0000020	00		00			А3	ED										
0000030	Thr	ee	D	gr	na	کهل (	ab	$S_3$									
00000040				4A													
000000		31					3-9	63									
			30	5		0	30	30									
00000050	31	65	34	62	61	37	34	34									
00000100	30																
00000	66																
0000	34																
0000	39																
00000140	31																
00000160 0000 Etuii	Fin	63 an	35 ICE	32 36(	Orc	61 )SS	37 -0	35. nai	38 <b>1</b> 611	39 Nor	ne\	37 /3 <b>11</b>	39 nar	ke	³¹ ta	35 aa	regator46381
00000180	6.5	36	32	32	39	34	37	32	31	31	36	36	62	66	36	32	e6224947321

86009688	01	0)(0)	0.0	99	00	0.0	0.0	00	96	.00	90	90	99	98	00	UU	
00000 <b>D</b> i	SC	ıaı		er	66												
00000000000	ue <i>f</i>	AUC	311														
ooooo Fui	i Fir	nar	nce	60	ros	SS-(	cha	ain	mor	nev	m	ark	æt	aad	are	ga:	tor <sub>1e4ba7445bb6e80e</sub>
00000060	31	66	65	65		34		37			61		61			33	1fee1456376a13c3
								34							31	64	ffff074fff00001c
00000100		31		34				66						31			0104ffffffff0100
00000110		32				61		31							34		f2052a0100000043
00000120	34	31		34		36		35			65	38	35	33	35	31	4104946b538e5853
00000130	39	63	37	32	36	61			39	31	65	36	31	65		31	9c726ac91e6e6ec1
00000140	31	36	30		61	65	31		39	30		31	33	61		32	16000ae139038132
00000150	37	63	36	36	66	62	38	62	65	37	39	34	37	62	65	36	7c66fb8be7947be6
00000150	33	63	35	32	64	61	37	35	38	39	33	37	39	35	31	35	3c52da7358979515
00000170	64	34	65	30	61	36	30	34	66	38	31	34	31	37	38	31	d4e0a64638141781
00000170	65	36	32	32	39	34	37	32	31	31	36	36	62	66	36	32	e622494732116662
00000190	31	65	37	33	61	38	32	63	62	66	32	33	34	32	63	38	1e73a823cbf234c8
00000130	35	38	65	65	61	63	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	00	50	58eacc000000000
000000170	30	31	30	30	30	30	30	30	34	38	36	30	65	62	31	38	010000004860eb18
00000000	-		31	62	31	36	32	30	65	33	37	65	39	34	39	30	bf1b1206e3e94909
00000010	62	66		61	34	32	37	35	31	34	34	31			64		fc8a423351e44fd7
	66		38										36	66 61		37	
00000030	35	31	35	39	6	62	38	36	36	38	38	65	39	bl	38	33	519ab8688e9a8383

## **Disclaimer**

The ensuing audit offers no assertions or assurances about the code's security. It cannot be deemed an adequate judgment of the contract's correctness on its own. The authors of this audit present it solely as an informational exercise, reporting the thorough research involved in the secure development of the intended contracts, and make no material claims or guarantees regarding the contract's post-deployment operation. The authors of this report disclaim all liability for all kinds of potential consequences of the contract's deployment or use. Due to the possibility of human error occurring during the code's manual review process, we advise the client team to commission several independent audits in addition to a public bug bounty program.

99000000	01	0.0	0.0		00	0.0	0.6	00	.06	.00	90	00	99		00	8.6	
00000010																	
00000060																	
00000080																	
0000090																	
00000A0																	
000000B0																	
00000000																	
000000E0																	
000000F0																	
00000100																	
00000110																	
00000110																	
			_	_													
Ta	DIE	3 (	<b>OT</b>		<b>O</b> I	ŢŢŧ	en	ITS									
000000 Co	ae <i>i</i>	AUC	AHP.				30										
	i Fir	าลท	ice	6	ros	35-0	ha	ain i	mor	JEV	m	ark	æt	മവ	are	aa.	tor <sub>1e4ba7445bb6e80e</sub>
0000000000000	31		65	65		34		37			61			33		33	1fee1456376a13c3
000000A0																	
000000000																	
000000D0																	
000000E0																	
000000F0								34							66 31	64	ffff074fff00001c
00000100		66 31		66 34										31		30	
						66		66									0104ffffffff0100
00000110	66	32		35	32	61		31							34	33	f2052a0100000043
00000120	34	31	30	34		36	62	35		38	65	38	35	33		31	4104946b538e5853
00000130	39		37	32	36	61	32		39	31	65	36	31	65		31	9c726ac91e6e6ec1
00000140	31	36	30	30	61		31	33	39	30	38	31	33	61	36	32	16000ae139038132
00000150	37	63	36	36	66	62	38	62	65	37	39	34	37	62	65	36	7c66fb8be7947be6
00000160	33	63	35	32	64	61	37	35	38	39	33	37	39	35	31	35	3c52da7358979515
00000170	64	34	65	30	61	36	30	34	66	38	31	34	31	37	38	31	d4e0a64638141781
00000180	65	36	32	32	39	34	37	32	31	31	36	36	62	66	36	32	e622494732116662
00000190	31	65	37	33	61	38	32	63	62	66	32	33	34	32	63	38	1e73a823cbf234c8
000001A0	35	38	65	65	61	63	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30		-	58eacc000000000
00000000	30	31	30	30	30	30	30	30	34	38	36	30	65	62	31	38	010000004860eb18
00000010	62	66	31	62	31	36	32	30	65	33	37	65	39	34	39	30	bf1b1206e3e94909
00000020	66	63	38	61	34	32	37	35	31	34	34	31	36	66	64	37	fc8a423351e44fd7
00000030	3.5	31	35	39	61	62	38	36	36	38	38	65	39	61	38	33	519ab8688e9a8383

# **Table Of Contents**

Disclaimer	3
Summary	8
Scope	10
Methodology	12
Project Dashboard	14
Code Maturity Evaluation	17
Findings	20
3S-FUJI-C01	20
3S-FUJI-C02	21
3S-FUJI-H01	23
3S-FUJI-H02	25
3S-FUJI-H03	27
3S-FUJI-H04	28
3S-FUJI-H05	29
3S-FUJI-H06	30
3S-FUJI-H07	31
3S-FUJI-M01	32
3S-FUJI-M02	34
3S-FUJI-M03	35
3S-FUJI-M04	37
3S-FUJI-M05	39
3S-FUJI-M06	40
3S-FUJI-M07	42
3S-FUJI-M08	43
3S-FUJI-M09	44
3S-FUJI-M10	45

3S-FUJI-L01	46
3S-FUJI-L02	48
3S-FUJI-L03	49
3S-FUJI-L04	50
3S-FUJI-L05	51
3S-FUJI-L06	52
3S-FUJI-L07	53
3S-FUJI-L08.	54
3S-FUJI-N01	55
3S-FUJI-N02	56
3S-FUJI-N03	57
3S-FUJI-N04	58
3S-FUJI-N05	59
3S-FUJI-N06	60
3S-FUJI-N07	61
3S-FUJI-N08	62
3S-FUJI-N09	63
3S-FUJI-N10	64
3S-FUJI-N11	65
3S-FUJI-N12	66
3S-FUJI-N13	
3S-FUJI-N14	68
3S-FUJI-N15	69
3S-FUJI-N16	
3S-FUJI-N17	71
3S-FUJI-N18	72
3S-FUII-N19	73

01	0.0	8.6	88	00	0.0	0.0	00	00	.00	90	00	90	88	00	(Big)	
		ar	<b>y</b>													
le A	\uc	tit														
				.61												
Fir	ıan	ıce	65	ros	SS-(	ona	ain	mor	ıey	$\frac{m}{61}$	ark	ær	agg	gre	gai	1fee1456376a13c3
																ffff074fff00001c
	31															0104ffffffff0100
	32															f2052a0100000043
																4104946b538e5853
		37							31							9c726ac91e6e6ec1
	36	30				31					31	33				16000ae139038132
		-														7c66fb8be7947be6
																3c52da7358979515
						_ ,										d4e0a64638141781
													-			e622494732116662
																1e73a823cbf234c8
35	38	65	65	61	63	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	00	50	58eacc000000000
		00	UJ	O T	00	50	20	50	20	50	50	50	50			
		30	30	30	30	30	30	3./	38	36	30	65	67	31	38	0100000048600619
30	31	30	30	30	30	30	30	34	38	36	30	65	62 37	31	38	010000004860eb18
		30 31 38	30 62 61	30 31 34	30 36 32	30 32 37	30 30 35	34 65 31	38 33 34	36 37 34	30 65 31	65 39 36	62 34 66	31 39 64	38 30 37	010000004860eb18 bf1b1206e3e94909 fc8a423351e44fd7
	01 4A 6C 73 6F 2A 19 79 8A 30 61 62 62 73 73 73 73 73 73 73 73 73 73 73 73 73	4A 61 6C 6F 73 65 6F 72 2A 01 19 67 79 62 F3 55 8A 4C 30 31 61 65 65 Auc Finar 31 66 35 34 35 37 66 66 30 31 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30	01 04 45 4A 61 6E 6C 6F 72 73 65 63 6F 72 20 2A 01 00 19 67 F1 79 62 E0 F3 55 04 8A 4C 70 30 31 30  MMA 61 65 36 65 31 35 E0 Audito  Finance 31 66 65 35 34 30 35 37 32 66 66 66 30 31 30	00 00 00 00 00 00 01 04 45 54 4A 61 6E 2F 6C 6F 72 20 62 2A 01 00 00 19 67 F1 A6 79 62 E0 EA F3 55 04 E5 8A 4C 70 2B 30 31 30 30 Finance 61 65 65 35 34 30 62 35 37 32 33 66 66 66 66 66 30 31 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30	00 00 00 00 00 00 01 04 45 54 68 4A 61 6E 2F 32 6C 6F 72 20 6F 73 65 63 6F 6E 6F 72 20 62 61 2A 01 00 00 00 19 67 F1 A6 71 79 62 E0 EA 1F F3 55 04 E5 1E 8A 4C 70 2B 6B 30 31 30 30 30 Finance 6C 65 31 66 65 65 31 35 34 30 62 66 35 37 32 33 36 66 66 66 66 66 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30	00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 01 04 45 54 68 65 4A 61 6E 2F 32 30 6C 6F 72 20 6F 6E 73 65 63 6F 6E 64 6F 72 20 62 61 6E 2A 01 00 00 00 43 19 67 F1 A6 71 30 79 62 E0 EA 1F 61 F3 55 04 E5 1E C1 8A 4C 70 2B 6B F1 30 31 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30	90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 9	00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00	00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00	00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00	00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00	00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00	00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00	00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00	## 10	00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 FF FF FF FF FF AD 04 FF FF 00 1D 01 04 45 54 68 65 20 54 69 6D 65 73 20 30 33 2F AA 61 6E 2F 32 30 30 39 20 43 68 61 6E 63 65 6C 6C 6F 72 20 6F 6E 20 62 72 69 6E 6B 20 6F 66 20 67 36 65 36 6F 6E 64 20 62 61 69 6C 6F 75 74 20 66 6F 72 20 6F 6E 6B 73 FF FF FF FF 01 00 F2 05 2A 01 00 00 00 43 41 04 67 8A FD B0 FE 55 48 27 19 67 F1 A6 71 30 B7 10 5C D6 A8 28 E0 39 09 A6 79 62 E0 EA 1F 61 DE B6 49 F6 BC 3F 4C EF 38 C4 F3 55 04 E5 1E C1 12 DE 5C 38 4D F7 BA 0B 8D 57 8A 4C 70 2B 6B F1 1D 5F AC 00 00 00 00 31 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30

# **Summary**

Three Sigma Labs audited Fuji Finance in a 6 person week engagement. The audit was conducted from 05-06-2023 to 05-25-2023.

## **Protocol Description**


Fuji is a protocol that aggregates money markets in the decentralized finance (DeFi) space. In the background, Fuji routes users' loan requests to the liquidity sources with the best rates and refinances the open positions. It relies on external secure bridges (such as Connext) to enable unlimited cross-chain composability.

Fuji users benefit by obtaining lowest borrowing rates, and constant automated refinancing to the lowest rate once market conditions change. It enables users to provide collateral on chain A and get their loans disbursed on chain B by narrowing down the whole operation to a single transaction. Fuji analyzes thousands of lend and borrow terms across multiple protocols and chains to provide users with the best rates.

Fuji's goal is to build a cross-chain loan aggregator and debt management platform that identifies the best terms on different lending protocols and reduces the friction of managing debt on multiple chains.

88000000	81	0.0	0.0	60	00	99	0.0	90	.00	.00	90	90	99	88	00	BB	
_																	
Sc	:Oh	Jе															
Cod	de A	$\Delta uc$	tik														
99999969	3 1	ıar	ıce	65	1OS	SS-(	SME	air i	mor	ıey	61	ark	ær	ag	gre	ga	1fee1456376a13c3
								34							31	64	ffff074fff00001c
00000100		31		34				66						31			0104ffffffff0100
00000110		32				61		31							34		f2052a0100000043
00000110	34	31		34	39	36		35			65	38	35	33		31	4104946b538e5853
00000130	39	63	37	32	36	61			39	31	65	36	31	65		31	9c726ac91e6e6ec1
00000130	31	36	30	30	61	65	31		39	30		31	33	61		32	16000ae139038132
00000150	37	63	36	36	66	62	38	62	65	37	39	34	37	62	65	36	7c66fb8be7947be6
00000160	33	63	35	32	64	61	37	35	38	39	33	37	39	35	31	35	3c52da7358979515
00000170	64	34	65	30	61	36	30	34	66	38	31	34	31	37	38	31	d4e0a64638141781
00000170	65	36	32	32	39	34	37	32	31	31	36	36	62	66	36	32	e622494732116662
00000190	31	65	37	33	61	38	32	63	62	66	32	33	34	32	63	38	1e73a823cbf234c8
00000130	35	38	65	65	61	63	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	00	50	58eacc000000000
000000170	30	31	30	30	30	30	30	30	34	38	36	30	65	62	31	38	010000004860eb18
00000000		66	31	62	31	36	32	30	65	33	37	65	39	34	39	30	bf1b1206e3e94909
00000010	62				34	32	37					31					
	66	63	38	61				35	31	34	34		36	66	64	37	fc8a423351e44fd7
00000030	35	3 L	35	39	bl	0/	38	36	36	38	38	05	59	61	38	5.5	519ab8688e9a8383

# Scope



## **Assumptions**

The scope of the audit was carefully defined to include the contracts at the lowest level of

the inheritance hierarchy, as these are the ones that will be deployed to the mainnet. The

only external libraries used in the implementation of these contracts were ones trusted by

the community (i.e. OpenZeppelin) - these libraries have already been battle-tested by multiple protocols, guaranteeing a high level of security.

36000600	01	0,0	8.0	80	90	99	0.0	80	00	.00	90	00	9.0	88	00	(6)(6)	
00000010																	
00000030																	
00000060																	
00000070																	
00000080																	
00000090																	
000000A0																	
000000B0																	
00000000																	
000000D0																	
00000E0																	
00000F0																	
00000100																	
00000110																	
00000000																	
Me	211	10	a	ZK	၁၅	<b>y</b> <sub>7</sub>											
					3.0	38											
Cod	de A	$\Delta uc$	dit														
					\61c	37.	- B4-										
00000060	31	1 <b>a</b> r	ıce	65	108	55-(	JI 16	31 <u>7</u> 1	mor	еу	61	ark	er	agg	gre	gai	1fee1456376a13c3
00000070																	
00000080																	
000000A0																	
000000B0																	
00000000																	
000000D0																	
00000E0																	
00000F0								34							31	64	ffff074fff00001
00000100		31		34										31			0104ffffffff0100
00000110		32			32	61		31							34		f2052a0100000043
00000120	34	31		34	39	36	62	35	33		65	38	35	33	35	31	4104946b538e5853
00000130	39	63	37	32	36	61	32		39	31	65	36	31	65		31	9c726ac91e6e6ec
00000140	31	36			61	65	31		39			31	33	61	36	32	16000ae139038132
00000150	37	63	36	36	66	62	38	62	65	37	39	34	37	62	65	36	7c66fb8be7947be6
00000160	33	63	35	32	64	61	37	35	38	39	33	37	39	35	31	35	3c52da735897951
00000170	64	34	65	30	61	36	30	34	66	38	31	34	31	37	38	31	d4e0a64638141781
00000180	65	36	32	32	39	34	37	32	31	31	36	36	62	66	36	32	e622494732116662
00000190	31	65	37	33	61	38	32	63	62	66	32	33	34	32	63	38	1e73a823cbf234c8
000001A0	35	38	65	65	61	63	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30			58eacc000000000
00000000	30	31	30	30	30	30	30	30	34	38	36	30	65	62	31	38	010000004860eb18
	62	66	31	62	31	36	32	30	65	33	37	65	39	34	39	30	bf1b1206e3e94909
00000010	( ) /			~ /	-	J 0	J 6-	00		00	J 1	~ ~	00		00	~ ~	~ ~ _ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~
00000010	66	63	38	61	34	32	37	35	31	34	34	31	36	66	64	37	fc8a423351e44fd7

# Methodology

To begin, we reasoned meticulously about the contract's business logic, checking security-critical features to ensure that there were no gaps in the business logic and/or inconsistencies between the aforementioned logic and the implementation. Second, we thoroughly examined the code for known security flaws and attack vectors. Finally, we discussed the most catastrophic situations with the team and reasoned backwards to ensure they are not reachable in any unintentional form.

## **Taxonomy**

In this audit we report our findings using as a guideline Immunefi's vulnerability taxonomy, which can be found at immunefi.com/severity-updated/. The final classification takes into account the severity, according to the previous link, and likelihood of the exploit. The following table summarizes the general expected classification according to severity and likelihood; however, each issue will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis and may not strictly follow it.

Severity / Likelihood	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH
NONE		None	
LOW		Low	
MEDIUM	Low	Medium	Medium
HIGH	Medium	High	High
CRITICAL	High	Critical	Critical

980000000	01	00	(10)	66	00	99	00	80	00	.00	90	99	90	88	00	6(0)	
00000010																	
00000020																	
0000030																	
00000050																	
00000000																	
00000070																	
00000080																	
00000090																	
000000A0																	
000000B0																	
00000000																	
00000000																	
000000E0																	
000000F0																	
00000100																	
00000110																	
00000000																	
00000 Pro	ပ၂မ	30	36	ノ	151	ŢŅ	$O_{i}$	ar	U39								
0000020	-																
000003 0000 Coc	de A	Auc	tit														
					61-	37											
Fuji	Fir	nar	ıce	65	ros	SS-(	ona	airi	mor	ıey	m	ark	ær	agg	gre	gai	1fee1456376a13c3
00000070																	
00000080																	
00000090																	
000000A0																	
000000B0																	
00000000																	
000000D0																	
000000E0																	
000000F0								34							31	64	ffff074fff00001c
00000100		31		34										31			0104ffffffff0100
00000110		32				61		31							34		f2052a0100000043
00000110	34	31		34		36		35			65	38	35	33	35	31	4104946b538e5853
00000130	39	63	37	32	36	61			39	31	65	36	31	65		31	9c726ac91e6e6ec
00000130	31	36	30	30	61	65	31		39	30		31	33	61		32	16000ae139038132
00000150	37	63	36	36	66	62	38	62	65	37	39	34	37	62	65	36	7c66fb8be7947be6
00000150	33	63	35	32	64	61	37	35	38	39	33	37	39	35	31	35	3c52da735897951
00000170	64	34	65	30	61	36	30	34	66	38	31	34	31	37	38	31	d4e0a64638141781
00000170	65	36	32	32	39	34	37	32	31	31	36	36	62	66	36	32	e622494732116662
00000190	31	65	37	33	61	38	32	63	62	66	32	33	34	32	63	38	1e73a823cbf234c8
00000130	35	38	65	65	61	63	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	00		58eacc000000000
00000170	30	31	30	30	30	30	30	30	34	38	36	30	65	62	31	38	010000004860eb18
000000000	62	66	31	62	31	36	32	30	65	33	37	65	39	34	39	30	bf1b1206e3e94909
	66	63	38	61	34	32	37	35	31	34	34	31	36	66	64	37	fc8a423351e44fd7
00000020	from from														m / 1		1 ( 8 1/1 / 5 5 5 1 1 1 / 1 1 / 1

# **Project Dashboard**

# **Application Summary**

Name	Fuji Finance
Commit	42e9d36
Language	Solidity
Platform	Ethereum

# **Engagement Summary**

Timeline	05-06-2023 to 25-06-2023
Nº of Auditors	2
Review Time	6 person weeks

# **Vulnerability Summary**

Issue Classification	Found	Addressed	Acknowledge d
Critical	2	2	0
High	7	4	3
Medium	10	6	4
Low	8	4	4
None	19	18	1

# **Category Breakdown**

Suggestion	15
Documentation	1
Bug	17
Optimization	11
Good Code Practices	3

36000400	61	06	86	66	00	66	00	88	99	.00	66	96	00	88	00		
00000010																	
00000060																	
00000080																	
00000A0																	
000000B0																	
00000000																	
000000D0																	
000000E0																	
000000F0																	
00000100																	
00000110																	
00000110																	
	) Da	င္ျ		ат	ur	IΤ\	/3 <b>t</b>		alu	ат	10	n					
						30											
Co	de A	کارزد	1it														
				20				30				30					
Huj	i Fir	nar	nce		ros	SS-(	cha	nı	mor	ney	m	ark	æt	agg	gre	ga	tor <sup>1</sup> e4ba7445bb6e80e
0000000										62				33	63	33	
00000070																	
00000090																	
000000A0																	
000000B0																	
00000000																	
000000D0																	
000000E0								30							66	66	000000000000fff
000000F0		66		66				34						30		64	ffff074fff00001c
00000100		31				66		66						31	30		0104ffffffff0100
00000110	66	32		35	32	61		31							34	33	f2052a0100000043
00000120	34	31		34		36	62	35			65	38	35	33		31	4104946b538e5853
00000130	39		37	32	36	61	32		39	31	65	36	31	65		31	9c726ac91e6e6ec1
00000140	31	36			61	65	31	33	39			31	33	61	36	32	16000ae139038132
00000150	37	63	36	36	66	62	38	62	65	37	39	34	37	62	65	36	7c66fb8be7947be6
00000160	33	63	35	32	64	61	37	35	38	39	33	37	39	35	31	35	3c52da7358979515
00000170	64	34	65	30	61	36	30	34	66	38	31	34	31	37	38	31	d4e0a64638141781
00000180	65	36	32	32	39	34	37	32	31	31	36	36	62	66	36	32	e622494732116662
00000190	31	65	37	33	61	38	32	63	62	66	32	33	34	32	63	38	1e73a823cbf234c8
000001A0	35	38	65	65	61	63	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30			58eacc000000000
00000000	30	31	30	30	30	30	30	30	34	38	36	30	65	62	31	38	010000004860eb18
00000010	62	66	31	62	31	36	32	30	65	33	37	65	39	34	39	30	bf1b1206e3e94909
00000020	66	63	38	61	34	32	37	35	31	34	34	31	36	66	64	37	fc8a423351e44fd7
00000030	35	31	35	39	61	62	38	36	36	38	38	65	39	61	38	33	519ab8688e9a8383

# **Code Maturity Evaluation**

# **Code Maturity Evaluation Guidelines**

Category	Evaluation
Access Controls	The use of robust access controls to handle identification and authorization and to ensure safe interactions with the system.
Arithmetic	The proper use of mathematical operations and semantics.
Centralization	The presence of a decentralized governance structure for mitigating insider threats and managing risks posed by contract upgrades
Code Stability	The extent to which the code was altered during the audit.
Upgradeability	The presence of parameterizations of the system that allow modifications after deployment.
Function Composition	The functions are generally small and have clear purposes.
Front-Running	The system's resistance to front-running attacks.
Monitoring	All operations that change the state of the system emit events, making it simple to monitor the state of the system. These events need to be correctly emitted.
Specification	The presence of comprehensive and readable codebase documentation.
Testing and Verification	The presence of robust testing procedures (e.g., unit tests, integration tests, and verification methods) and sufficient test coverage.

# **Code Maturity Evaluation Results**

Category	Evaluation
Access Controls	Satisfactory. The codebase has a strong access control mechanism.
Arithmetic	Satisfactory. The codebase uses Solidity version >0.8.0 as well as takes the correct measures in rounding the results of arithmetic operations.
Centralization	Moderate. The owner has some privileges over the protocol.
Code Stability	Satisfactory. The code was stable during the audit.
Upgradeability	Weak. The contracts are not upgradeable.
Function Composition	Satisfactory. There is little duplicated logic and functions have a clear purpose.
Front-Running	Moderate. There are a few front-running opportunities.
Monitoring	Moderate. Some events are emitted, but not all state changing operations are covered with events.
Specification	Satisfactory. There is a comprehensive and readable documentation.
Testing and Verification	Satisfactory. There is an adequate testing suite with unit, integration, functional and fuzz testing.

380000000	91	00	8.6	89	00	99	0.0	80	00	.00	90	90	9.0	88	00	8.6	
00000010																	
00000000																	
00000080																	
00000090																	
000000A0																	
00000000																	
00000E0																	
000000F0																	
00000100																	
00000110																	
00000000																	
Fir	10	ĺΪ	ys	33													
000003 0000 Coc	de A	Auc	tit														
					.61												
••••••Fuji	7 IT	nan	ıce	65	ros	SS-(	ona	ain	mor	iey	$\frac{m}{61}$	ark	ær	agg	gre	gai	1fee1456376a13c3
00000070																	
00000080																	
000000F0								34							31	64	ffff074fff00001c
00000100		31		34										31			0104ffffffff0100
00000110		32				61		31							34		f2052a0100000043
00000110	34	31		34		36		35			65	38	35	33	35	31	4104946b538e5853
00000120	39	63	37	32	36	61	32		39	31	65	36	31	65		31	9c726ac91e6e6ec1
00000130	31	36	30	30	61	65	31		39	30		31	33	61		32	16000ae139038132
00000150	37	63	36	36	66	62	38	62	65	37	39	34	37	62	65	36	7c66fb8be7947be6
00000160	33	63	35	32	64	61	37	35	38	39	33	37	39	35	31	35	3c52da7358979515
00000170	64	34	65	30	61	36	30	34	66	38	31	34	31	37	38	31	d4e0a64638141781
00000170	65	36	32	32	39	34	37	32	31	31	36	36	62	66	36	32	e622494732116662
00000190	31	65	37	33	61	38	32	63	62	66	32	33	34	32	63	38	1e73a823cbf234c8
		38	65	65	61	63	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	00	50	58eacc000000000
[0] [0] [0] [0] [0] [ A [0]	35			1 1 1	U.L	00	20	50	50	20	20	20	50	50			3004000000000
000001A0	35	_				30	30	30	3./	38	36	30	65	67	31	38	010000004860019
00000000	30	31	30	30	30	30	30	30	34 65	38	36 37	30 65	65	62 34	31	38	010000004860eb18
		_				30 36 32	30 32 37	30 30 35	34 65 31	38 33 34	36 37 34	30 65 31	65 39 36	62 34 66	31 39 64	38 30 37	010000004860eb18 bf1b1206e3e94909 fc8a423351e44fd7

# **Findings**

# 3S-FUJI-C01

In **BaseRouter**, the beneficiary isn't checked when starting a **flashloan** action and it replaces the previous beneficiary

Id	3S-FUJI-C01
Classification	Critical
Severity	Critical
Likelihood	High
Category	Bug
Relevant Links	abstracts/BaseRouter.sol#L292

## **Description**

When doing a flashloan action in the **BaseRouter.sol** the beneficiary isn't compared with the beneficiary of the previous action, and the variable gets replaced with the beneficiary for the **flashloan**, this can lead to a beneficiary change, which could lead to stolen assets.

For example, using **3S-FUJI-M10**, it is possible to withdraw for another user, use a **flashloan** to change the beneficiary and send the tokens to an attacker.

## Recommendation

Add a function to check the beneficiary instead of replacing.

### **POC**

https://github.com/threesigmaxyz/fuji-issues-external/blob/master/test/POC/POCAttackerChangesBeneficiary.t.sol#L111

### **Status**

# 3S-FUJI-C02

Wrong tokensToCheck logic in BaseRouter enables attackers to steal funds

Id	3S-FUJI-C02
Classification	Critical
Severity	Critical
Likelihood	High
Category	Bug
Relevant Links	abstracts/BaseRouter.sol#L636-L640

## **Description**

The **BaseRouter** implements a mechanism to prevent tokens from being stuck that checks the balance of the router before and after the actions and ensures it remains equal. Problem is, the **\_addTokenToList(...)** function has a bug such that only the last token interacted with is added to the array at the first element (0). The **\_isInTokenList(...)** function returns index 0 if the token is not in the array, so the position **uint256 position = index == 0 ? index : index + 1;** will always be 0.

Attackers can use this to steal other users by waiting for withdraw approvals for the **BaseRouter** of other users and then use these approvals to withdraw to the **BaseRouter**, followed by a deposit action in another vault to remove the asset of the withdraw from the **tokensToCheck** array. The asset is then held by the **BaseRouter**, which can be retrieved in a following transaction by the attacker by

- 1) depositing the funds to the vault, where the receiver and owner are the BaseRouter.
- 2) withdrawing these funds to the attacker, where the receiver is the attacker and the owner the **BaseRouter**.
- 3) depositing another asset to another vault, removing the first asset from the **tokensToCheck** array.

## Recommendation

Fix the implementation of the **\_addTokenToList(...)** function by keeping a memory variable with the number of tokens to check. The position to add in **\_addTokenToList(...)** should be the number of tokens to check + 1, if the token is not in the array.

### **POC**

https://github.com/threesigmaxyz/fuji-issues-external/blob/master/test/POC/POCWrongTokensToCheckLogic.t.sol#L80

### **Status**

Changing providers might lead to lost assets in **BorrowingVault** and **YieldVault** 

Id	3S-FUJI-H01
Classification	High
Severity	Critical
Likelihood	Low
Category	Bug
Relevant Links	borrowing/BorrowingVault.sol#L943 yield/YieldVault.sol#L276

## **Description**

totalAssets(...) and totalDebt(...) are fetched from the set of providers, which can be changed. Thus, if providers change, but debt or assets are deposited/borrow from the old providers, totalAssets(...) and/or totalDebt(...) will change.

In the case of **totalAssets(...)**, this means that users shares would be worth less, such that existing users would take a loss and new users could profit from depositing at this reduced rate and, after/if the **totalAssets(...)** were recovered, take a profit.

In the case of **totalDebt(...)**, **debtShares** would be worth less, so existing users would make a profit by being able to **payback** their debt for less debt. New users would take a loss, following the same reasoning as before.

### Recommendation

When removing a provider, check if the debt balance is bigger than 0, in which case, it should be repaid/moved to another provider first.

In the case of the assets, ensuring that the deposit balance of a provider is 0 is vulnerable to a DoS attack, where attackers could deposit on the vault's behalf. Thus, when changing providers, if the deposit balance of an old provider is not 0, these assets could be moved atomically to a new provider.

### **Status**

Acknowledged with the following statement:

The issue identified is acknowledged by the team. However, current **BorrowingVault** smart contract bytecode size is a limitation for the proposed change and requires a major refactor that is planned to be introduced at a later stage.

The team recognizes the risk which is only a temporary DOS to the vault's funds when a provider with assets is removed by mistake. The provider that was removed mistakenly can always be reestablished by a subsequent **timelock** call.

**REBALANCER\_ROLE** can drain funds by rebalancing in a loop in the **BorrowingVault** 

Id	3S-FUJI-H02
Classification	High
Severity	Critical
Likelihood	Trusted Actor is compromised
Category	Suggestion
Relevant Links	borrowing/BorrowingVault.sol#L791

## **Description**

The rebalancer in the borrowing vault receives a fee for providing **debtAsset** to repay the originating provider and send to the destination provider. A malicious provider could use this to profit, for example

max fee = 
$$10 / 10000 = 1 / 1000 = 0.001$$
  
 $100\_000 \text{ debt} \rightarrow 100\_100$   
 $100\_100 \text{ deby} \rightarrow 100200.1$ 

and so on...

For this attack, the attacker only needs to pay a **flashloan** fee once (or have the initial funds available).

## Recommendation

The likelihood of this attack is reduced because the rebalancer is a privileged role, but maybe adding a timelock to the rebalancing function would be a good measure so that the **chief** can disallow a rebalancer if they behave maliciously, before they profit too much from this exploit.

### **Status**

Acknowledged with the following statement:

The issue identified is acknowledged by the Fuji team, however, the team will implement the following security measures at the **BorrowingVault** at a later stage. The rationale to delay the fixes is that the team does not consider this issue an imminent user risk considering that only the **RebalancerManager** contract should have the **REBALANCER** role. In addition the **BorrowingVault** bytecode size is near limits and additional logic is not possible until a major refactor. The future measures that will be considered are:

- 1. Restricting the **REBALANCER\_ROLE** to only contract implementations. This action will reduce the chance of a compromised **EOA** account.
- 2. Adding a non-reentrant restriction to the **rebalance(...)** function. This action will restrict the looping optionality that is described in this issue.

## UniswapV2Swapper uses block.timestamp for deadline [Out of scope]

200601	
Id	3S-FUJI-H03
Classification	High
Severity	High
Likelihood	High
Category	Bug
Relevant Links	swappers/ UniswapV2Swapper.sol#L72

## **Description**

Uniswap sets a deadline to limit arbitrage opportunities if the swap does not get included right away. If the swap specifies a deadline of **block.timestamp**, then the swap transaction can be included in any block. This means that the price can, by then, have changed significantly.

### Recommendation

Send a deadline argument.

#### Status

Acknowledged with the following statement:

The issue identified is acknowledged by the Fuji team. It is worth noting that the bundleInternal(...) currently has some indirect protection against slippage. However, Fuji will proceed to implement a deadline argument in the LiquidationManager.sol and BaseRouter.sol during Q3-2023 while working on general optimizations/improvements.

# ConnextHandler executeFailedWithUpdatedArgs(...) reentrancy allowedCaller can steal all ConnextHandler tokens

Id	3S-FUJI-H04
Classification	High
Severity	Critical
Likelihood	Low
Category	Bug
Relevant Links	routers/ConnextHandler.sol#L221

## **Description**

In **executeFailedWithUpdatedArgs(...)**, the allowedCaller can steal all assets available on the **ConnextHandler** by calling **executeFailedWithUpdatedArgs(...)** again after the **xBundle(...)** call. This can be mitigated also by adding the **nonReentrant** modifier to **xBundle(...)**.

## Recommendation

Write txn.executed = true; before the try/catch call and rewrite txn.executed = false if it fails.

### **Status**

Wrong transformation in function previewMintDebt(...)

Id	3S-FUJI-H05
Classification	High
Severity	High
Likelihood	High
Category	Bug
Relevant Links	

## **Description**

In the **BorrowingVault.sol** the function **previewMintDebt(...)** is supposed to take an amount of shares and turn them into an amount of debt. Currently it is taking the shares as if they were debt and turning them to shares.

```
function previewMintDebt(uint256 shares) public view override
returns (uint256 debt) {
   return _convertDebtToShares(shares, Math.Rounding.Down);
}
```

### Recomendation

```
Change the function to use _convertToDebt(...) instead of
_convertDebtToShares(...), as following

function previewMintDebt(uint256 shares) public view override
returns (uint256 debt) {
   return _convertToDebt(shares, Math.Rounding.Down);
}
```

### **Status**

safeApprove(...) reverts if approval is different than 0, use
safeIncreaseAllowance(...) instead

Id	3S-FUJI-H06
Classification	High
Severity	High
Likelihood	High
Category	Bug
Relevant Links	abstracts/BaseRouter.sol#L554

## **Description**

The **BaseRouter** interacts with the vault and some actions require tokens being pulled from the **BaseRouter** to the vault, which means that the **BaseRouter** must first approve the vault. This approval is using **SafeERC20** safeApprove(...), which is deprecated and should not be used due to the fact that it reverts if the allowance of pair owner and spender is not 0. This allowance should always be 0 for most tokens and situations when safeApprove(...) is called, given that the tokens are spent right after the approval is emitted. However, some weird tokens or behaviour could lead to not all tokens being spent, which would freeze the **BaseRouter** actions that require approval.

### Recommendation

Use **safeIncreaseAllowance(...)** instead of **safeApprove(...)**.

### **Status**

Attackers can claim deposits to vaults if users specify the router as receiver and don't withdraw shares after

Id	3S-FUJI-H07
Classification	High
Severity	Critical
Likelihood	Low
Category	Bug
Relevant Links	abstracts/BaseRouter.sol#L192
	abstracts/BaseRouter.sol#L205

## **Description**

The **BaseRouter** checks if the initial balance of the tokens interacted with is the same as the end balance. However, for vaults, it only checks the balance of the underlying asset, not the shares themselves. Thus, for example, when a user makes a deposit action and specifies the **BaseRouter** as the receiver, but does not do any further action, the shares will be locked in the **BaseRouter**. Then, an attacker can call the withdrawal action of the **BaseRouter** and redeem these shares for any receiver.

### Recommendation

Add to the **tokensToCheck** array the address of the vault itself (its shares).

## **POC**

https://github.com/threesigmaxyz/fuji-issues-external/blob/master/test/POC/POCAttackerStealsUser.t.sol#L40

### **Status**

# 3S-FUJI-M01

**BorrowingVault**, if the debt/assets ratio falls too much, liquidators could choose to repay debt equal to the assets at a discount

0.10000.110	
Id	3S-FUJI-M01
Classification	Medium
Severity	High
Likelihood	Low
Category	Suggestion
Relevant Links	borrowing/BorrowingVault.sol#L835

## **Description**

Currently the borrowing vault enables liquidating a user's position 50% if the debt/assets ratio is above **liqRatio**, but below **liqRatio** /

**FULL\_LIQUIDATION\_THRESHOLD**. If the ratio debt/assets increases too much, a liquidation might not be profitable for liquidators, because users might not have enough assets. In this scenario, it could be possible to completely close the user position by paying back the debt corresponding to the assets of the user. This will still leave some amount of bad debt, but hopefully much less.

In the current implementation, if a specific collateral asset drops too much, it could happen that many liquidations would not be profitable and a lot of bad debt would appear. This bad debt could be limited with this recommendation. In the end, it could prevent a liquidation in a provider.

## Example:

75 debt, 100 assets

asset/debt value falls to 0.74

paying 75 debt, would give the liquidator 100 assets, which is equivalent to 74 debt at 0.74 price, **not profitable**.

This would leave 75 bad debt in the protocol

### Recommendation

Let the liquidators "close" the position of the user by getting 100 assets for the corresponding **debt** at a discount.

## Same Example:

Letting liquidators choose to repay the debt corresponding to the total amount of assets, if these are worth less than the debt, would help keep the protocol healthier.

In this case, let's say a liquidator wants to repay the 100 assets, it would cost assets \* price \* LIQUIDATION\_PENALTY = 100 \* 0.74 \* 0.9 = 66.6 debt.

This would leave **8.4** bad debt in the protocol.

Note that the current liquidation logic would require skipping the maxRedeem(...) of the user, if the liquidation is not profitable, userAssets < userDebt \* price \* 10 \*\* \_asset.decimals().

### **Status**

# 3S-FUJI-M02

**Payback** can be **DoSed** in the **BorrowingVault**, may be profitable for liquidators

101 119010000	
Id	3S-FUJI-M02
Classification	Medium
Severity	Medium
Likelihood	High
Category	Bug
Relevant Links	borrowing/BorrowingVault.sol#L723

## **Description**

The borrowing vault enables anyone to **payback** the debt of another user. Thus, attackers can frontrun a user **payback** transaction, **payback** 1 wei and stop users from paying back their debts. This would make sense for liquidators, who are incentivized to do this to liquidate users.

### Recommendation

There are 2 alternatives:

- Instead of reverting if the **payback** is bigger than the maximum, limit it to the maximum.
- Only enable the user to **payback** its debt.

### **POC**

https://github.com/threesigmaxyz/fuji-issues-external/blob/master/test/POC/POCPaybackDoSed.t.sol#L27

### **Status**

# 3S-FUJI-M03

## Approval in BaseVault reduces over time

Id	3S-FUJI-M03
Classification	Medium
Severity	Medium
Likelihood	High
Category	Bug
Relevant Links	extensions/ERC4626.sol#L50
	abstracts/BaseVault.sol#L146
	abstracts/BaseVault.sol#L163
	abstracts/BaseVault.sol#L180
	abstracts/BaseVault.sol#L196
	abstracts/BaseVault.sol#L212
	borrowing/BorrowingVault.sol#L676

## **Description**

BaseVault stores users allowances as underlying assets allowances. When a user calls, for example, <code>approve(...)</code>, it converts the shares amount in the argument to a corresponding asset amount. This approach means that, over time, due to the value of shares increasing over time (yield from providers), the same amount of shares will be worth more assets. Thus, if users approve a certain allowance, and then a few seconds later, another user tries to use this same allowance amount, it should revert, as this shares amount now equals more assets.

The BorrowingVault does not have this issue because it never converts between **debt** and **debtShares** and the allowance is stored in debt. Thus, if a user approves another user for, let's say, 100 debt, the other user can always spend 100 debt.

### Recommendation

Instead of converting to the underlying assets, store the allowances in shares. This is how the openzeppelin ERC4626 implementation does it and is more reliable.

### **POC**

https://github.com/threesigmaxyz/fuji-issues-external/blob/master/test/POC/POCFaillingApproval.t.sol#L32

### **Status**

Acknowledged with the following statement:

The issue identified is acknowledged by the Fuji team, however, the team encountered that such change will require major refactors at: smart contracts, sdk, and front-end. Therefore, they intend to address this issue in Q4-2023, to replace storing assets for asset-shares allowance.

**BaseFlasher** transfers tokens and then calls **xBundle(...)**, so the sent tokens can't be returned due to the balance check

Id	3S-FUJI-M04
Classification	Medium
Severity	Medium
Likelihood	High
Category	Bug
Relevant Links	abstracts/BaseFlasher.sol#L102

### **Description**

The **BaseRouter** checks if the balances of the assets remain the same after the **xBundle(...)** execution. The BaseFlasher, **\_requestorExecution(...)** is implemented in the following way

```
IERC20(asset).safeTransfer(requestor, amount);
requestor.functionCall(requestorCalldata);
// approve flashloan source address to spend to repay flashloan
IERC20(asset).safeApprove(getFlashloanSourceAddr(asset), amount +
fee);
```

Thus, when xBundle(...) is called in requestor.functionCall(requestorCalldata);, the initial balance of the BaseRouter will take into account the received funds from the flashloan, such that it will be impossible to return the funds at the end of the call.

#### Recommendation

Similarly to **xReceive(...)** of the ConnextRouter, the BaseRouter could implement a similar function. In this case, the caller of, let's say, **flashloanReceive(...)**, could be whitelisted to one of the flashers.

#### **POC**

https://github.com/threesigmaxyz/fuji-issues-external/blob/master/test/POC/POCCantUseFlashloanFunds.t.sol#L97

### **Status**

\_crossTransfer(...) reverts for smart contracts that don't share the same address on different chains

Id	3S-FUJI-M05
Classification	Medium
Severity	Medium
Likelihood	High
Category	Bug
Relevant Links	routers/ConnextRouter.sol#L275

### **Description**

**\_crossTransfer(...)** has a beneficiary check such that the receiver of the funds in the destination chain must be the same as the previous beneficiary (most likely the msg.sender or the **ConnextRouter**). If the address is a smart contract, the address will probably be different on the different chain, which will make the transaction revert.

#### Recommendation

Allow users to specify in a mapping the corresponding beneficiary in the destination chain, in a function addBeneficiaryToDestDomain(...), which would set beneficiary[msg.sender][destDomain] = newBeneficary;

#### **Status**

Acknowledged with the following statement:

The issue identified is acknowledged by the Fuji team. Smart contract integrations will require the capability of defining a different address as beneficiary in a different domain. This feature will be added during Q3-2023 while working on general optimizations/improvements on the router contracts.

**ConnextRouter** fails to record failed message if gas sent is not enough

<u> </u>	
Id	3S-FUJI-M06
Classification	Medium
Severity	High
Likelihood	Low
Category	Bug
Relevant Links	routers/ConnextRouter.sol#L171
	POC/POCXReceiveGas.t.sol#L34

# **Description**

The ConnextRouter places the **xBundleConnext(...)** call on a **try/catch block** to prevent failed actions to make the transaction revert and the funds being given to **Connext**. The **EVM** saves 1/64th of gas before an external call to try to finish execution after the external call. However, if the **xBundleConnext(...)** transaction inside the **try/catch** fails, the following execution consumes a non significant amount of gas (transferring and recording the failed message), such that 1/64 of the sent **gas** could not be enough to finish the execution.

#### Recommendation

Calculate the minimum amount required of gas to finish execution after the try/catch block and revert if this gas is not available prior to the block with **gasleft()**. This ensures that whatever actions users do inside the try/catch block, the message will always be recorded if it fails.

#### **POC**

https://github.com/threesigmaxyz/fuji-issues/blob/master/test/POC/POCXReceiveGas.t.sol#L34

#### **Status**

Acknowledged with the following statement:

The issue identified is acknowledged by the Fuji team, however, as indicated the likelihood of its occurrence is low. Along with issue **3S-FUJI-N05**, during Q3-2023 we will be working on general optimizations/improvements on the router contracts that will allow a more consistent estimation of gas during a failed transfer and implement fix as suggested.

It's impossible to do a **depositETH** action on **xReceive(...)** in **ConnextRouter** 

Id	3S-FUJI-M07
Classification	Medium
Severity	Medium
Likelihood	High
Category	Bug
Relevant Links	abstracts/BaseRouter.sol#L299-L301

### **Description**

The **ConnextRouter** allows users to bridge items from one chain to another and perform arbitrary actions there. Currently, the **ConnextRouter** checks, in the **depositETH** action, that the amount is equal to the **msg.value** sent. This means that for **xReceive(...)** calls, which never send native, it's impossible to deposit **ETH**.

#### Recommendation

The check that the amount is equal to the msg.value is unnecessary, given that it should be impossible to steal an already existing **ETH** from the router due to the balance checks. Additionally, this should be implemented for consistency, because for ERC20 tokens this check does not exist currently; users can specify the router as the sender in deposit actions, effectively not checking if the users sent the tokens.

Thus, remove

```
if (amount != msg.value) {
   revert BaseRouter__bundleInternal_insufficientETH();
}
```

#### **Status**

Users can claim tokens in **ConnextRouter** by calling **xReceive(...)** directly

Id	3S-FUJI-M08
Classification	Medium
Severity	High
Likelihood	Low
Category	Suggestion
Relevant Links	routers/ConnextRouter.sol#L148
	abstracts/BaseRouter.sol#L119
	routers/ConnextRouter.sol#L148
	routers/ConnextRouter.sol#L175

# **Description**

The **ConnextRouter** allows anyone to call **xReceive(...)** and the amount of assets the user provided is the **balance** of the contract. Thus, users can use this functionality to sweep any existing funds into their wallets. It also happens when a **xReceive(...)** call fails at **this.xBundleConnext(...)**, and the balance, including the existing tokens, get attributed to the user.

It should not be a likely event given that there are checks to ensure that the **ConnextRouter** does not end up with funds after **xBundle(...)** calls. Still, given that the **BaseRouter** has a **sweepTokens(...)** function, this might lead to a false sense of security.

### Recommendation

Implement a proxy receiver which receives the tokens from **Connext** and then forwards them to the **ConnextRouter**.

#### **Status**

**Connext** delegates can perform important actions, make sure smart contract users implement them

Id	3S-FUJI-M09
Classification	Medium
Severity	Medium
Likelihood	Medium
Category	Suggestion
Relevant Links	https://docs.connext.network/ developers/guides/handling- failures#high-slippage

### **Description**

**Connext** implements a mechanism of adjusting/forcing parameters in the bridged assets which can be triggered by a delegate. If the delegate is a **EOA** or wallet, there is no problem, as the delegate can call directly the connext bridge. However, care must be taken if the caller of **xBundle(...)** is a smart contract, in which it may not implement the necessary **Connext** function calls. This can be dangerous if the smart contract user set, for example, a low slippage tolerance and did not implement the function **forceUpdateSlippage(...)** of the connext bridge.

#### Recommendation

Implement methods in the **Router/Handler** to handle these function calls, such as **bumpTransfer(...)** and make the ConnextRouter the delegate. In alternative, make it very clear in the documentation and comments in the interface/code that the user must implement these important **Connext** methods if it is a smart contract.

#### **Status**

# Withdraw and borrow can be DoSed in BaseRouter

Id	3S-FUJI-M10
Classification	Medium
Severity	Medium
Likelihood	Medium
Category	Suggestion
Relevant Links	abstracts/BaseRouter.sol#L197C3- L218

# **Description**

Withdraw and borrow actions in the **BaseRouter** require the owner to increase the approval allowances. If the allowance increase and withdrawal action transaction are not done atomically (via a **multicall**, for example), anyone can withdraw 1 token, which will make the real withdraw revert. Same for borrow.

#### Recommendation

Similarly to the **deposit(...)** action \_safePullTokenFrom(...), only the owner of the withdrawal and borrow actions should be able to call these actions directly. To allow someone withdrawing for a user or cross chain withdrawals, the withdrawal should only be allowed if there was a permit action before (same for borrowing).

#### **Status**

Acknowledged with the following statement:

The issue identified is acknowledged by the Fuji team including the severity and potential for griefing attacks possible with user's excess allowance on the router. The team intends to implement the discussed solution: combining IRouter.Action.PermitBorrow and IRouter.Action.PermitWithdraw followed respectively by borrow or withdraw operations. Then restrict the "pure" IRouter.Action.Withdraw, and IRouter.Action.Borrow to ONLY be callable when msg.sender is the owner. This change will be implemented among other pending changes in O3 2023.

Handling someone else repaying debt for the **BorrowingVault** 

could	be	done	different	ly
_				

Id	3S-FUJI-L01
Classification	Low
Severity	N/A
Likelihood	N/A
Category	Suggestion
Relevant Links	extensions/ERC4626.sol#L232
	extensions/ERC4626.sol#L239
	borrowing/BorrowingVault.sol#L462- L464
	borrowing/BorrowingVault.sol#L975

# **Description**

In \_convertDebtToShares(...), if totalDebt(...) is 0, it reverts. This means that, if someone decides to repay the full vault debt, this function would always revert. The current measure taken is pausing the vault and then borrowing a debt amount equal to the debt shares. This leads to a temporary halting of the vault and it may require rebalancing the providers to enable borrowing all the debt from the same provider (if the debt was distributed among many providers).

#### Recommendation

The Openzeppelin ERC4626 implementation, instead of placing totalAssets(...) in the denominator (here equivalent to totalDebt(...)), places totalAssets(...) + 1 (also adds 1 when converting shares to assets). The yield vault could also use this logic, although I don't think it's possible for the totalAssets(...) to be 0 and the shares different from 0.

This would fix this problem, take a look at the following example

There are 10000 shares and 10000 assets.

User repays 10000 assets (directly at provider(s)), and now the supply is 10000 and totalDebt is 0.

Some user wants to borrow 100 debt:

```
shares = debt * supply / (totalAssets + 1) = 100 * 10_000 / 1 = 1_000_000
```

if this user tries to pay back the debt

```
debt = shares * (totalAssets + 1) / supply = 1_000_000 * 101 / 1_010_000 = 100
```

which adds up correctly

if another user wants to repay their debt, the calculation would be

shares = 100, supply = 10000, assets = 0

debt = shares \* (totalAssets + 1) / supply = 
$$100 * 1 / 10000 = 0$$

which means their debt would have been paid by the attacker. It would only increase if they borrow more, which would work correctly, as shown in the previous example.

#### **Status**

# BaseVault is not fully ERC5143 compliant

Id	3S-FUJI-L03
Classification	Low
Severity	N/A
Likelihood	N/A
Category	Bug
Relevant Links	https://eips.ethereum.org/EIPS/eip-20
	https://eips.ethereum.org/EIPS/eip- 4626

### **Description**

The BaseVault implements ERC5143, an extension of ERC4626. Thus, it should try to match every requirement of the ERC. In this case, when setting a new withdraw allowance, an event **Approval(address indexed \_owner, address indexed \_spender, uint256 \_value)** should be triggered.

Additionally, **allowance** related functions only let spenders send assets to themselves (unless calling **withdrawAllowance** related functions).

#### Recommendation

- Emit the **approval** event when setting a new withdrawal allowance (when calling **approve(...)**, **increaseAllowance(...)** and **decreaseAllowance(...)**).
- Approval related functions should be fully compliant and set the approval of an address to all other addresses. This is important for other dApps to be compatible. Given that borrowing is not part of the standard, the borrow balance could be left as is. However, the withdraw allowance should be turned into the usual allowance mapping of ERC20. Applying the recommended fix to **3S-FUJI-M10** would make this change fully secure.

#### **Status**

In BaseRouter, \_handleSwapAction(...), users shouldn't be allowed to send funds to an allowed flasher

Id	3S-FUJI-L04
Classification	Low
Severity	N/A
Likelihood	N/A
Category	Suggestion
Relevant Links	

### **Description**

\_handleSwapAction(...) allows sending funds to the Flasher. This should be to pay for a taken flashloan. However, if the goal of this exception is only to enable the payment of a flashloan, it should be removed and handled differently. This is because it may allow users to send funds to the flasher, without taking a flashloan, either maliciously or by mistake.

### Recommendation

Create a new action called **repayFlashLoan** and use it to repay the **flashLoan**. This action should revert if the amount being repaid is bigger than the **flashloan** taken.

#### **Status**

Acknowledged with the following statement:

The issue identified is acknowledged by the Fuji team, however, as indicated the severity of this issue is low. During Q3-2023 we will be working on general optimizations/improvements on the router contracts.

**BaseRouter**, \_bundleInternal(...) Action.Flashloan does not check if the selector matches xBundle(...)

Id	3S-FUJI-L05
Classification	Low
Severity	N/A
Likelihood	N/A
Category	Bug
Relevant Links	abstracts/BaseRouter.sol#L288-L290

### **Description**

Users make flashloans by calling xBundle(...) with a flashloan action. When the flashloan calls the callback of the Flasher, in \_requestorExecution(...) of the BaseFlasher, it calls the function selector in the first 4 bytes in the requestorCalldata. However, in \_bundleInternal(...), the correct selector is not enforced, so users can call any function of the BaseRouter. There does not seem to be any clear path for an exploit, but it's best to check.

#### Recommendation

Add if (bytes4(LibBytes.slice(requesterCalldata, 0, 4)) != this.xBundle(...).selector) revert(); or similar.

#### **Status**

Acknowledged with the following statement:

The issue identified is acknowledged by the Fuji team, however, as indicated the severity of this issue is low. During Q3-2023 the team will be working on general optimizations/improvements on the router contracts.

\_crossTransfer(...) should revert if users specify
routerByDomain[destDomain] as destination

Id	3S-FUJI-L06
Classification	Low
Severity	N/A
Likelihood	N/A
Category	Suggestion
Relevant Links	routers/ConnextRouter.sol#L275
	routers/ConnextRouter.sol#L324

# **Description**

This scenario only happens if the router in the **destDomain** has the same address as the router in the **destDomain**. Else, the beneficiary check will fail.

\_crossTransfer(...) enables users to bridge assets to any destination, without calldata. If users want to send assets to the router on the other chain, they might select \_crossTransfer(...) instead of \_crossTransferWithCalldata(...), which would cause them to lose their funds.

#### Recommendation

Add the check if (receiver) == routerByDomain[destDomain]) revert(); in the crossTransfer() call.

#### **Status**

executeFailedWithUpdatedArgs(...) shouldn't be able to change beneficiary

arrainge serremany	
Id	3S-FUJI-L07
Classification	Low
Severity	N/A
Likelihood	N/A
Category	Suggestion
Relevant Links	routers/ConnextHandler.sol#L202

# **Description**

When the **ConnextRouter** message fails, it records the message in the **ConnextHandler** and sends it the funds.

In the **ConnextHandler**, it's possible to change the actions and arguments of a failed tx in **executeFailedWithUpdatedArgs(...)**.

Thus, it's possible to change the beneficiary, which would leave room for attacks to steal assets.

### Recommendation

Check the beneficiary of the first action to match the previous beneficiary.

#### **Status**

Acknowledged with the following statement:

The issue identified is acknowledged by the Fuji team, however, as indicated the severity of this issue is low. The call to execute a failed transfer is permissioned and it's in the team's best interest to resolve failed transfers ethically. During Q3-2023 the team will be working on general optimizations/improvements on the router contracts in which this fix will be implemented.

When changing addresses, use 2 step transfer and/or contract size and/or address **0x0** checks

Id	3S-FUJI-L08
Classification	Low
Severity	N/A
Likelihood	N/A
Category	Suggestion
Relevant Links	abstracts/BaseRouter.sol#L97-L98
	abstracts/BaseRouter.sol#L120
	abstracts/BaseRouter.sol#L125
	routers/ConnextRouter.sol#L102
	borrowing/BorrowingVault.sol#L791

### **Description**

When changing important addresses, it's best to use additional safety measures to prevent wrong addresses from being set. When the address to change is guaranteed to be a smart contract, a **isContract** check is very helpful. Another layer of protection is using 2 step address transfer, in which a pending role is set first and only then, from the pending role account, it accepts the new role.

#### Recommendation

Check every address **setter** and use the mentioned patterns.

#### **Status**

Acknowledged with the following statement:

The optimization identified is acknowledged by the Fuji team. However, as indicated the issue is of low severity. During Q3 we will be working on optimizations that will improve general patterns within our contracts.

\_getBeneficiaryFromCalldata(...) in ConnextRouter should not allow the first action to be depositETH(...)

Id	3S-FUJI-ERROR01
Classification	Low
Severity	N/A
Likelihood	N/A
Category	Suggestion
Relevant Links	routers/ConnextRouter.sol#L400

# **Description**

Currently issue **3S-FUJI-M07** means that the deposit action can't be performed on a cross transfer at all.

Still, having fixed it, the first action should not be **depositETH(...)**, as there is no ETH to be deposited yet (unless users are using the balance of the **ConnextRouter** in the other chain, which should not be intended).

### Recommendation

In \_getBeneficiaryFromCalldata(...), revert if the first action is depositETH(...). Flashloans would not be able to call depositETH(...) in the first action, which is okay because they send ERC20s anyway.

#### **Status**

Borrowing is not vulnerable to an inflation attack, it's unnecessary to borrow when initializing the vault

Id	3S-FUJI-N01
Classification	None
Severity	N/A
Likelihood	N/A
Category	Optimization
Relevant Links	borrowing/BorrowingVault.sol#L171

# **Description**

An inflation attack occurs because attackers manipulate the denominator of the assets calculation by increasing **totalAssets(...)**, which when calculating the shares as **shares** = **assets** \* **supply** / **totalAssets(...)**, would make it round down and the depositing user is stolen. In the case of debt, it's not possible to increase the denominator **totalDebt(...)** without borrowing, which increases the shares. In fact, if the **debtShares** were rounded down by attackers, it would be beneficial to the user, who would have to pay less debt for the same **debtShares**.

#### Recommendation

Remove the borrow line in the **initializeVault(...)**.

#### **Status**

**YieldVault maxRedeem(...)** unnecessarily converts shares to assets and back to shares again

Id	3S-FUJI-N02
Classification	None
Severity	N/A
Likelihood	N/A
Category	Optimization
Relevant Links	abstracts/BaseVault.sol#L272
	abstracts/BaseVault.sol#L280
	yield/YieldVault.sol#L211

# **Description**

maxRedeem(...) enables users to know how many shares they can redeem. In the case of the borrowing vault, it depends on the amount of debt a user has taken, which is taken into account in \_computeFreeAssets(...).

In the case of the yield vault, maxRedeem(...) is the balance of the user. Currently, it converts the balance of the user to assets in \_computeFreeAssets(...), and then in maxRedeem(...) back to shares again. This is unnecessary and the code could be refactored to handle these 2 situations.

#### Recommendation

The **YieldVault** could override **maxRedeem(...)** and return the balance of the user directly (if not paused).

#### **Status**

Throughout code base, implement using **SafeERC20** for **IERC20** for better readability

better readability

Id	3S-FUJI-N03
Classification	None
Severity	N/A
Likelihood	N/A
Category	Suggestion
Relevant Links	utils/SafeERC20.sol#L16
	abstracts/BaseVault.sol#L24
	abstracts/BaseRouter.sol#L13
	borrowing/BorrowingVault.sol#L27
	yield/YieldVault.sol#L21
	routers/ConnextHandler.sol#L19

# **Description**

When using SafeERC20, it's common to implement with **using SafeERC20 for IERC20**. Take a look at the **openzeppelin code**.

#### **Status**

# BaseFlasher does extra abi.encode unnecessarily

	<i>y</i>
Id	3S-FUJI-N04
Classification	None
Severity	None
Likelihood	
Category	Optimization
Relevant Links	abstracts/BaseFlasher.sol#L73 abstracts/BaseFlasher.sol#L86

# **Description**

The \_entrypoint in BaseFlasher is keccak256(abi.encode(data))

#### Recommendation

Remove abi.encode and set it as keccak256(data)

### **Status**

# **ConnextHandler** can store the hash of the failed messages instead

Id	3S-FUJI-N05
Classification	None
Severity	N/A
Likelihood	N/A
Category	Optimization
Relevant Links	routers/ConnextHandler.sol#L202

# **Description**

Storing the failed message itself is very expensive.

#### Recommendation

Store the hash and then when calling **executeFailedWithUpdatedArgs(...)** send the **txn** as an argument and match it against the stored hash.

#### **Status**

Acknowledged with the following statement:

The optimization identified is acknowledged by the Fuji team. During Q3 the team will be working on optimizations that will improve the router contracts.

When recording failed transactions in **ConnextHandler**, getting the next **Nonce** involves an unnecessary for loop

Id	3S-FUJI-N06
Classification	None
Severity	N/A
Likelihood	N/A
Category	Optimization
Relevant Links	routers/ConnextHandler.sol#90 routers/ConnextHandler.sol#179

### **Description**

In **ConnextHandler.sol**, in order to record a failed transaction it is necessary to know the next **nonce** in the **mapping**, this involves a **for** cycle with a storage read that expends **gas**. Since it only adds at the end of the list and access is always done using the **nonce**, the variable **\_failedTxns** could be changed from a **mapping** of a **mapping** to the **mapping** of an **array**, this way in order to add a transaction **push()** could be used and to be able to know the nonce the **length** of the array would suffice. This way the **for** cycle wouldn't be needed and it would save on **gas**.

#### Recommendation

New declaration: mapping(bytes32 => FailedTxn[]) private \_failedTxns; Fetching the nonce: uint128 nextNonce = \_failedTxns[transferId].length; And adding to the list: \_failedTxns[transferId].push(...);

#### **Status**

Mismatching calldata in \_crossTransferWithCalldata(...) and xReceive(...) in ConnextRouter

Id	3S-FUJI-N07
Classification	None
Severity	N/A
Likelihood	N/A
Category	Bug
Relevant Links	POC/EncodingCalldata.t.sol#L12

### **Description**

Users can bridge assets by inserting an Action.XTransferWithCall action, with
calldata specified in the args field. The calldata in
\_crossTransferWithCalldata(...) and \_getBeneficiaryFromCalldata(...) is
decoded as:
(Action[] memory actions, bytes[] memory args,) =
 abi.decode(callData, (Action[], bytes[], uint256));

Whereas in xReceive(...), it lacks the last uint256:

(Action[] memory actions, bytes[] memory args) = abi.decode(callData, (Action[], bytes[]));

### Recommendation

Remove the last uint256 parameter from being decoded, as it is not being used.

#### **POC**

https://github.com/threesigmaxyz/fuji-issues-external/blob/master/test/POC/EncodingCalldata.t.sol#L12

### Status

In ConnextHandler, executeFailedWithUpdatedArgs(...), the whole tx is updated on storage if the try call succeeds

Id	3S-FUJI-N08
Classification	None
Severity	N/A
Likelihood	N/A
Category	Optimization
Relevant Links	routers/ConnextHandler.sol#L222- L223

# **Description**

In the ConnextHandle, **executeFailedWithUpdatedArgs(...)**, the failed **tx** executed field is set to true. Currently it is loaded in memory and then written to storage completely, which is unnecessary and adds significant gas overhead.

#### Recommendation

Change the code below try connextRouter.xBundle(actions, args) to \_failedTxns[transferId][nonce].executed = true; to save on storage writes.

#### **Status**

When transferring tokens, skip if the amount is 0

Id	3S-FUJI-N09
Classification	None
Severity	N/A
Likelihood	N/A
Category	Optimization
Relevant Links	abstracts/BaseRouter.sol#L120
	abstracts/BaseRouter.sol#L523
	abstracts/BaseRouter.sol#L542
	abstracts/BaseFlasher.sol#L112
	abstracts/BaseVault.sol#L537
	abstracts/BaseVault.sol#L587
	borrowing/BorrowingVault.sol#L775
	borrowing/BorrowingVault.sol#L791

# **Description**

Before each transfer call, if the amount is 0, it should be skipped.

### Recommendation

```
An example would be
function _safeTransferETH(address receiver, uint256 amount) internal
{
   if (amount == 0) return;
   (bool success,) = receiver.call{value: amount}(new bytes(0));
   if (!success) revert BaseRouter__safeTransferETH_transferFailed();
}
```

#### **Status**

# **xBundle(...)** and **xReceive(...)** should have **nonReentrant** modifiers

Id	3S-FUJI-N10
Classification	None
Severity	N/A
Likelihood	N/A
Category	Suggestion
Relevant Links	facets/BaseConnextFacet.sol#L51
	facets/BaseConnextFacet.sol#L51
	abstracts/BaseRouter.sol#L102
	routers/ConnextRouter.sol#L131

### **Description**

**xBundle(...)** and **xReceive(...)** make several external calls and check the balances before and after these calls. It's safer to include nonReentrant modifiers to prevent reentrancy.

### Recommendation

Check the Connext implementation for an example. Using non zero state variables as mutex saves gas, because the second write is to the same slot as the first write. Add a check such that if **msg.sender** is the flasher, it can reenter.

#### **Status**

Fujicracy/fuji-v2#622

\_to argument missing 0x0 address check in the ConnextRouter

Id	3S-FUJI-N11
Classification	None
Severity	N/A
Likelihood	N/A
Category	Suggestion
Relevant Links	routers/ConnextRouter.sol#L275
	routers/ConnextRouter.sol#L324

# **Description**

The ConnextRouter does not check, in the \_crossTransfer(...) and \_crossTransferWithCalldata(...) functions, if the receiver and routerByDomain[destDomain] equal address(0). This should revert anyway because the Connext contract reverts if \_to is address(0), but it's safer to make this additional check.

#### Recommendation

Check if the address is 0.

#### **Status**

checkNoBalanceChange(...) cycle should break in BaseRouter

Id	3S-FUJI-N12
Classification	None
Severity	N/A
Likelihood	N/A
Category	Optimization
Relevant Links	abstracts/BaseRouter.sol#L662

# **Description**

\_checkNoBalanceChange(...) has a for cycle that goes through all tokens. For each token it checks if they are address(0), this is only true if we have arrived at the end of the list of tokens, therefore we can break the cycle to save on gas.

### Recomendation

Add a break to the **for** cycle to save gas.

#### **Status**

\_handleSwapAction(...) creates situations where the arguments receiver and sweeper need to be the same address in BaseRouter

Id	3S-FUJI-N13
Classification	None
Severity	N/A
Likelihood	N/A
Category	Documentation
Relevant Links	abstracts/BaseRouter.sol#L506 abstracts/BaseRouter.sol#L510

# **Description**

In \_handleSwapAction(...) the function checks if both the receiver and sweeper are the beneficiary given certain conditions. Since there can only be one beneficiary there are situations where a user can't name the receiver and sweeper as two different addresses.

#### Recommendation

This should be explained as expected behavior in the documentation or in comments.

#### **Status**

Constants should be placed as constants and not hardcoded for better readability

Id	3S-FUJI-N14
Classification	None
Severity	N/A
Likelihood	N/A
Category	Good Code Practices
Relevant Links	N/A

### **Description**

Hardcoded values are hard to track and constants should be used instead.

#### Recommendation

For example in **BorrowingVault**, **1e18** is used several times for precision, which could be set as a constant such as **uint256 private constant PRECISION CONSTANT** = **1e18** 

#### **Status**

\_tempTokenToCheck in BaseRouter does not need to be a state variable

Id	3S-FUJI-N15
Classification	None
Severity	N/A
Likelihood	N/A
Category	Optimization
Relevant Links	abstracts/BaseRouter.sol#L89
	abstracts/BaseRouter.sol#L102
	abstracts/BaseRouter.sol#L140
	routers/ConnextRouter.sol#L151-L153

### **Description**

\_tempTokenToCheck checks that the balance of the ConnextRouter does not change after having received tokens in xReceive(...) . This variable is unnecessary as the tokensToCheck variable of \_bundleInternal(...) could be created before the \_bundleInternal(...) call and passed as argument.

#### Recommendation

In the ConnextRouter, create the **tokensToCheck** variable in the **xReceive(...)** function and pass it as argument to **xBundleConnext(...)**, which should pass it as argument to **\_bundleInternal(...)**. In the BaseRouter, create the **tokensToCheck** variable in **xBundle(...)** and pass it as argument to **\_bundleInternal(...)**.

#### **Status**

Unnecessary extra condition in if statement

Id	3S-FUJI-N16
Classification	None
Severity	N/A
Likelihood	N/A
Category	Optimization
Relevant Links	

### **Description**

On the **BorrowingVault.sol** contract in the function \_withdraw(...) the if statement checks the following conditions:

If the first two conditions are true the third will always be true, therefore there is no need to check it.

#### Recommendation

Remove the third check in the **if** statement.

#### **Status**

Useless else statement

Id	3S-FUJI-N17
Classification	None
Severity	N/A
Likelihood	N/A
Category	Good Code Practices
Relevant Links	routers/ConnextRouter.sol#L151-L153
	vaults/borrowing/
	BorrowingVault.sol#L163
	vaults/yield/YieldVault.sol#L64
	vaults/borrowing/
	BorrowingVault.sol#L204-L207

### **Description**

If a call reverts in the first **if** statement, the following **else** is not required.

#### Recommendation

```
Replace
if (balance < amount) {
    revert ConnextRouter__xReceive_notReceivedAssetBalance();
} else {
    _tempTokenToCheck = Snapshot(asset, balance - amount);
} with
if (balance < amount) {
    revert ConnextRouter__xReceive_notReceivedAssetBalance();
}
_tempTokenToCheck = Snapshot(asset, balance - amount);</pre>
```

#### **Status**

Addressed here: Fujicracy/fuji-v2#625 and Fujicracy/fuji-v2#622

Saving parameters in memory without using them spends gas

Id	3S-FUJI-N18
Classification	None
Severity	N/A
Likelihood	N/A
Category	Optimization
Relevant Links	abstracts/BaseVault.sol/#L136 abstracts/BaseVault.sol/#L160
	abstracts/BaseVault.sol/#L178
	abstracts/BaseVault.sol/#L194

### **Description**

In **BaseVault.sol** several functions receive a variable as a parameter then save it in memory and immediately use it to make a call without making any changes.

```
function increaseAllowance(address receiver, uint256 shares) public
override returns (bool) {
   address operator = receiver;
   increaseWithdrawAllowance(operator, receiver,
convertToAssets(shares));
   return true;
}
```

#### Recommendation

In the mentioned functions in the links, remove the variable in memory being created and pass the variable directly to the call (address operator, above).

### **Status**

Don't return the same memory variable if your passing it as argument

9	
Id	3S-FUJI-N19
Classification	None
Severity	None
Likelihood	
Category	Good Code Practices
Relevant Links	abstracts/BaseRouter.sol#L192

# **Description**

In BaseRouter, \_bundleInternal(...), the tokensToCheck array is updated in tokensToCheck = \_addTokenToList(token, tokensToCheck); In \_addTokenToList(...), the token is added to the array if it is not present yet, which modifies the tokensToCheck in the outer scope of the function; there is no need to return it - when a variable is passed as memory to an internal function, the same memory location is used, solidity does not create a copy.

#### Recommendation

Change addTokenToList(...) to not return anything.

#### **Status**