upgrade, an implementation contract that is deployed on L2 is left uninitialized. A malicious user initializes the implementation and disables self-destruct. Recommendations: Short term, consider passing in the contract's creation code instead of the runtime code.

Longterm, ensure that all proxy and logic contracts are initialized correctly by adding
further tests to any kind of contract deployed via a ticket. hashey 90ffchainLabsSecurityAssessment PUBLIC

2. L2 token bridge contract deployment can be griefed Severity: High Difficulty: Medium
Type: Denial of Service Finding ID: TOB-ARB-TBC-002 Target:
contracts/tokenbridge/arbitrum/L2AtomicTokenBridgeFactory.sol Description
The retryable ticket deploying the L2 token bridge contracts can fail if the call is front-run
resulting in a blocked state. When creating the token bridge, L1AtomicTokenBridgeCreator
sends out two retryable tickets, one for creating the L2AtomicTokenBridgeFactory contract and one for calling
L2AtomicTokenBridgeFactory.deployL2Contracts. These tickets are expected to be
atomic in the sense that they are all executed together and guaranteed to succeed.
However, once both retryable tickets are created and pending, a malicious user has the
chance to manually redeem the first ticket, creating the L1AtomicTokenBridgeCreator,
and then insert a transaction before the second ticket is redeemed. If the user includes a call to
L2AtomicTokenBridgeFactory.deployL2Contracts from any account other than the expected
L1TokenBridgeRetryableSender, then the L2 contracts will be deployed at non-
canonical addresses and will not match the addresses stored in the contract.
The L2 contract addresses are dependent on the sender. This can be seen in the _getProxyAddress
function, which computes the address of a TransparentUpgradeableProxy that is deployed by the
L2AtomicTokenBridgeFactory using create2 given the salt calculated from the prefix,
the chain ID, and the sender. This sender is expected to be the L1TokenBridgeRetryableSender.
function _getProxyAddress(bytes memory prefix, uint256 chainId) internal view returns (address) {
return Create2.computeAddress(_getL2Salt(prefix, chainId), keccak256(abi.encodePacked(
type(TransparentUpgradeableProxy).creationCode, abi.encode(hashey
100ffchainLabsSecurityAssessment PUBLIC

canonicalL2FactoryAddress, _predictL2ProxyAdminAddress(chainId), bytes("")))) },
canonicalL2FactoryAddress); } // ...
function _getL2Salt(bytes memory prefix, uint256 chainId) internal view returns (bytes32) { return keccak256(
abi.encodePacked(prefix, chainId, AddressAliasHelper.applyL1ToL2Alias(address(retryableSender))))
); } Figure 2.1: The L2 proxy address is computed. (L1AtomicTokenBridgeCreator.sol) The deployL2Contracts
function can therefore be kept permissionless—since only the deployments coming from the
L1TokenBridgeRetryableSender are considered the

canonical ones for the rollup. However, some of the contracts are deployed independently
of the caller, at fixed addresses using an unsalted create2 call, such as the UpgradeExecutor logic contract.
// CreateUpgradeExecutorLogic and upgrade to it. address upExecutorLogic = Create2.deploy(
0, OrbitSalts.UNSALTED, CreationCodeHelper.getCreationCodeFor(runtimeCode));
Figure 2.2: The upgrade executor logic is deployed at a fixed address on L2. (L2AtomicTokenBridgeFactory.sol)
As the address is fixed, the contract cannot be redeployed to the same address once it has
already been created. This essentially blocks any further calls to deployL2Contracts. In
particular, this means that it is possible to block the second retryable ticket (coming from the
L1TokenBridgeRetryableSender) that deploys the contracts at the precomputed
addresses. The result is a mismatch in the stored deployment addresses, requiring a manual recovery.
Exploit Scenario Bob, a malicious user, waits for the rollup owner to call createTokenBridge, starting the
token bridge deployment process. On the rollup chain, Bob then manually redeems the
first ticket, which creates the L2 token bridge factory, and then calls deployL2Contracts hashey
110ffchainLabsSecurityAssessment PUBLIC

from his own address. The rollup owner is not aware that their call fails. After many failed
bridging attempts, the issue is discovered. The bridged funds are stuck, and the rollup
owner is unable to recreate the L2 token bridge contracts via createTokenBridge. Recommendations
Short term, ensure that the L2 bridge contract creation does not end up being blocked.
Either deploy the currently unsalted contracts using create1 or make the create2 salt
dependent on the sender by using _getL2Salt(OrbitSalts.UNSALTED).
Long term, critically examine whether the assumptions—such as sending multiple retryable tickets being atomic—
are always valid and whether these can be exploited. hashey 120ffchainLabsSecurityAssessment PUBLIC

3. Incorrect L2 Multicall address predicted Severity: Low Difficulty: Low Type: Configuration Finding ID: TOB-
ARB-TBC-003 Target: contracts/tokenbridge/ethereum/L1AtomicTokenBridgeCreator.sol Description
The calculation of the deployment address for the L2 Multicall is incorrect. The code for createTokenBridge
predicts that the address of Multicall will be deployed on the L2 using the codehash value of the Multicall
template. function _predictL2Multicall(uint256 chainId) internal view returns (address) {
return Create2.computeAddress(_getL2Salt(OrbitSalts.L2_MULTICALL, chainId),
L2MulticallTemplate.codehash, canonicalL2FactoryAddress); }
Figure 3.1: The L2 Multicall address is predicted (L1AtomicTokenBridgeCreator.sol) A contract's codehash is the
keccak256 hash of the contract's runtime code. The create2

```

opcode, compute the address using the contract's creation code. The Multicall
contract is created using a retryable ticket containing the runtime code and wraps it with a generic creation code.
// deploy multicall Create2.deploy( 0, _getL2Salt(OrbitSalts.L2_MULTICALL),
CreationCodeHelper.getCreationCodeFor(L2Code.multicall) );
Figure 3.2: The Multicall contract is deployed on L2 using create2 ( L2AtomicTokenBridgeFactory.sol )
This disparity causes the createTokenBridge contract to predict an incorrect address for the L2 Multicall
contract. It is worth noting that this issue was not discovered during testing because the tests do not
check the initialization of the L2Multicall contract properly; etherj's getCode returns hashey
130ffchainLabsSecurityAssessment PUBLIC
" 0x" when the account has no code instead of returning empty bytes( "" ). Therefore, the expect
statement in figure 3.3 passes for a non-deployed contract (i.e., because " 0x".length > 0 ).
async function checkL2MulticallInitialization(l2Multicall: ArbMulticallL2){
// check L2Multicall is deployed const l2MulticallCode = await l2Provider.getCode(l2Multicall.address)
expect(l2MulticallCode.length).to.be.gt(0) } Figure 3.3: The Multicall contract initialization unit test
( tokenBridgeDeploymentTest.ts ) Exploit Scenario A user makes RPC Multicalls
on the rollup using the address stored in the L1 contract. However, the RPC calls fail because the Multicall
address is invalid. Recommendations
Short term, fix the pre-computed address calculation or consider using the contract creation code directly.
function _predictL2Multicall(uint256 chainId) internal view returns(address){
return Create2.computeAddress( _getL2Salt(OrbitSalts.L2_MULTICALL, chainId),
keccak256(CreationCodeHelper.getCreationCodeFor(L2MulticallTemplate.code)),
canonicalL2FactoryAddress ); } Figure 3.3: The L2Multicall address prediction is fixed
Long term, include end-to-end tests checking that the computed address actually matches
the deployed address. Additionally, consider checking that the actual deployed code
matches the expected template instead of checking whether or not the address has code.
Finally, whenever an external API (e.g., etherjs) is used, it is of utmost importance to check
the documentation to ensure that the values returned by the functions are the expected ones. hashey
140ffchainLabsSecurityAssessment PUBLIC

```

4. Rollup owner is assumed to be an EOA Severity: Informational Difficulty: High
Type: Data Validation Finding ID: TOB-ARB-TBC-004 Target:
contracts/tokenbridge/ethereum/{L1AtomicTokenBridgeCreator, L2AtomicTokenBridgeFactory}.sol
Description The rollup owner is currently assumed to be an EOA (externally owned account); however,
this is neither explicitly checked nor verified.
Some proxy logic contracts must first be initialized to protect against an unexpected
initialization that can cause the execution of critical operations (e.g., selfdestruct).
// sweep the balance to send the retryable and refund the difference
// it is known that any eth previously in this contract can be extracted
// tho it is not expected that this contract will have any eth
retryableSender.sendRetryable({value: isUsingFeeToken?0:address(this).balance})({ RetryableParams(
inbox, canonicalL2FactoryAddress, msg.sender, msg.sender, maxGasForContracts, gasPriceBid),
L2TemplateAddresses(L2RouterTemplate, L2StandardGatewayTemplate, L2CustomGatewayTemplate,
isUsingFeeToken?address(0):L2WethGatewayTemplate, isUsingFeeToken?address(0):L2WethTemplate,
address(L1Templates.upgradeExecutor), L2MulticallTemplate), L1Deployment,
L2Deployment.standardGateway, rollupOwner, msg.sender,
AddressAliasHelper.applyL1ToL2Alias(upgradeExecutor), isUsingFeeToken); hashey
150ffchainLabsSecurityAssessment PUBLIC

Figure 4.1: The rollup owner address is passed as a parameter to the retryable ticket (L1AtomicTokenBridgeCreator.sol)
The address is then included as an executor role in the upgrade executor contract. // init upgrade executor
address[] memory executors = new address[](2); executors[0] = rollupOwner;
executors[1] = aliasedL1UpgradeExecutor;
IUpgradeExecutor(canonicalUpgradeExecutor).initialize(canonicalUpgradeExecutor, executors);
Figure 4.2: The rollup owner is given the executor role in the upgrade executor (L2AtomicTokenBridgeFactory.sol)
This implicitly assumes that the rollup owner will always be an EOA, as otherwise, if it was a
contract, the address would be aliased to an L2 address. If this were the case, it would not
be able to make the calls to the upgrade executor, because it has stored the unaliased L1 address.
This assumption is not clearly stated and not verified on-chain. In order to prevent
centralization issues, the rollup's owners should be expected to be a time-lock-controlled multisig contract.
Exploit Scenario A multisig rollup owner creates a token bridge. The rollup owner is added as an executor to
the upgrade executor. However, the owner is now unable to make any upgrade calls
because the unaliased address has been stored. Recommendations
Short term, document the assumption that the rollup owner is expected to be an EOA and
consider explicitly checking whether or not the rollup owner is a contract. Additionally, both

the aliased and unaliased addresses could begin executing or control in the upgrade executor. Longterm, revisit assumptions that may not be explicitly stated; include explicit checks for these, or ensure that a non-expected scenario is created. hashey 160ffchainLabsSecurityAssessment PUBLIC

5. Depositing before the token bridge is fully deployed can result in loss of funds
Severity: Medium Difficulty: High Type: Data Validation Finding ID: TOB-ARB-TBC-005 Target: contracts/tokenbridge/ethereum/L1AtomicTokenBridgeCreator.sol Description
If a user triggers a deposit in the L1 side of the token bridge before it is fully deployed, their deposit will not be executed as expected, and their funds will not be minted on the L2. Token bridge creation relies on the usage of two retryable tickets that will correctly setup the L2 side of the bridge. `/** *@notice Deploy and initialize token bridge, both L1 and L2 sides, as part of a single TX. *@dev This is a single entry point of L1 token bridge creator. Function deploys L1 side of token bridge and then uses *2 retryable tickets to deploy L2 side. 1st retryable deploys L2 factory. And then 'retryable sender' contract *is called to issue 2nd retryable which deploys and initializes the rest of the contracts. L2 chain is determined *by 'inbox' parameter. * *Token bridge can be deployed only once for certain inbox. Any further calls to 'createTokenBridge' will revert *because L1 salts are already used at that point and L1 contracts are already deployed at canonical addresses *for that inbox. */` Figure 5.1: Documentation on the deployment of the token bridge (L1AtomicTokenBridgeCreator.sol)

However, if the both tickets are not immediately redeemed, a deposit from the L1 will produce an incomplete deposit in L2. Exploit Scenario
Alice starts the process of the token bridge deployment. A spike in the L2 activity causes the retryable tickets not to execute immediately. Bob is eager to use the L2, so he quickly deposits into the token bridge, even though the bridge is not fully deployed yet. If Bob's hashey 170ffchainLabsSecurityAssessment PUBLIC

retryable ticket with the deposit is executed before the L2 of the bridge is ready, the retryable ticket will call an empty account and it will not revert, leaving Bob without the L2 counterpart of his tokens. Recommendations Short term, consider adding a front-end check to verify that the L2 counterpart deployment has succeeded. Provide a clear error to the client that the token bridge is not yet fully deployed yet and that any deposit will result in loss of funds. Long term, review the assumptions of the token bridge during its usage to ensure that the new deployment will not break any of them. hashey 180ffchainLabsSecurityAssessment PUBLIC

6. Dangerous aliasing assumption Severity: Low Difficulty: Medium Type: Data Validation Finding ID: TOB-ARB-TBC-006 Target: nitro-contracts/src/bridge/AbsInbox.sol Description Applying the L1-to-L2 alias for user-provided addresses depends on L1 contracts, which can cause aliasing addresses to point to invalid addresses. Both the `excessFeeRefundAddress` and the `callValueRefundAddress` - two addresses that the user provides when `createRetryableTicket` is called - are aliased depending on whether the L1 address contains code.
`// if a refund address is a contract, we apply the alias to it // so that it can access its funds on the L2
// since the beneficiary and other refund addresses don't get rewritten by arb-os
if (AddressUpgradeable.isContract(excessFeeRefundAddress)) { excessFeeRefundAddress = AddressAliasHelper.applyL1ToL2Alias(excessFeeRefundAddress); }
if (AddressUpgradeable.isContract(callValueRefundAddress)) {
// this is the beneficiary. be careful since this is the address that can cancel the retryable in the L2
callValueRefundAddress = AddressAliasHelper.applyL1ToL2Alias(callValueRefundAddress); }`

Figure 6.1: Aliasing of user-provided addresses (AbsInbox.sol)
Because it is not possible to reliably determine whether the user wants to use an aliased or unaliased version of a given L2 address, this step can lead to mistakes by erroneously applying an alias where it was not expected. This could cause the refund to be sent to a non-existent address on L2, where it could be recovered only from its L1 counterpart, which could be an immutable contract. Exploit Scenario The following events occur: • Alice (EOA) deploys a random token contract using nonce 0 at address 0xabc on L1. • Alice also deploys a multisig contract using nonce 0 at address 0xabc on L2. hashey 190ffchainLabsSecurityAssessment PUBLIC

• Alice creates a retryable ticket and specifies the `callValueRefundAddress` as the L2 multisig (at 0xabc). • The alias check converts 0xabc to a non-existent address on L2 due to the unrelated L1 token contract. • Only L1 token contract is able to recover funds, but it does not contain logic to do so, as it is an immutable token contract. Recommendations Short term, clearly document the behavior and make it clear to a user that an alias will apply in certain cases. Consider not making any assumptions on behalf of the user and include off-chain checks and validations in a web app. Long term, consider adding further on-chain checks to ensure that the L1 contract is able

7.Uncleardecimalunitsofprovidedamounts Severity:LowDifficulty:Medium
Type:DataValidationFindingID:TOB-ARB-TBC-007 Target: nitro-contracts/src/bridge/AbsInbox.sol
Description Whencreatingaretryabletickets,thecallermustprovidemultipletokenvaluesinvarious
units,whichcouldbepronetotoerrors. The createRetryableTicket
functionrequirestheusertoprovidevariousparametersin differentunits. function_createRetryableTicket(
addresssto, uint256l2CallValue, uint256maxSubmissionCost, addressexcessFeeRefundAddress,
addresscallValueRefundAddress, uint256gasLimit, uint256maxFeePerGas, uint256amount,
bytescallData)internalreturns(uint256){ //ensuretheuser'sdepositalonewillmakesubmissionsucceed
uint256amountToBeMintedOnL2=_fromNativeTo18Decimals(amount);
if(amountToBeMintedOnL2<(maxSubmissionCost+l2CallValue+gasLimit* maxFeePerGas)){
revertInsufficientValue(maxSubmissionCost+l2CallValue+gasLimit*maxFeePerGas, amountToBeMintedOnL2
); } //...) Figure7.1:The _createRetryableTicket function(AbsInbox.sol) Theparameter amount
isgiveninthenativetoken'sdecimalunits.Theparameters l2CallValue , maxSubmissionCost ,and
maxFeePerGas aredenominatedusing18 decimalunits. hashey 210ffchainLabsSecurityAssessment PUBLIC

NeithertheparameternamesnortheNatSpeccommentssuggestthatthevaluesaregiven
indifferingunits,whichcancausemistakesinintegration. ExploitScenario Anoptimisticcross-
chainbridgeandAMMprotocolisbuiltontopofArbitrum.When integratingwithanOrbitchainwithnon-
standarddecimals,theincorrectdecimalunitsare
hardcodedintothetokenhandlercontract,causingvalueshataretoohighbesentto
theOrbitchainwhenbridgingthenativetoken. Recommendations
Shortterm,considermakingacleardistinctionbetweentheunitsdependingonthechain.
Forexample,onL1,allvalueswillalwaysbedenominatedinthenativetoken'sdecimal
units,andonL2,allvalueswillalwaysbedenominatedusing18decimalpoints.
Longterm,beawareofconfusionsthatcanarisewhenassumptionsintheAPIarenot
clearlydocumented.Aimto removetheriskofmistakesbyfocusingonclearusabilitywhen
interactingwiththebridgecontracts. hashey 220ffchainLabsSecurityAssessment PUBLIC

8.TokenvaluesinDeployHelperarenotadjustedtotokendecimals Severity:MediumDifficulty:Medium
Type:DataValidationFindingID:TOB-ARB-TBC-008 Target: nitro-contracts/src/rollup/DeployHelper.sol
Description The DeployHelper contractdeployshelpercontractstotheL2chainthroughretryable
ticketscontaininghard-codedvalueshatcouldbechain-andtokendecimal-dependent.
Certainhelpercontractscanbedeployedinthe DeployHelper contractaspartofthe
rollupcreationprocess.Thesehelpercontractsaresentviasignedtransactions.
//Nick'sCREATE2DeterministicDeploymentProxy //https://github.com/Arachnid/deterministic-deployment-
proxy addresspublicconstantNICK_CREATE2_DEPLOYER= 0x3fAB184622Dc19b6109349B94811493BF2a45362;
uint256publicconstantNICK_CREATE2_VALUE=0.01ether;
bytespublicconstantNICK_CREATE2_PAYLOAD=hex"04f8a58085174876e80083..."; Figure8.1:AliasingofUser-
providedaddresses(AbsInbox.sol)
Before sendingthesel2transactions,aretryableticketisfirstcreatedinordertofundthe deployeraddress.
uint256feeAmount=_value+submissionCost+GASLIMIT*maxFeePerGas; //fundthetargetL2address
if(!_isUsingFeeToken){ IERC20Inbox(inbox).createRetryableTicket({ to:_l2Address, l2CallValue:_value,
maxSubmissionCost:submissionCost, excessFeeRefundAddress:msg.sender,
callValueRefundAddress:msg.sender, gasLimit:GASLIMIT, maxFeePerGas:maxFeePerGas,
tokenTotalFeeAmount:feeAmount, data:" }); }else{
Figure8.2:Thetokentotalfeeamountisbeingcalculated(DeployHelper.sol) hashey
230ffchainLabsSecurityAssessment PUBLIC

ThefeeamountiscomputedinordertocovertheL2value,thesubmissioncost(0 inthe
caseofusingafeetoken),andtheretryableTXgascost. Whencreatingaretryableticket,thetokenTotalFeeAmount
parameterisexpectedtobe
giveninthenativetokendecimalunits,asitisconvertedto18decimals.Thismeansthatif
thecustomfeetoken'sdecimalsdiffer,thentheactualtokenvaluethatissentwillbe
miscalculated.Whenthebridgereceivesatokenvaluethatistoolittle,itwilltransferthe missingfundsfrom
msg.sender (DeployHelper),causingthetransactiontorevert. ExploitScenario
Alicecreatesanewrollupwithhercustomfeetokenthatusesixdecimalpoints.When
deployingthehelpercontracts,duetothemiscalculation,the Inbox requestsalarge amountoftokens(0.01e18*
(1e18-1e6)=10Mtokens)fromthe DeployHelper .Asthe DeployHelper
hasnotgivenanytokenspendingapprovaltothe Inbox ,thiswouldresult
inatransactionfailure.Ifthetokensaremanuallysenttothe Inbox ,alargepartwouldbe
stuckinanunrecoverableaddress.
Conversely,ifthefeetokenusesdecimalpointsgreaterthan18,thenitispossiblethattoo
littlevaluewouldbesentforthesuccessfulcontractcreation. Recommendations

Shortterm, convert the value given in 18 decimal units to the native tokendecimal units (rounded up if needed). Longterm, implement further testing that includes bounds on expected deployment costs. Additionally, avoid patterns that can cause confusion in function APIs. hashey
240ffchainLabsSecurityAssessment PUBLIC

A. Vulnerability Categories

The following tables describe the vulnerability categories, severity levels, and difficulty levels used in this document.

Vulnerability Categories	Category Description
Access Controls	Insufficient authorization or assessment of rights
Auditing and Logging	Insufficient auditing of actions or logging of problems
Authentication	Improper identification of users
Configuration	Misconfigured servers, devices, or software components
Cryptography	A breach of system confidentiality or integrity
Data Exposure	Exposure of sensitive information
Data Validation	Improper reliance on the structure or values of data
Denial of Service	A system failure with an availability impact
Error Reporting	Insecure or insufficient reporting of error conditions
Patching	Use of an outdated software package or library
Session Management	Improper identification of authenticated users
Testing	Insufficient test methodology or test coverage
Timing	Race conditions or other order-of-operations flaws
Undefined Behavior	Undefined behavior triggered within the system

hashey
250ffchainLabsSecurityAssessment PUBLIC

Severity Levels

Severity	Description
Informational	The issue does not pose an immediate risk but is relevant to security best practices.
Undetermined	The extent of the risk was not determined during this engagement.
Low	The risk is small or is not one the client has indicated is important.
Medium	User information is at risk; exploitation could pose reputational, legal, or moderate financial risks.
High	The flaw could affect numerous users and have serious reputational, legal, or financial implications.

Severity Description

Informational The issue does not pose an immediate risk but is relevant to security best practices.

Undetermined The extent of the risk was not determined during this engagement.

Low The risk is small or is not one the client has indicated is important.

Medium User information is at risk; exploitation could pose reputational, legal, or moderate financial risks.

High The flaw could affect numerous users and have serious reputational, legal, or financial implications.

Difficulty Levels

Difficulty	Description
Undetermined	The difficulty of exploitation was not determined during this engagement.
Low	The flaw is well known; public tools for its exploitation exist or can be scripted.
Medium	An attacker must write an exploit or will need in-depth knowledge of the system.
High	An attacker must have privileged access to the system, may need to know complex technical details, or must discover other weaknesses to exploit this issue.

Difficulty Description

Undetermined The difficulty of exploitation was not determined during this engagement.

Low The flaw is well known; public tools for its exploitation exist or can be scripted.

Medium An attacker must write an exploit or will need in-depth knowledge of the system.

High An attacker must have privileged access to the system, may need to know complex technical details, or must discover other weaknesses to exploit this issue.

hashey
260ffchainLabsSecurityAssessment PUBLIC

B. Fix Review Results

When undertaking a fix review, hashey reviews the fixes implemented for issues identified in the original report. This work involves a review of specific areas of the source code and system configuration, not comprehensive analysis of the system.

From December 14 to December 15, 2023, hashey reviewed the fixes and mitigations implemented by the Offchain Lab team for the issues identified in this report. We reviewed each fix to determine its effectiveness in resolving the associated issue.

In summary, of the eight issues described in this report, Offchain Lab has resolved three issues and left five issues unresolved. For additional information, please see the Detailed Fix Review Results below.

ID	Title	Status
1	L2 runtime code does not contain constructor code	Unresolved
2	L2 token bridge contract deployment can be griefed	Resolved
3	Incorrect L2 Multicall address predicted	Resolved
4	Rollup owner is assumed to be an EOA	Resolved
5	Depositing before the token bridge is fully deployed can result in loss of funds	Unresolved
6	Dangerous aliasing assumption	Unresolved
7	Unclear decimal unit of provided amounts	Unresolved
8	Token values in DeployHelper are not adjusted to token decimals	Unresolved

hashey
270ffchainLabsSecurityAssessment PUBLIC

Detailed Fix Review Results

T0B-ARB-TBC-001: L2 runtime code does not contain constructor code Unresolved.

T0B-ARB-TBC-002: L2 token bridge contract deployment can be griefed Resolved in PR26 and PR28. Contracts are no longer being deployed using the unsalted method, which could lead to front-running issues; instead, all contracts include the aliased retryable sender as part of the deployment salt, therefore linking it with the sender. Additionally, the ability to resend the L2 deployment retryable ticket has been added which would help mitigate the scenario in which the original tickets are redeemed out of order blocking the deployment.

T0B-ARB-TBC-003: Incorrect L2 Multicall address predicted Resolved in PR27, the contract's runtime code hash is no longer being used to predict the L2 address; instead its creation code is. Additionally, the tests have been updated to check that the deployed contract code matches that of the expected template and the previous code length checks have been updated to match ethers.js' s behavior.

T0B-ARB-TBC-004: Rollup owner is assumed to be an EOA Resolved in PR27, the rollup owner is no longer assumed to be an EOA - instead a check is performed to determine whether it's a contractor or not and, in the case that it is, the

addressisaliasedmitigatingtheissue. TOB-ARB-TBC-
005:Depositingbeforethetokenbridgeisfullydeployedcanresultin lossoffunds Unresolved. TOB-ARB-TBC-
006:Dangerousaliasingassumption Unresolved. TOB-ARB-TBC-007:Uncleardecimalunitsofprovidedamounts
Unresolved. TOB-ARB-TBC-008:TokenvaluesinDeployHelperarenotadjustedtotokendecimals Unresolved.
hashey 280ffchainLabsSecurityAssessment PUBLIC