



Kodiak Bault Security Audit Report

May 5, 2025



Contents

1 Introduction

[1.1 About Kodiak Bault](#)

[1.2 Source Code](#)

2 Overall Assessment

3 Vulnerability Summary

[3.1 Overview](#)

[3.2 Security Level Reference](#)

[3.3 Vulnerability Details](#)

4 Appendix

[4.1 About AstraSec](#)

[4.2 Disclaimer](#)

[4.3 Contact](#)

1 Introduction

1.1 About Kodiak Bault

The Kodiak Bault is a yield-optimizing vault system where users stake LP tokens to earn BGT rewards. Rewards are auto-compounded through an innovative auction mechanism that sells BGT for more LP tokens. The system includes a factory and an ERC4626-compliant vault. In auctions, solvers provide LP tokens to claim all unclaimed BGT and receive a fixed LP bounty. BGT can also be claimed directly or minted into liquid wrappers such as iBGT or LBGT.



1.2 Source Code

The following source code was reviewed during the audit:

▶ <https://github.com/Kodiak-Finance/bgt-baults>

▶ CommitID: 6cd780a

[src/aultFactory.sol](#)

[src/Bault.sol:](#)

[src/BgtConverter.sol](#)

▶ <https://github.com/Kodiak-Finance/kodiak-periphery>

▶ CommitID: 8863c91

[src/vaults/BaultRouter.sol](#) (The inherited IslandRouter contract is not within the scope of the audit)

2 Overall Assessment

This report has been compiled to identify issues and vulnerabilities within the Kodiak Bault protocol. Throughout this audit, we identified a total of 3 low severity level issues. By employing auxiliary tool techniques to supplement our thorough manual code review, we have discovered the following findings.

Severity	Count	Acknowledged	Won't Do	Addressed
Critical	—	—	—	—
High	—	—	—	—
Medium	—	—	—	—
Low	3	2	—	1
Informational	—	—	—	—
Undetermined	—	—	—	—

3 Vulnerability Summary

3.1 Overview

Click on an issue to jump to it, or scroll down to see them all.

L-1

[Revisited Slippage Control in Bault::claimBgt\(\)](#)

L-2

[Improved Corner Case Handling in Bault::withdraw\(\)/redeem\(\)](#)

L-3

[Potential Risks Associated with Centralization](#)

3.2 Security Level Reference

In web3 smart contract audits, vulnerabilities are typically classified into different severity levels based on the potential impact they can have on the security and functionality of the contract. Here are the definitions for critical-severity, high-severity, medium-severity, and low-severity vulnerabilities:

Severity	Acknowledged
C-X (Critical)	A severe security flaw with immediate and significant negative consequences. It poses high risks, such as unauthorized access, financial losses, or complete disruption of functionality. Requires immediate attention and remediation.
H-X (High)	Significant security issues that can lead to substantial risks. Although not as severe as critical vulnerabilities, they can still result in unauthorized access, manipulation of contract state, or financial losses. Prompt remediation is necessary.
M-X (Medium)	Moderately impactful security weaknesses that require attention and remediation. They may lead to limited unauthorized access, minor financial losses, or potential disruptions to functionality.
L-X (Low)	Minor security issues with limited impact. While they may not pose significant risks, it is still recommended to address them to maintain a robust and secure smart contract.
I-X (Informational)	Warnings and things to keep in mind when operating the protocol. No immediate action required.
U-X (Undetermined)	Identified security flaw requiring further investigation. Severity and impact need to be determined. Additional assessment and analysis are necessary.

3.3 Vulnerability Details

3.3.1 [L-1] Revisited Slippage Control in Bault::claimBgt()

TARGET	CATEGORY	IMPACT	LIKELIHOOD	STATUS
Bault.sol	Business Logic	Low	Low	Addressed

The `claimBgt()` function in the Bault contract retrieves the amount of BGT rewards using `rewardVault.earned(address(this))` and requires that `bgtBalance > 0`. It then calls `_takeBounty()` to allow the caller to claim BGT rewards by providing a bounty amount of staking tokens. However, this implementation introduces a front-running arbitrage opportunity. A malicious actor could front-run the transaction, manipulating the BGT balance or bounty, resulting in the actual BGT received by the caller to significantly differ from the expected amount. To mitigate this risk, enhanced slippage protection mechanisms, such as specifying a minimum acceptable BGT output, should be implemented to ensure fair reward distribution.

Note that the `claimBgtWrapper()` function in the same contract shares the same issue.

```
bgt-baults-6cd780aac5fcd0d4dc6f980ab212079ced559a5b - Bault.sol
144 //***** BGT CLAIM / COMPOUND *****
145 function claimBgt(address bgtRecipient) external nonReentrant {
146     ...
147     uint256 bgtBalance = rewardVault.earned(address(this));
148     require(bgtBalance > 0, "Bault: No BGT to claim");
149
150     (uint256 compoundAmount, uint256 compoundFee) = _takeBounty(); //Evan: 将一部分stakingToken stake到vault里
151
152     rewardVault.getReward(address(this), bgtRecipient);
153
154     ...
155     emit BgtClaimed(msg.sender, bgtRecipient, compoundAmount, compoundFee, bgtBalance);
156 }
```

Remediation To address this issue, implement slippage protection mechanisms, such as minimum output checks, in both `claimBgt()` and `claimBgtWrapper()` functions to ensure fair BGT value for the caller.

3.3.2 [L-2] Improved Corner Case Handling in Bault::withdraw()/redeem()

TARGET	CATEGORY	IMPACT	LIKELIHOOD	STATUS
Bault.sol	Business Logic	Low	Low	Acknowledged

To prevent malicious users from hijacking rewards by entering the vault right before a reward claim and exiting right after, the Bault contract imposes an exit fee on users who withdraw. These exit fees are distributed as rewards to the remaining depositors. However, a corner case arises when the last user withdraws or redeems all assets: the fee collected from this last user remains in the reward vault as dust since the totalSupply becomes 0, making it unrecoverable. This could lead to a permanent loss of funds. To address this, the contract should either refund the fee to the last user or send the collected exit fee to the treasury contract before the totalSupply reaches zero.

```
bgt-baults-6cd780aac5fcd0d4dc6f980ab212079ced559a5b - Bault.sol
91 //unstake from bgt reward vault and emit the exit fee
92 function _beforeWithdraw(uint256 assets, uint256 /*shares*/) internal override {
93     rewardVault.withdraw(assets);
94     uint256 fee = _feeOnRaw(assets);
95     emit ExitFeePaid(assets, fee);
96 }
```

Remediation To address this issue, implement a mechanism to refund the exit fee to the last user or send it to the treasury contract before the totalSupply reaches 0.

Response By Team This issue has been confirmed by the team. The team has chosen not to implement a fix and leave it simple. The risk of leaving a dust amount of exitFee in the vault from the last depositor is known and that's ok.

3.3.3 [L-3] Potential Risks Associated with Centralization

Target	Category	IMPACT	LIKELIHOOD	STATUS
Multiple Contracts	Security	High	Low	Acknowledged

In the Kodiak Bault project, the existence of a privileged owner account introduces centralization risks, as it holds significant control and authority over critical operations governing the protocol. In the following, we show the representative function potentially affected by the privileges associated with the privileged account.

```
bgt-baults-6cd780aac5fcd0d4dc6f980ab212079ced559a5b - Bault.sol
266 //Set the exit fee, in bps, to be taken on withdraw
267 //This is retained in the vault to be distributed to remaining depositors
268 function setExitFeeBps(uint256 _exitFeeBps) external onlyFactoryOwner {
269     require(_exitFeeBps <= 100, "Bault: Exit fee too high"); // Max 1%
270     exitFeeBps = _exitFeeBps; // @audit : trust issue of admin keys
271     emit ExitFeeBpsUpdated(_exitFeeBps);
272 }
273
274 function unpause() external onlyFactoryOwner {
275     paused = false;
276     emit Unpaused(msg.sender);
277 }
278
279 function pause() external {
280     require(msg.sender == factory.owner() || factory.pauser(msg.sender), "Bault: Not factory owner or pauser");
281     paused = true;
282     emit Paused(msg.sender);
283 }
```

Remediation To mitigate the identified issue, it is recommended to introduce multi-sig mechanism to undertake the role of the privileged account. Moreover, it is advisable to implement timelocks to govern all modifications to the privileged operations.

Response By Team This issue has been confirmed by the team.

4 Appendix

4.1 About AstraSec

AstraSec is a blockchain security company that serves to provide high-quality auditing services for blockchain-based protocols. With a team of blockchain specialists, AstraSec maintains a strong commitment to excellence and client satisfaction. The audit team members have extensive audit experience for various famous DeFi projects. AstraSec's comprehensive approach and deep blockchain understanding make it a trusted partner for the clients.

4.2 Disclaimer

The information provided in this audit report is for reference only and does not constitute any legal, financial, or investment advice. Any views, suggestions, or conclusions in the audit report are based on the limited information and conditions obtained during the audit process and may be subject to unknown risks and uncertainties. While we make every effort to ensure the accuracy and completeness of the audit report, we are not responsible for any errors or omissions in the report.

We recommend users to carefully consider the information in the audit report based on their own independent judgment and professional advice before making any decisions. We are not responsible for the consequences of the use of the audit report, including but not limited to any losses or damages resulting from reliance on the audit report.

This audit report is for reference only and should not be considered a substitute for legal documents or contracts.

4.3 Contact

Phone	+86 156 0639 2692
Email	contact@astrasec.ai
Twitter	https://twitter.com/AstraSecAI