



BEOSIN
Blockchain Security



ICPSwap-Farm

Smart Contract Security Audit

No. 202408011145

Aug 1st, 2024



SECURING BLOCKCHAIN ECOSYSTEM

WWW.BEOSIN.COM

Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| 1 Overview | 7 |
| 1.1 Project Overview | 7 |
| 1.2 Audit Overview | 7 |
| 1.3 Audit Method | 7 |
| 2 Findings | 9 |
| [Farm-01] The reward calculation method is unreasonable | 10 |
| [Farm-02] The amount of tokens extracted by the close function is inaccurate | 11 |
| [Farm-03] Variable value sets incorrectly | 12 |
| [Farm-04] The amount of reward tokens in TVL is not updated in a timely manner | 13 |
| [Farm-05] The _rewardPerCycle calculate inaccurate | 14 |
| [Farm-06] The _stakeRecordBuffe record calculate inaccurate | 15 |
| [Farm-07] The _updateTVL calculate inaccurate | 17 |
| [Farm-08] Any user can record incorrect data | 19 |
| [Farm-09] Variable name set incorrect | 20 |
| [Farm-10] Error in transfer parameters for rewardTokenAdapter | 21 |
| [Farm-11] Design flaw in the getLiveFarmsByPools function | 22 |
| [Farm-12] Dependent library version specification error | 24 |
| [Farm-13] Permission check incomplete | 25 |
| [Farm-14] Redundant code | 26 |
| 3 Appendix | 29 |
| 3.1 Vulnerability Assessment Metrics and Status in Smart Contracts | 29 |

3.2 Audit Categories 32

3.3 Disclaimer 34

3.4 About Beosin 35

Summary of Audit Results

After auditing,2 High-risk, 1 Medium-risk ,8 Low-risk and 3 Info items were identified in the ICPSwap-Farm project. Specific audit details will be presented in the Findings section. Users should pay attention to the following aspects when interacting with this project:

High

Fixed : 2 Acknowledged: 0

Medium

Fixed : 1 Acknowledged: 0

Low

Fixed : 8 Acknowledged: 0

Info

Fixed : 3 Acknowledged: 0

● Project Description:

Business overview

ICPSwap-Farm implements the function of staking to obtain rewards, including five functional modules: FarmFactory, Farm, FarmFeeReceiver, FarmIndex. Below is a separate explanation of the business logic for each module.

FarmFactory:

This actor is mainly responsible for creating a reward farm. The admin can call the `create` function to create a valid reward farm. The validity verification mainly includes: the reward amount `rewardAmount` must be a positive number, the validity of the farm start time `startTime` and end time `endTime`, and the farm duration's validity, the validity of the reward distribution cycle `secondPerCycle` relative to the duration.

Farm:

This actor mainly includes the following three parts of business functions, which will be introduced separately below.

The first part is the pledge-related logic: users can call the `stake` function to pledge the `_swapPoolAct` related liquidity voucher tokens specified in the farm to obtain reward tokens. Since the voucher position contains the price range, if the farm has turned on the price limit, then only positions within the valid price range can be pledged, and qualified positions will be transferred to the farm for pledge; later, the user can call the `unstake` function to unstake, and the contract will return the user's pledged tokens and issue the user's staking rewards; in addition, `feeReceiverCid` can call `withdrawRewardFee` to obtain the staking reward handling fee.

The second part is the logic related to reward calculation: each farm sets a timer, and regularly calls the `_distributeReward` function to update the user's reward in each time period. The total reward amount of the farm in each cycle is fixed. At each reward update, the actor will calculate the overall reward weight based on whether the price limit is turned on and the liquidity of all users' pledged positions, and then based on the liquidity of the user's single pledged position and time to calculate its reward amount and update it.

The third part is the status management of the farm. There are four statuses of the farm, namely `#NOT_STARTED`, `#LIVE`, `#CLOSED`, and `#FINISHED`. When there is no user staking in the farm, the

admin can call the close function to set the farm status to #CLOSED, and recycle the remaining unallocated reward tokens to the `refunder` address; the admin can also call the `finishManually` function to set the farm status to #FINISHED.; the admin can also call the `restartManually` function to reset the farm status to #LIVE, at which time the user can continue staking, etc.

FarmFactoryValidator:

It mainly implements the parameter validity check for Farm creation, and the caller permission check when setting permissions for `Admins`, `FarmAdmins`, `FarmControllers`, etc. The relevant implementation has not yet been used in the project.

FarmFeeReceiver:

This actor is responsible for the management of pledge fees and is mainly divided into two parts of business logic functions. All logic can only be called by addresses with Controller permissions. The first part is that the Controller can call the `claim` function to withdraw the pledge fees accumulated in the farm. The second part is that the Controller can call the `transfer` and `transferAll` functions to transfer the fee tokens to other addresses. The token standards supported by this actor include DIP20, DIP20-WICP, DIP20-XTC, EXT, ICRC1, ICRC2, ICRC3, and ICP.

Code module update

In the commit with hash 05494329812b95408ca1a7111cdce6d94e4c229, the project team made the following changes to the code.

Farm: Added information on reward tokens. Used the `_updateTVL` and `_updateAPR` functions to calculate and update the TVL and APR of assets in the farm. Utilized `farmlIndex` to manage data synchronization for users participating in the farm, as well as farm status and TVL.

Factory: Removed the functionality for synchronizing and updating the Farm data status. The primary logic now focuses on creating Farms.

FarmFactoryValidator: Removed the address check for `rewardPool`.

FarmlIndex: Added this actor for managing data related to users and Farms. Multiple Farms will periodically call `_updateUserInfo`, `_updateStatus`, and `_updateTVL` to synchronize data with FarmlIndex. Users can query information about the entire project in `FarmlIndex`.

1 Overview

1.1 Project Overview

| | |
|------------------|---|
| Project Name | ICPSwap-Farm |
| Project Language | Motoko |
| Platform | IC |
| Code Base | https://github.com/ICPSwap-Labs/icpswap-farm |
| Commit Id | d76bf2d55ca48f1b1016c2d553f3f30ca9d1a659 2b89ee1905e105ac055389332e85de2a82f5c499 d562ae0d8c78314b5d4396eb47b60ec440824461 9f33f69e773ae82936a63dd2a626a2fdc6a0860c 0a0a78fb0650e7cee6f780d104f8c9170f979f51 c45af75007396da674ee1c780b2a3fbea11db8b8 5121eb23fdc3f3ee3ff7e0b9bb953103e6fd0348 63ef937f3e1738f65cb025083b3b6f9f5b4105a4 05494329812b95408ca1a7111cdce6d94e4c229 |

1.2 Audit Overview

Audit work duration: May 10, 2024 – May 22, 2024, Jun 19, 2024 – Jun 25, 2024

Update time: Aug 1, 2024

Audit team: Beosin Security Team

1.3 Audit Method

The audit methods are as follows:

1. Formal Verification

Formal verification is a technique that uses property-based approaches for testing and verification. Property specifications define a set of rules using Beosin's library of security expert rules. These rules call into the contracts under analysis and make various assertions about their behavior. The rules of the specification play a crucial role in the analysis. If the rule is violated, a concrete test case is provided to demonstrate the violation.

2. Manual Review

Using manual auditing methods, the code is read line by line to identify potential security issues. This ensures that the contract's execution logic aligns with the client's specifications and intentions, thereby safeguarding the accuracy of the contract's business logic.

The manual audit is divided into three groups to cover the entire auditing process:

The Basic Testing Group is primarily responsible for interpreting the project's code and conducting comprehensive functional testing.

The Simulated Attack Group is responsible for analyzing the audited project based on the collected historical audit vulnerability database and security incident attack models. They identify potential attack vectors and collaborate with the Basic Testing Group to conduct simulated attack tests.

The Expert Analysis Group is responsible for analyzing the overall project design, interactions with third parties, and security risks in the on-chain operational environment. They also conduct a review of the entire audit findings.

3. Static Analysis

Static analysis is a method of examining code during compilation or static analysis to detect issues. Beosin-VaaS can detect more than 100 common smart contract vulnerabilities through static analysis, such as reentrancy and block parameter dependency. It allows early and efficient discovery of problems to improve code quality and security.

2 Findings

| Index | Risk description | Severity level | Status |
|---------|--|----------------|--------|
| Farm-01 | The reward calculation method is unreasonable | High | Fixed |
| Farm-02 | The amount of tokens extracted by the close function is inaccurate | High | Fixed |
| Farm-03 | Value sets incorrectly | Medium | Fixed |
| Farm-04 | The amount of reward tokens in TVL is not updated in a timely manner | Low | Fixed |
| Farm-05 | The _rewardPerCycle calculate inaccurate | Low | Fixed |
| Farm-06 | The _stakeRecordBuf record calculate inaccurate | Low | Fixed |
| Farm-07 | The _updateTVL calculate inaccurate | Low | Fixed |
| Farm-08 | Any user can record incorrect data | Low | Fixed |
| Farm-09 | Variable name set incorrect | Low | Fixed |
| Farm-10 | Error in transfer parameters for rewardTokenAdapter | Low | Fixed |
| Farm-11 | Design flaw in the getLiveFarmsByPools function | Low | Fixed |
| Farm-12 | Dependent library version specification error | Info | Fixed |
| Farm-13 | Permission check incomplete | Info | Fixed |
| Farm-14 | Redundant code | Info | Fixed |

Finding Details:

[Farm-01] The reward calculation method is unreasonable

| | |
|----------------|--|
| Severity Level | High |
| Type | Business Security |
| Lines | Farm.mo #L924, 940 |
| Description | <p>In the initial audited code, the formula used to calculate user staking rewards is: <code>deposit.liquidity * (currentTime - deposit.initTime)</code>, where <code>deposit.initTime</code> represents the user's staking start time. This leads to an unreasonable situation: even if two users have the same liquidity and the same staking duration within the current period, their rewards for this period will differ due to the different staking start times.</p> <pre>rewardAmount := _computeReward(deposit.liquidity * (currentTime - deposit.initTime), totalWeightedRatio);</pre> |
| Recommendation | <p>Update the user's <code>deposit.initTime</code> each time rewards are calculated. Specifically, after updating the rewards, also update the <code>initTime</code>, so that the next reward calculation uses the new <code>initTime</code>.</p> |
| Status | <p>Fixed. This issue has been fixed in commit 3bc1c9b.</p> <pre>if (Nat.equal(deposit.lastDistributeTime, 0)) { totalWeightedRatio := totalWeightedRatio + deposit.liquidity * (currentTime - deposit.initTime); } else { totalWeightedRatio := totalWeightedRatio + deposit.liquidity * (currentTime - deposit.lastDistributeTime); };</pre> |

[Farm-02] The amount of tokens extracted by the close function is inaccurate

| | |
|----------------|---|
| Severity Level | High |
| Type | Business Security |
| Lines | Farm.mo #L455,464 |
| Description | <p>The close function is intended to collect unallocated rewards within the actor. Therefore, there are two issues with the close function:</p> <p>(1) If all users have claimed their rewards, then balance and _totalRewardBalance should be equal, causing the balance check to always fail.</p> <pre>if (balance < _totalRewardBalance) { _errorLogBuffer.add("InsufficientFunds. balance: " # debug_show (balance) # " totalRewardBalance: " # debug_show (_totalRewardBalance) # " . nowTime: " # debug_show (nowTime)); };</pre> <p>(2) If there are users who have not claimed their rewards, then balance will be greater than _totalRewardBalance. In this case, the amount that should actually be withdrawn is balance, not _totalRewardBalance..</p> <pre>var amount = balance - _rewardTokenFee;</pre> |
| Recommendation | It is recommended to add a check in the close function to ensure that all user rewards have been claimed. Additionally, the amount withdrawn in this function should directly be the actor's entire balance. |
| Status | Fixed. This issue has been fixed in commit 5121eb2. The premise for calling this function is that all users have received rewards, and the amount received this time is the actor's balance. |

[Farm-03] Variable value sets incorrectly

| | |
|----------------|---|
| Severity Level | Medium |
| Type | Business Security |
| Lines | Farm.mo#L80 |
| Description | <p>The value of <code>_token1AmountLimit</code> is being set to <code>initArgs.token0AmountLimit</code> here, which should be set to <code>initArgs.token1AmountLimit</code>.</p> <pre> private stable var _positionNumLimit : Nat = 500; private stable var _token0AmountLimit : Nat = initArgs.token0AmountLimit; private stable var _token1AmountLimit : Nat = initArgs.token0AmountLimit; private stable var _priceInsideLimit : Bool = initArgs.priceInsideLimit; </pre> |
| Recommendation | It is recommended to replace <code>initArgs.token0AmountLimit</code> with <code>initArgs.token1AmountLimit</code> . |
| Status | Fixed. |

[Farm-04] The amount of reward tokens in TVL is not updated in a timely manner

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Severity Level | Low |
| Type | Business Security |
| Lines | Farm.mo |
| Description | <p>There are many unreasonable updates of TVL in Farm actor:</p> <p>(1) The TVL (Total Value Locked) is updated exclusively within the <code>_distributeReward</code> function, which is called only once per cycle. Consequently, the recorded TVL may not be accurate, as users can stake and withdraw at any time.</p> <p>(2) The <code>rewardToken.amount</code> within the TVL is not being updated and remains constant at <code>initArgs.totalReward</code>. This is clearly unreasonable.</p> |
| Recommendation | <p>Regarding issue (1), we believe no changes are necessary for now, as the cycle specified by the <code>FarmFactory</code> actor ranges from half an hour to 12 hours, which should be acceptable. If this is not acceptable, we recommend updating the TVL with every stake and unstake operation. However, this would require iterating through all deposits, potentially consuming a significant amount of cycles.</p> <p>For question (2), we recommend that users update TVL each time they claim rewards. This should also include admin claiming any rewards.</p> |
| Status | Fixed. |

[Farm-05] The `_rewardPerCycle` calculate inaccurate

| | |
|----------------|--|
| Severity Level | Low |
| Type | Business Security |
| Lines | Farm.mo#L117-119 |
| Description | <p>In the <code>init</code> function, an extra 1 is being added to the cumulative <code>tempRewardTotalCount</code> used in the calculation of <code>_rewardPerCycle</code>. This results in a lower reward per cycle than intended.</p> <pre> _canisterId := ?Principal.fromActor(this); var tempRewardTotalCount = SafeUint.Uint512(initArgs.endTime).sub(SafeUint.Uint512(initArgs.startTime)).div(SafeUint.Uint512(initArgs.secondPerCycle)).add(SafeUint.Uint512(1)); _totalCycleCount := tempRewardTotalCount.val(); _rewardPerCycle := SafeUint.Uint512(_totalReward).div(tempRewardTotalCount).val(); let rewardPoolMetadata = switch (await _rewardPoolAct.metadata()) { case (#ok(poolMetadata)) { poolMetadata }; case (#err(code)) { { key = ""; token0 = { address = ""; standard = "" }; token1 = { address = ""; standard = "" }; fee = 0; tick = 0; liquidity = 0; sqrtPriceX96 = 0; maxLiquidityPerTick = 0; }; }; }; </pre> |
| Recommendation | It is recommended that the project team to review and confirm the business logic. |
| Status | Fixed. The project team removed the addition of 1 when calculating the <code>_rewardPerCycle</code> . |

[Farm-06] The `_stakeRecordBuffer` record calculate inaccurate

| | |
|----------------|--|
| Severity Level | Low |
| Type | Business Security |
| Lines | Farm.mo#L434-472 |
| Description | <p>When there is no staked position, the admin can call the close function to withdraw the remaining undistributed reward tokens to the <code>refunder</code> address. However, the Actor mistakenly recorded the amount in the <code>_stakeRecordBuffer</code> as the reward quantity after deducting the token transfer fees, resulting in a lower recorded amount than the actual quantity.</p> |

```

var fee = await _rewardTokenAdapter.fee();
var balance = await _rewardTokenAdapter.balanceOf({
  owner = Principal.fromActor(this);
  subaccount = null;
});
if (balance <= _totalRewardBalance) {
  _errorLogBuffer.add("InsufficientFunds. balance: " # debug_show
(balance) # " totalRewardBalance: " # debug_show (_totalRewardBalance)
# " . nowTime: " # debug_show (nowTime));
};
Timer.cancelTimer(_distributeRewardPerCycle);
Timer.cancelTimer(_syncPoolMetaPer60s);
Timer.cancelTimer(_updateStatusPer60s);
if (balance > fee) {
  var amount = balance - fee;
  try {
    switch (await _rewardTokenAdapter.transfer({ from = { owner =
Principal.fromActor(this); subaccount = null }; from_subaccount = null;
to = { owner = initArgs.refunder; subaccount = null }; amount = amount;
fee = ?fee; memo = null; created_at_time = null }))) {
      case (#Ok(index)) {
        await _farmControllerAct.updateFarmInfo(
          #CLOSED,
          {
            stakedTokenTVL = 0;
            rewardTokenTVL = 0;
          },
        );
      }
    }
  }
}

```

```
_stakeRecordBuffer.add({
  timestamp = nowTime;
  transType = #harvest;
  positionId = 0;
  from = Principal.fromActor(this);
  to = initArgs.refunder;
  amount = amount;
  liquidity = 0;
});
_totalRewardBalance := 0;
_status := #CLOSED;
_TVL.stakedTokenTVL := 0;
_TVL.rewardTokenTVL := 0;
};
```

Recommendation It is recommended that the project team to replace `amount` with `balance`.

Status **Fixed.** The project team replaces `amount` with `balance`.

[Farm-07] The _updateTVL calculate inaccurate

| | |
|----------------|--|
| Severity Level | Low |
| Type | Business Security |
| Lines | Farm.mo#L960-986 |
| Description | The function <code>_updateTVL</code> calculates the TVL (Total Value Locked) of the current reward tokens, referred to as <code>rewardTokenTVL</code> , using the <code>_totalReward</code> value. However, it's important to note that <code>_totalReward</code> represents the total reward quantity for the Farm and remains unchanged throughout the reward distribution process. As a result, the calculated <code>rewardTokenTVL</code> may be overestimated and remain constant, potentially deviating from the actual value. |

```
private func _updateTVL() {
    _TVL.stakedTokenTVL := if (_poolZeroForOne) {
        Float.add(
            Float.mul(
                Float.div(Float.fromInt(_poolToken0Amount),
                    Float.fromInt(SafeInt.Int256(10 ** _poolToken0Decimals).val())),
                _poolMetadata.toICPPPrice,
            ),
            Float.div(Float.fromInt(_poolToken1Amount),
                Float.fromInt(SafeInt.Int256(10 ** _poolToken1Decimals).val())),
        );
    } else {
        Float.add(
            Float.mul(
                Float.div(Float.fromInt(_poolToken1Amount),
                    Float.fromInt(SafeInt.Int256(10 ** _poolToken1Decimals).val())),
                _poolMetadata.toICPPPrice,
            ),
            Float.div(Float.fromInt(_poolToken0Amount),
                Float.fromInt(SafeInt.Int256(10 ** _poolToken0Decimals).val())),
        );
    };
    _TVL.rewardTokenTVL := if (Text.equal(initArgs.ICP.address,
        initArgs.rewardToken.address)) {
        Float.div(Float.fromInt(_totalReward),
            Float.fromInt(SafeInt.Int256(10 ** _rewardTokenDecimals).val()));
    };
```



```

    } else {
      Float.mul(
        Float.div(Float.fromInt(_totalReward),
          Float.fromInt(SafeInt.Int256(10 ** _rewardTokenDecimals).val())),
          _rewardPoolMetadata.toICPPrice,
        );
    };
  };
};

```

Recommendation

It is recommended that the project team to replace `_totalReward` with `_totalRewardBalance`.

Status

Fixed. Currently, the project team updates the `TVL` when modifying asset balances and synchronizes this data with the `FarmIndex`.

```

    return #ok(
      {
        poolToken0 = { address = _TVL.poolToken0.address; standard
= _TVL.poolToken0.standard; amount = 0; };
        poolToken1 = { address = _TVL.poolToken1.address; standard
= _TVL.poolToken1.standard; amount = 0; };
      }
    private func _updateTVL() : async () {
      // Debug.print(" ---> _updateTVL ");
      await _farmIndexAct.updateFarmTVL(_TVL);
    };

```

[Farm-08] Any user can record incorrect data

| | |
|----------------|--|
| Severity Level | Low |
| Type | General Vulnerability |
| Lines | FarmController.mo#L134-148 |
| Description | <p>updateFarmInfo in the FarmController actor does not have any calling restrictions, that is, anyone can call this function to record wrong Farm and TVL data, which will not affect the normal Farm, but will affect data query.</p> <pre> public shared (msg) func updateFarmInfo(status : Types.FarmStatus, tv1 : Types.TVL) : async () { _farmDataService.deleteNotStartedFarm(msg.caller); _farmDataService.deleteLiveFarm(msg.caller); _farmDataService.deleteFinishedFarm(msg.caller); _farmDataService.deleteClosedFarm(msg.caller); if (status == #NOT_STARTED) { _farmDataService.putNotStartedFarm(msg.caller, tv1); } else if (status == #LIVE) { _farmDataService.putLiveFarm(msg.caller, tv1); } else if (status == #FINISHED) { _farmDataService.putFinishedFarm(msg.caller, tv1); } else if (status == #CLOSED) { _farmDataService.putClosedFarm(msg.caller, tv1); }; }; </pre> |
| Recommendation | It is recommended that the project team that the caller of this function should be restricted to the farm actor created through the create function. |
| Status | Fixed. The project team added a caller's permission check. |

[Farm-09] Variable name set incorrect

| | |
|----------------|--|
| Severity Level | Low |
| Type | Business Security |
| Lines | Farm.mo #L1004-1020 |
| Description | <p>In <code>_computeReward</code>, <code>rate</code> is expanded by <code>10e8</code>, but the variable name means it is expanded by <code>10e9</code>. Of course, this is just an expansion of accuracy and will basically not affect the calculation results.</p> <pre> private func _computeReward(weightedRatio : Nat, totalWeightedRatio : Nat) : Nat { var excessDecimal = SafeUint.Uint512(100000000); var weightedRatioXe9 = SafeUint.Uint512(weightedRatio).mul(excessDecimal); // Debug.print("weightedRatioXe9: " # debug_show (weightedRatioXe9.val())); var rate = if (totalWeightedRatio == 0) { SafeUint.Uint512(0) } else { weightedRatioXe9.div(SafeUint.Uint512(totalWeightedRatio)); }; // Debug.print("rate: " # debug_show (rate.val())); var reward = SafeUint.Uint512(_rewardPerCycle).mul(rate).div(excessDecimal).val(); // Debug.print("reward: " # debug_show (reward)); _totalRewardUnharvested := _totalRewardUnharvested + reward; _totalRewardBalance := _totalRewardBalance - reward; return reward; }; </pre> |
| Recommendation | It is recommended that the project team to review and confirm the business logic. |
| Status | Fixed. The project team replaces <code>weightedRatioXe9</code> with <code>weightedRatioXe8</code> . |

[Farm-10] Error in transfer parameters for rewardTokenAdapter

| | |
|----------------|---|
| Severity Level | Low |
| Type | Business Security |
| Lines | Farm.mo #L555-558 |
| Description | <p>In the <code>close</code> function, the <code>rewardTokenAdapter</code> uses the value of <code>_totalRewardFee</code> as the fee for the transfer. If the <code>rewardTokenAdapter</code> has a fee that is actually different from <code>_totalRewardFee</code>, the transfer will fail. Consequently, when the Farm is marked as closed, the reward tokens will remain in the Farm.</p> <pre> if (balance > _rewardTokenFee) { var amount = balance - _rewardTokenFee; try { switch (await _rewardTokenAdapter.transfer({ from = { owner = Principal.fromActor(this); subaccount = null }; from_subaccount = null; to = { owner = initArgs.refunder; subaccount = null }; amount = amount; fee = ?_totalRewardFee; memo = null; created_at_time = null }))) { </pre> |
| Recommendation | It is recommended to modify the transfer parameter of <code>rewardTokenAdapter</code> to <code>_rewardTokenFee</code> . |
| Status | Fixed |
| | <pre> if (balance > _rewardTokenFee) { var amount = balance - _rewardTokenFee; try { switch (await _rewardTokenAdapter.transfer({ from = { owner = Principal.fromActor(this); subaccount = null }; from_subaccount = null; to = { owner = initArgs.refunder; subaccount = null }; amount = amount; fee = ?_rewardTokenFee; memo = null; created_at_time = null }))) { </pre> |

[Farm-11] Design flaw in the getLiveFarmsByPools function

| | |
|----------------|--|
| Severity Level | Low |
| Type | Business Security |
| Lines | FarmIndex.mo #L239-262 |
| Description | <p>The <code>_intersectArrays</code> function has a design flaw: when one array has values and the other is null, it takes the non-null array as the result. This does not align with the concept of an intersection, which should result in null. Otherwise, functions like <code>getLiveFarmsByPools</code> will produce inaccurate intersection results in such cases.</p> <p>The <code>getLiveFarmsByPools</code> function is supposed to correctly compute the intersection of arrays. If one of the arrays is empty, the result will not be as expected.</p> <pre> public query func getLiveFarmsByPools(pools : [Principal]) : async Result.Result<[(Principal, Principal)], Types.Error> { var farms = Buffer.Buffer<Principal>(0); for (pool in pools.vals()) { switch (_poolFarms.get(pool)) { case (?farmArray) { farms.append(Buffer.fromArray(farmArray)); }; case (_) {}; }; }; var liveFarms = TrieSet.toArray(_liveFarmSet); var matchedFarms = Option.get(_intersectArrays(?Buffer.toArray(farms), ?liveFarms), []); </pre> |
| Recommendation | <p>It is recommended that the <code>getLiveFarmsByPools</code> function checks if <code>liveFarms</code> and <code>farms</code> are both not null before calling <code>_intersectArrays</code>. If either is null, return an empty array. Then proceed to call the <code>_intersectArrays</code> function for comparison.</p> |
| Status | <p>Fixed.</p> <pre> public query func getLiveFarmsByPools(pools : [Principal]) : async Result.Result<[(Principal, Principal)], Types.Error> { var farms = Buffer.Buffer<Principal>(0); for (pool in pools.vals()) { </pre> |

```
switch (_poolFarms.get(pool)) {  
  case (?farmArray) {  
    farms.append(Buffer.fromArray(farmArray));  
  };  
  case (_) {};  
};  
  
var liveFarms = TrieSet.toArray(_liveFarmSet);  
if (Nat.equal(farms.size(), 0) or Nat.equal(liveFarms.size(),  
0)) { return #ok([]); };
```

[Farm-12] Dependent library version specification error

| Severity Level | Info |
|----------------|--|
| Type | Coding Conventions |
| Lines | package-set.dhall #L19-23 |
| Description | <p>The <code>package-set.dhall</code> file imports version v1.0.3 of the <code>farm-token-adapter</code> library. However, the main branch of the library only has versions v1.0.6 and v1.0.7. This indicates a potential issue with importing the correct version.</p> <pre> additions = [{ name = "base" , repo = "https://github.com/dfinity/motoko-base" , version = "moc-0.9.7" , dependencies = [] : List Text } , { dependencies = ["base"] , name = "commons" , repo = "git@github.com:farm-Labs/ic-commons-v2.git" , version = "v0.0.5" } , { dependencies = [] : List Text , name = "token-adapter" , repo = "git@github.com:farm-Labs/farm-token-adapter.git" , version = "v1.0.3" } , { dependencies = [] : List Text , name = "icpswap-v3-service" , repo = "git@github.com:ICPSwap-Labs/icpswap-v3-service.git" , version = "v3.4.2" }] </pre> |
| Recommendation | It is recommended that the project team to switch to the appropriate version. |
| Status | Fixed. The project team has updated the library version to v1.0.7. |

[Farm-13] Permission check incomplete

| | |
|----------------|--|
| Severity Level | Info |
| Type | Business Security |
| Lines | FarmFeeReceiver.mo#L105-117 |
| Description | <p>According to the code guidelines, it is recommended to add a permission check for <code>transferAll</code> in the system function <code>inspect</code>.</p> <pre> system func inspect({ arg : Blob; caller : Principal; msg : Types.FarmFeeReceiver; }) : Bool { return switch (msg) { // Controller case (#claim args) { Prim.isController(caller) }; case (#transfer args) { Prim.isController(caller) }; // Anyone case (_) { true }; }; }; </pre> |
| Recommendation | It is recommended that the project team to following the code guidelines |
| Status | Fixed. The project team add the permission check of the <code>transferAll</code> . |

[Farm-14] Redundant code

| Severity Level | Info |
|----------------|---|
| Type | Coding Conventions |
| Lines | Farm.mo #L98-109,#114-121,#236-243,#1022-1049 |
| Description | In the <code>_swapPoolAct</code> and <code>_rewardPoolAct</code> of Farm, there is redundant code. The function declares <code>batchRefreshIncome</code> , <code>quote</code> , and <code>refreshIncome</code> , but they are not used. |

```
private stable var _swapPoolAct = actor
(Principal.toText(initArgs.pool)) : actor {
  batchRefreshIncome : query (positionIds : [Nat]) -> async
Result.Result<{ totalTokensOwed0 : Nat; totalTokensOwed1 : Nat;
tokenIncome : [(Nat, { tokensOwed0 : Nat; tokensOwed1 : Nat })] },
Types.Error>;
  quote : query (args : Types.SwapArgs) -> async Result.Result<Nat,
Types.Error>;
  metadata : query () -> async Result.Result<Types.PoolMetadata,
Types.Error>;
  getUserPosition : query (positionId : Nat) -> async
Result.Result<Types.UserPositionInfo, Types.Error>;
  transferPosition : shared (from : Principal, to : Principal,
positionId : Nat) -> async Result.Result<Bool, Types.Error>;
  refreshIncome : query (positionId : Nat) -> async
Result.Result<{ tokensOwed0 : Nat; tokensOwed1 : Nat }, Types.Error>;
};
private stable var _rewardPoolAct = actor
(Principal.toText(initArgs.rewardPool)) : actor {
  quote : query (args : Types.SwapArgs) -> async Result.Result<Nat,
Types.Error>;
  metadata : query () -> async Result.Result<Types.PoolMetadata,
Types.Error>;
};
```

The `_initLock` variable can be deleted because in the `init` function, there is already a restriction of `_init` that the function can only be called once, and the caller of the `init` function must be an authorized account.

```
private stable var _inited : Bool = false;
private stable var _initLock : Bool = false;
public shared (msg) func init() : async () {
```

```

_checkPermission(msg.caller);

assert (not _inited);
assert (not _initLock);
_initLock := true;

```

The previous code has already validated `positionTokenAmounts.amount0 < _token0AmountLimit` and `positionTokenAmounts.amount1 < _token1AmountLimit`. There is no need to validate them again.

```

if (_token0AmountLimit != 0 and positionTokenAmounts.amount0 <
_token0AmountLimit) {
    return #err(#InternalError("The quantity of token0 does not reach
the low limit"));
};
if (_token1AmountLimit != 0 and positionTokenAmounts.amount1 <
_token1AmountLimit) {
    return #err(#InternalError("The quantity of token1 does not reach
the low limit"));
};
if (_token0AmountLimit != 0 and _token1AmountLimit != 0) {
    if (positionTokenAmounts.amount0 < _token0AmountLimit) {
        return #err(#InternalError("The quantity of token0 does not
reach the low limit"));
    };
    if (positionTokenAmounts.amount1 < _token1AmountLimit) {
        return #err(#InternalError("The quantity of token1 does not
reach the low limit"));
    };
};

```

The private function `_getTokenAmounts` is not used at all and can be deleted.

```

private func _getTokenAmounts(positionIds : [Nat]) :
Result.Result<{ totalLiquidity : Nat; totalAmount0 : Int; totalAmount1 :
Int }, Types.Error> {
    if (positionIds.size() == 0) {
        return #ok({ totalLiquidity = 0; totalAmount0 = 0; totalAmount1 =
0 });
    };
    var totalAmount0 : Int = 0;
    var totalAmount1 : Int = 0;
    var totalLiquidity : Nat = 0;

```

```

for (positionId in positionIds.vals()) {
    switch (_depositMap.get(positionId)) {
        case (?deposit) {
            let amountResult = switch
(_getTokenAmountByLiquidity(deposit.tickLower, deposit.tickUpper,
deposit.liquidity)) {
                case (#ok(result)) { result };
                case (#err(msg)) { return #err(#InternalError(msg)) };
            };
            totalAmount0 := totalAmount0 + amountResult.amount0;
            totalAmount1 := totalAmount1 + amountResult.amount1;
            totalLiquidity := totalLiquidity + deposit.liquidity;
        };
        case (_) {};
    };
};
return #ok({
    totalLiquidity = totalLiquidity;
    totalAmount0 = totalAmount0;
    totalAmount1 = totalAmount1;
});
};

```

Recommendation It is recommended to remove the Redundant code.

Status **Fixed.** The project team has removed the corresponding redundant code.

3 Appendix

3.1 Vulnerability Assessment Metrics and Status in Smart Contracts

3.1.1 Metrics

In order to objectively assess the severity level of vulnerabilities in blockchain systems, this report provides detailed assessment metrics for security vulnerabilities in smart contracts with reference to CVSS 3.1(Common Vulnerability Scoring System Ver 3.1).

According to the severity level of vulnerability, the vulnerabilities are classified into four levels: "critical", "high", "medium" and "low". It mainly relies on the degree of impact and likelihood of exploitation of the vulnerability, supplemented by other comprehensive factors to determine of the severity level.

| Impact Likelihood | Severe | High | Medium | Low |
|----------------------|----------|--------|--------|------|
| Probable | Critical | High | Medium | Low |
| Possible | High | Medium | Medium | Low |
| Unlikely | Medium | Medium | Low | Info |
| Rare | Low | Low | Info | Info |

3.1.2 Degree of impact

- **Severe**

Severe impact generally refers to the vulnerability can have a serious impact on the confidentiality, integrity, availability of smart contracts or their economic model, which can cause substantial economic losses to the contract business system, large-scale data disruption, loss of authority management, failure of key functions, loss of credibility, or indirectly affect the operation of other smart contracts associated with it and cause substantial losses, as well as other severe and mostly irreversible harm.

- **High**

High impact generally refers to the vulnerability can have a relatively serious impact on the confidentiality, integrity, availability of the smart contract or its economic model, which can cause a greater economic loss, local functional unavailability, loss of credibility and other impact to the contract business system.

- **Medium**

Medium impact generally refers to the vulnerability can have a relatively minor impact on the confidentiality, integrity, availability of the smart contract or its economic model, which can cause a small amount of economic loss to the contract business system, individual business unavailability and other impact.

- **Low**

Low impact generally refers to the vulnerability can have a minor impact on the smart contract, which can pose certain security threat to the contract business system and needs to be improved.

3.1.3 Likelihood of Exploitation

- **Probable**

Probable likelihood generally means that the cost required to exploit the vulnerability is low, with no special exploitation threshold, and the vulnerability can be triggered consistently.

- **Possible**

Possible likelihood generally means that exploiting such vulnerability requires a certain cost, or there are certain conditions for exploitation, and the vulnerability is not easily and consistently triggered.

- **Unlikely**

Unlikely likelihood generally means that the vulnerability requires a high cost, or the exploitation conditions are very demanding and the vulnerability is highly difficult to trigger.

- **Rare**

Rare likelihood generally means that the vulnerability requires an extremely high cost or the conditions for exploitation are extremely difficult to achieve.

3.1.4 Fix Results Status

| Status | Description |
|------------------------|--|
| Fixed | The project party fully fixes a vulnerability. |
| Partially Fixed | The project party did not fully fix the issue, but only mitigated the issue. |
| Acknowledged | The project party confirms and chooses to ignore the issue. |

3.2 Audit Categories

| No. | Categories | Subitems |
|-----|-----------------------|--|
| 1 | Coding Conventions | Compiler Version Security |
| | | Deprecated Items |
| | | Redundant Code |
| | | assert Usage |
| | | Cycles Consumption |
| 2 | General Vulnerability | Integer Overflow/Underflow |
| | | Reentrancy |
| | | Pseudo-random Number Generator (PRNG) |
| | | Transaction-Ordering Dependence |
| | | DoS (Denial of Service) |
| | | Function Call Permissions |
| | | Returned Value Security |
| | | Replay Attack |
| | | Overriding Variables |
| 3 | Business Security | Third-party Protocol Interface Consistency |
| | | Business Logics |
| | | Business Implementations |
| | | Manipulable Token Price |
| | | Centralized Asset Control |
| | | Asset Tradability |

Beosin classified the security issues of smart contracts into three categories: Coding Conventions, General Vulnerability, Business Security. Their specific definitions are as follows:

- **Coding Conventions**

Audit whether smart contracts follow recommended language security coding practices. For example, smart contracts developed in Solidity language should fix the compiler version and do not use deprecated keywords.

- **General Vulnerability**

General Vulnerability include some common vulnerabilities that may appear in smart contract projects. These vulnerabilities are mainly related to the characteristics of the smart contract itself, such as integer overflow/underflow and denial of service attacks.

- **Business Security**

Business security is mainly related to some issues related to the business realized by each project, and has a relatively strong pertinence. For example, whether the lock-up plan in the code match the white paper, or the flash loan attack caused by the incorrect setting of the price acquisition oracle.

* Note that the project may suffer stake losses due to the integrated third-party protocol. This is not something Beosin can control. Business security requires the participation of the project party. The project party and users need to stay vigilant at all times.

3.3 Disclaimer

The Audit Report issued by Beosin is related to the services agreed in the relevant service agreement. The Project Party or the Served Party (hereinafter referred to as the "Served Party") can only be used within the conditions and scope agreed in the service agreement. Other third parties shall not transmit, disclose, quote, rely on or tamper with the Audit Report issued for any purpose.

The Audit Report issued by Beosin is made solely for the code, and any description, expression or wording contained therein shall not be interpreted as affirmation or confirmation of the project, nor shall any warranty or guarantee be given as to the absolute flawlessness of the code analyzed, the code team, the business model or legal compliance.

The Audit Report issued by Beosin is only based on the code provided by the Served Party and the technology currently available to Beosin. However, due to the technical limitations of any organization, and in the event that the code provided by the Served Party is missing information, tampered with, deleted, hidden or subsequently altered, the audit report may still fail to fully enumerate all the risks.

The Audit Report issued by Beosin in no way provides investment advice on any project, nor should it be utilized as investment suggestions of any type. This report represents an extensive evaluation process designed to help our customers improve code quality while mitigating the high risks in blockchain.

3.4 About Beosin

Beosin is the first institution in the world specializing in the construction of blockchain security ecosystem. The core team members are all professors, postdocs, PhDs, and Internet elites from world-renowned academic institutions. Beosin has more than 20 years of research in formal verification technology, trusted computing, mobile security and kernel security, with overseas experience in studying and collaborating in project research at well-known universities. Through the security audit and defense deployment of more than 2,000 smart contracts, over 50 public blockchains and wallets, and nearly 100 exchanges worldwide, Beosin has accumulated rich experience in security attack and defense of the blockchain field, and has developed several security products specifically for blockchain.



BEOSIN
Blockchain Security



Official Website

<https://www.beosin.com>



Telegram

<https://t.me/beosin>



Twitter

https://twitter.com/Beosin_com



Email

service@beosin.com

