

# **Audit Report**

# **Increment Finance**

v0.3

April 28, 2022

# **Table of Contents**

Table of Contents	2
License	3
Disclaimer	3
Introduction	5
Purpose of This Report	5
Codebase Submitted for the Audit	5
Methodology	6
Functionality Overview	6
How to Read This Report	7
Summary of Findings	8
Code Quality Criteria	9
Detailed Findings	10
Liquidation penalty is not validated during struct initialization	10
Interest rate model capability is not validated during update	10
Local resource reference can be used for efficiency	10
Feeders can set non expirable prices by changing the expired high value	duration to arbitrary 11
Sorting algorithm can be improved	11
Typographical errors found in codebase	12
Possible chances of path collisions	12

## License







THIS WORK IS LICENSED UNDER A CREATIVE COMMONS ATTRIBUTION-NODERIVATIVES 4.0 INTERNATIONAL LICENSE.

## **Disclaimer**

THE CONTENT OF THIS AUDIT REPORT IS PROVIDED "AS IS", WITHOUT REPRESENTATIONS AND WARRANTIES OF ANY KIND.

THE AUTHOR AND HIS EMPLOYER DISCLAIM ANY LIABILITY FOR DAMAGE ARISING OUT OF, OR IN CONNECTION WITH, THIS AUDIT REPORT.

COPYRIGHT OF THIS REPORT REMAINS WITH THE AUTHOR.

This audit has been performed by

Oak Security

https://oaksecurity.io/ info@oaksecurity.io Introduction

**Purpose of This Report** 

Oak Security has been engaged by Increment Labs Ltd. to perform a security audit of the

IncrementFi-Oracle & IncrementFi-MoneyMarket smart contracts.

The objectives of the audit are as follows:

1. Determine the correct functioning of the protocol, in accordance with the project

specification.

2. Determine possible vulnerabilities, which could be exploited by an attacker.

3. Determine smart contract bugs, which might lead to unexpected behavior.

4. Analyze whether best practices have been applied during development.

5. Make recommendations to improve code safety and readability.

This report represents a summary of the findings.

As with any code audit, there is a limit to which vulnerabilities can be found, and unexpected execution paths may still be possible. The author of this report does not guarantee complete

coverage (see disclaimer).

**Codebase Submitted for the Audit** 

The audit has been performed on the following GitHub repositories:

https://github.com/IncrementFi/Money-Market

Commit hash: 25c25610763e9a3a8085e3214b2177d7a726c3c2

https://github.com/IncrementFi/Oracle

Commit hash: 052fa352bc4e049da42026dda719b19bc1c87339

5

### Methodology

The audit has been performed in the following steps:

- 1. Gaining an understanding of the code base's intended purpose by reading the available documentation.
- 2. Automated source code and dependency analysis.
- 3. Manual line by line analysis of the source code for security vulnerabilities and use of best practice guidelines, including but not limited to:
  - a. Race condition analysis
  - b. Under-/overflow issues
  - c. Key management vulnerabilities
- 4. Report preparation

### **Functionality Overview**

The submitted code implements the smart contracts for Increment Finance, a liquidity engine on Flow blockchain. The protocol consists of a pool-based DeFi money market and a price oracle which serves to provide price feeds across the Flow ecosystem.

# **How to Read This Report**

This report classifies the issues found into the following severity categories:

Severity	Description
Critical	A serious and exploitable vulnerability that can lead to loss of funds, unrecoverable locked funds, or catastrophic denial of service.
Major	A vulnerability or bug that can affect the correct functioning of the system, lead to incorrect states or denial of service.
Minor	A violation of common best practices or incorrect usage of primitives, which may not currently have a major impact on security, but may do so in the future or introduce inefficiencies.
Informational	Comments and recommendations of design decisions or potential optimizations, that are not relevant to security. Their application may improve aspects, such as user experience or readability, but is not strictly necessary. This category may also include opinionated recommendations that the project team might not share.

The status of an issue can be one of the following: Pending, Acknowledged, or Resolved.

Note that audits are an important step to improving the security of smart contracts and can find many issues. However, auditing complex codebases has its limits and a remaining risk is present (see disclaimer).

Users of the system should exercise caution. In order to help with the evaluation of the remaining risk, we provide a measure of the following key indicators: **code complexity**, **code readability**, **level of documentation**, and **test coverage**. We include a table with these criteria below.

Note that high complexity or low test coverage does not necessarily equate to a higher risk, although certain bugs are more easily detected in unit testing than in a security audit and vice versa.

# **Summary of Findings**

No	Description	Severity	Status
1	Liquidation penalty is not validated during struct initialization	Minor	Resolved
2	Interest rate model capability is not validated during update	Minor	Resolved
3	Local resource reference can be used for efficiency	Minor	Acknowledged
4	Feeders can set non expirable prices by changing the expired duration to arbitrary high value	Minor	Acknowledged
5	Sorting algorithm can be improved	Informational	Acknowledged
6	Typographical errors found in codebase	Informational	Resolved
7	Possible chances of path collisions	Informational	Resolved

### **Code Quality Criteria**

Criteria	Status	Comment
Code complexity	Medium	-
Code readability and clarity	High	Efficiently written code, which makes it easy to read and understand.
Level of documentation	High	External facing documentation is well crafted and covers overview of business logic and mathematical equations. Code is well documented as well that makes it easier to understand its nuances.
Test coverage	Medium-High	-

## **Detailed Findings**

### 1. Liquidation penalty is not validated during struct initialization

### **Severity: Minor**

In cadence/contracts/LendingComptroller.cdc:125-127 of the MoneyMarket repository, the liquidation penalty is not validated to be below 1.0 (ie. 100%) during the Market struct initialization. As a result, misconfiguring the liquidation penalty value might cause a liquidator to receive more funds than intended, causing a loss of funds for the borrower.

We consider this to be a minor issue since it can only be caused by the owner.

#### Recommendation

We recommend verifying the liquidation penalty value to be below 1.0 as seen in line 84.

**Status: Resolved** 

### 2. Interest rate model capability is not validated during update

#### **Severity: Minor**

In cadence/contracts/LendingPool.cdc:959-970 of the MoneyMarket repository, the newly set interest rate model capability is not validated to exist and can be borrowed. As a result, setting a non-existing capability for the interest rate model would cause several functions in the contract to fail, notably accrueInterestReadonly, getPoolBorrowRateScaled, getPoolBorrowAprScaled and getPoolSupplyAprScaled.

We consider this to be a minor issue since it can only be caused by the owner.

#### Recommendation

We recommend verifying the interest rate model capability to be valid as seen in line 1045.

**Status: Resolved** 

### 3. Local resource reference can be used for efficiency

#### **Severity: Minor**

In cadence/contracts/PriceOracle.cdc:128-130 of the Oracle repository, the certificate argument is passed as an OracleCertificate resource reference which is implemented by the OracleInterface contract interface. The certificate is then

verified by checking its type against the local <code>OracleCertificate</code> resource to make sure the caller can only be the current contract. This validation can be removed to introduce efficiency by only accepting the local <code>OracleCertificate</code> resource reference as an argument.

#### Recommendation

We recommend modifying the certificate to directly accept the local OracleCertificate resource reference and removing the unnecessary precondition check.

Status: Acknowledged

# 4. Feeders can set non expirable prices by changing the expired duration to arbitrary high value

**Severity: Minor** 

In cadence/contracts/PriceOracle.cdc:122-124 of the Oracle repository, feeders can set an arbitrary high expired duration which makes their prices non-expirable. With that said, this doesn't directly affect the prices of assets until more than half of the feeders act maliciously and set the expired duration to an arbitrarily high value.

We consider this to be a minor issue since this requires more than half of the feeders to be malicious.

#### Recommendation

We recommend setting the constant value of expired duration or using some upper and lower bounds for the expired duration value.

Status: Acknowledged

### 5. Sorting algorithm can be improved

### **Severity: Informational**

In cadence/contracts/PriceOracle.cdc:222 of the Oracle repository, the current sorting algorithm is inefficient due to time complexity. Since takeMedianPrice functionality will be called many times, this causes every other operation that is dependent on it to become gas inefficient.

#### Recommendation

We recommend implementing the merge sort algorithm for sorting.

Status: Acknowledged

6. Typographical errors found in codebase

**Severity: Informational** 

In cadence/contracts/PriceOracle.cdc of the Oracle repository, there were several typographical errors found in lines 104 and 383. Specifically, the word "oralce\_public" should be replaced with "oracle\_public" while the word "\_ExpriedDuration" should be

replaced with "\_ExpiredDuration".

Recommendation

We recommend correcting the misspellings mentioned above.

**Status: Resolved** 

7. Possible chances of path collisions

**Severity: Informational** 

In the MoneyMarket repository, the following storage and public paths are very generic:

• cadence/contracts/LendingPool:1086

• cadence/contracts/LendingPool:1088

• cadence/contracts/LendingPool:1089

This might lead to path collisions, potentially incorrect data access or resources overwriting.

Recommendation

We recommend choosing a less generic path to avoid collisions.

**Status: Resolved** 

12