# D2: Access Control



# **#2: Access Control**

- Similar to OWASP Top 10
- Insufficient access control and authentication checks
- Insecure access control methods
- Private, internal functions and data are accessible through a contract's public/external functions
- Results in unauthorized access
- Loss: estimated at 150,000 ETH (~\$30M USD at the time)

# Walkthrough scenario

- A smart contract designates the address which initializes it as the contract's owner in an initialization function
  - Grants special privileges such as the ability to withdraw the contract's funds.
- Initialization function not protected and can be called by anyone — even after it has already been called
- Allows anyone to become the owner of the contract and take its funds.

#### Example

- Owning a wallet contract (7/19/2017)
  - <u>https://blog.zeppelin.solutions/on-the-parity-wallet-multisig-hack-405a8c12e8f7</u>



Santiago Palladino Follow Developer and Security Researcher at Zeppelin Solutions. Jul 19, 2017 · 3 min read

# The Parity Wallet Hack Explained

TL;DR

• A vulnerability was found on the Parity Multisig Wallet version 1.5+, that allowed an attacker to steal over 150,000 ETH (~30M USD).

It was possible to turn the Parity Wallet library contract into a regular multi-sig wallet and become an owner of it by calling the init Wallet function. -- Parity

- Could have been up to ~\$180M, but white hat hackers "stole" the rest and returned it to rightful owners
  - <u>https://medium.freecodecamp.org/a-hacker-stole-31m-of-ether-how-it-happened-and-what-it-means-for-ethereum-9e5dc29e33ce</u>

• Contract's initialization function sets the caller of the function as its owner.

```
function initContract() public {
   owner = msg.sender;
}
```

- Logic is detached from the contract's constructor and does not keep track of the fact that it has already been called.
- Anyone can call initContract after contract creation to become owner

- Parity WalletLibrary in example
- Library used to implement common wallet functions
  - Initializer allows one to specify withdraw limit and owners

```
function initWallet(address[] _owners, uint _required, uint _daylimit) {
    initDaylimit(_daylimit);
    initMultiowned(_owners, _required);
}
```

- Library implemented as an external contract call to reduce costs
  - Rather than have each contract deploy a copy of the exact same library code, wallets do this...

```
address constant _walletLibrary =
0xa657491c1e7f16adb39b9b60e87bbb8d93988bc3;
```

- Then, use delegatecall () to invoke its functions
  - DELEGATECALL instruction in EVM takes call and invokes the exact same one on the contract you're using it on

```
function isOwner(address _addr) constant returns (bool) {
  return _walletLibrary.delegatecall(msg.data);
}
```

- Issue within fallback function
  - Fallback receives payment if someone sends you \$
  - Otherwise, msg. data has unknown function call that should be handled by library since no function in contract matches
    - delegatecall dispatches unknown calls to library

```
function() payable {
    if (msg.value > 0)
        Deposit(msg.sender, msg.value);
    else if (msg.data.length > 0)
        _walletLibrary.delegatecall(msg.data);
```

- Issue: ALL public calls in library can now be called (including initWallet again!)
- Leads to..
  - Unintended call to initWallet <u>https://etherscan.io/tx/0x707aabc2f24d756480330b75fb4890ef6b8a26ce0554e</u> <u>c80e3d8ab105e63db07</u>
  - Followed by transfer out of wallet WHG <u>https://etherscan.io/tx/0x9654a93939e98ce84f09038b9855b099da38863b3c2e</u> <u>0e04fd59a540de1cb1e5</u>

- MetaCoin contract for purchasing and exchanging coins
  - sendCoin call to doTransfer from msg.sender to receiver

```
contract MetaCoin {
  mapping (address => uint) public balances;
  function sendCoin(address receiver, uint amount) public returns(bool sufficient) {
    if (balances[msg.sender] < amount) return false;
    doTransfer(msg.sender, receiver, amount);
    return true;
  }
  function doTransfer(address from, address to, uint amount) {
    balances[from] -= amount;
    balances[to] += amount;
  }
</pre>
```

• What errors are there?

- doTransfer not set to internal (can be called externally)
- No check on from being msg.sender in doTransfer
- Bonus vulnerability: Underflow and overflow on balances update not checked

#### • Same contract



- What is the error?
  - Contract's password set to "private", but appears in clear on blockchain
  - Find secretPassword and mint coins
- Everything is public by design
  - Contract code & storage
  - Transaction contents
  - Private modifier does nothing for secrecy!

```
def input(choice):
    if self.storage["player1"] == msg.sender:
        self.storage["plvalue"] = choice
        return(1)
    elif self.storage["player2"] == msg.sender:
        self.storage["p2value"] = choice
        return(2)
    else:
        return(0)
```

- Adversary can see everything!
  - Must use a bit-commitment protocol
  - Two players commit to a keyed cryptographic hash of choice
  - Both reveal choice to determine winner

## Remediation

- Remove all catch-all function dispatchers (specify exact calls allowed)
- Ensure calls are internal, unless intended to be external
- Validate identity before execution using modifiers and via require

```
contract Unprotected{
 address private owner;
 modifier onlyOwner {
    require(msg.sender==owner);
 function constructor() public {
    owner = msg.sender;
  // This function should be protected
 function changeOwner_broken(address _newOwner) public {
   owner = _newOwner;
 function changeOwner_fixed(address _newOwner) public onlyOwner {
    owner = _newOwner;
```

# SI CTF Lab 3.4, 3.5