

Campie Security Audit Report

August 20, 2024

Contents

1	Intr	oduction	3
	1.1	About Campie	3
	1.2	Audit Scope	3
	1.3	Changelog	5
2	Ove	erall Assessment	6
3	Vuli	nerability Summary	7
	3.1	Overview	7
	3.2	Security Level Reference	8
	3.3	Vulnerability Details	9
4	Арр	pendix 1	6
	4.1	About AstraSec	16
	4.2	Disclaimer	16
	43	Contact	16

1 Introduction

1.1 About Campie

Developed by Magpie, Campie is a DeFi platform developed atop Camelot DEX, which emerges as a pioneering SubDAO initiative, thoughtfully designed to bolster Camelot DEX and the Arbitrum kingdom.

1.2 Audit Scope

First Audit Scope

The following source code was reviewed during the audit:

- https://github.com/magpiexyz/Campie/tree/grailRush2
- Commit ID: 118fa2e

And this is the final version representing all fixes implemented for the issues identified in the audit:

- https://github.com/magpiexyz/Campie/tree/grailRush2
- Commit ID: 7d6ba8e

Note this audit only covers the CamelotStaking.sol, mGrailConvertor.sol, and MasterCampie.sol contracts.

Second Audit Scope

The following source code was reviewed during the audit:

- https://github.com/magpiexyz/Campie/pull/21/
- Commit ID: 5540946

And this is the final version representing all fixes implemented for the issues identified in the audit:

• https://github.com/magpiexyz/Campie/pull/21/

• Commit ID: 6a9fe05

Third Audit Scope

The following source code was reviewed during the audit:

https://github.com/magpiexyz/Campie/pull/40/

• Commit ID: ff4dd83

And this is the final version representing all fixes implemented for the issues identified in the audit:

https://github.com/magpiexyz/Campie/pull/40/

• Commit ID: 3c559c1

Forth Audit Scope

The following source code was reviewed during the audit:

https://github.com/magpiexyz/Campie/pull/41/

• Commit ID: a20206c

This audit only covers the code change for the MasterCampie contract. There is no issue observed in this audit, so no fix is committed.

Fifth Audit Scope

The following source code was reviewed during the audit:

https://github.com/magpiexyz/Campie/pull/43/

• Commit ID: ba5f6da

And this is the final version representing all fixes implemented for the issues identified in the audit:

https://github.com/magpiexyz/Campie/pull/43/

• Commit ID: dd0c1ef

1.3 Changelog

Version	Date
First Audit	April 5, 2024
Second Audit	May 20, 2024
Third Audit	June 20, 2024
Forth Audit	July 26, 2024
Fifth Audit	August 20, 2024

2 Overall Assessment

This report has been compiled to identify issues and vulnerabilities within the Campie project. Throughout this audit, we identified several issues spanning various severity levels. 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	1	-	-	1
Medium	2	-	-	2
Low	1	1	-	-
Informational	1	-	-	1
Undetermined	-	-	-	-

3 Vulnerability Summary

3.1 Overview

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

- H-1 Improper Logic of mGrailConvertor::convert()
- M-1 Revisited Reward Distribution in CamelotStaking
- M-2 Double Claim Risk in GraiRush2::convert()
- L-1 Potential Risks Associated with Centralization
- H1 Meaningful Events for Key Operations

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	Description
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 unautho-
	rized access, manipulation of contract state, or financial losses. Prompt
	remediation is necessary.
M-X (Medium)	Moderately impactful security weaknesses that require attention and re-
	mediation. 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 im-
	pact need to be determined. Additional assessment and analysis are
	necessary.

3.3 Vulnerability Details

[H-1] Improper Logic of mGrailConvertor::convert()

Target	Category	IMPACT	LIKELIHOOD	STATUS
mGrailConvertor.sol	Business Logic	High	Medium	<i>⊗</i> Addressed

The mGrailConvertor::convert() function is designed to process the deposits of the grail token and mint the mGrail token simultaneously. When the input parameter _mode is set to stakeMode, it will deposit the minted mGrail token to the masterCampie contract on behalf of the user. While examining the staking logic, we notice the mGrail token is directly minted to the masterCampie contract (line 80). At the same time, we observe the MasterCampie::depositFor() function attempts to extract the mGrail token again from msg.sender (line 329), which will cause the transaction to revert.

```
mGrailConvertor::convert()
68 function convert(
69
       address _for,
       uint256 _amount,
70
       uint256 _mode
72 ) external whenNotPaused nonReentrant {
       if (_amount == 0) revert ZeroNotAllowed();
73
       IERC20(grail).safeTransferFrom(msg.sender, address(this), _amount);
75
       _convert(_amount);
76
       if (_mode == stakeMode) {
78
           if (masterCampie == address(0)) revert MasterCampieNotSet();
           IMintableERC20(mGrail).mint(address(masterCampie), _amount);
80
81
           IMasterCampie(masterCampie).depositFor(
                mGrail,
                _for,
83
84
                _{\mathtt{amount}}
           );
85
       } else {
86
           IMintableERC20(mGrail).mint(_for, _amount);
87
88
       emit mGrailConverted(_for, _amount, _mode);
89
90 }
```

```
MasterCampie::depositFor()

321 function depositFor(
322 address _stakingToken,
323 address _for,
```

Remediation Properly improve the implementation of the convert() function.

[M-1] Revisited Reward Distribution in CamelotStaking

Target	Category	IMPACT	LIKELIHOOD	STATUS
CamelotStaking.sol	Business Logic	Medium	Medium	<i>⊗</i> Addressed

By design, the depositLp() function accepts the deposits of the Camelot LP tokens and deposits them into the corresponding Camelot NFTPool to earn GRAIL/xGRAIL as rewards. It calls _harvestBatchLp -Rewards() (line 217) to harvest and distribute rewards. Upon thorough examination of the current implementation, we identify a vulnerability that needs to be improved. The _harvestBatchLpRewards() function calls harvestPosition() (line 245) to harvest and calculate rewards based on the GRAIL/xGRAIL balance changes in the CamelotStaking contract. However, the addToPosition() function is called (line 212) before to deposit the Camelot LP tokens into the Camelot NFTPool, and it calls _harvestPosition() (line 584) (which is equivalent to harvestPosition()), sending rewards to the CamelotStaking contract. As a result, the second call to harvestPosition() in _harvestBatchLpRewards() does not yield any reward, causing them to be locked in the CamelotStaking contract without proper distribution.

```
CamelotStaking::depositLp()
191 function depositLp(
       address _lp,
       address _for,
193
194
        address _from,
195
        uint256 _amount
196 ) external override nonReentrant whenNotPaused _onlyActivePoolHelper(_lp){
       Pool storage poolInfo = pools[_lp];
197
        IERC20(poolInfo.lp).safeTransferFrom(_from, address(this), _amount);
199
        if(lpPostionTokenId[_lp] == 0)
202
            uint256 lpNextTokenId = INFTPool(poolInfo.lpNftPool).lastTokenId() + 1;
```

```
lpPostionTokenId[_lp] = lpNextTokenId;
204
            IERC20(poolInfo.lp).approve(poolInfo.lpNftPool, _amount);
206
            INFTPool(poolInfo.lpNftPool).createPosition(_amount,0);
207
        }
208
209
        else
        {
210
            IERC20(poolInfo.lp).approve(poolInfo.lpNftPool, _amount);
211
212
            INFTPool(poolInfo.lpNftPool).addToPosition(lpPostionTokenId[_lp],
                _amount);
        }
213
        address[] memory _lps = new address[](1);
215
        _lps[0] = _lp;
216
        _harvestBatchLpRewards( _lps );
219
        // mint the receipt to the user driectly
        IMintableERC20(poolInfo.receiptToken).mint(_for, _amount);
220
        emit NewLpDeposit(_for, _lp, _amount, poolInfo.receiptToken, _amount);
222
223 }
225 function _harvestBatchLpRewards(
226
        address[] memory _lps
227 ) internal {
        if(_lps.length == 0) return;
229
        for(uint256 i = 0; i < _lps.length; i++)</pre>
232
            Pool storage poolInfo = pools[_lps[i]];
233
234
            if ((poolInfo.lastHarvestTime + harvestTimeGap) > block.timestamp)
                return:
            if (!pools[_lps[i]].isActive) revert OnlyActivePool();
236
            poolInfo.lastHarvestTime = block.timestamp;
237
239
            uint256 _tokenId = lpPostionTokenId[_lps[i]];
            if(_tokenId == 0) revert NoOpenPositionForLp();
240
            uint256 xGrailBeforeBalance = xGrailToken.balanceOf(address(this));
            uint256 grailBeforeBalance = IERC20(GRAIL).balanceOf(address(this));
243
            INFTPool(poolInfo.lpNftPool).harvestPosition(_tokenId);
245
            uint256 xGrailAfterBalance = xGrailToken.balanceOf(address(this));
247
            uint256 grailAfterBalance = IERC20(GRAIL).balanceOf(address(this));
248
            if((grailAfterBalance - grailBeforeBalance) > 0)
250
            {
251
```

```
IERC20(GRAIL).safeApprove(address(rewardDistributor), (
252
                      grailAfterBalance - grailBeforeBalance));
                 IReward \texttt{Distributor} \, (\texttt{rewardDistributor}) \, . \, \texttt{sendYieldBoosterRewards} \, (
                      poolInfo.rewarder, GRAIL, (grailAfterBalance - grailBeforeBalance
                      ));
254
             }
             if((xGrailAfterBalance - xGrailBeforeBalance) > 0)
256
257
                 xGrailToken.approve(address(rewardDistributor), (xGrailAfterBalance
258
                      xGrailBeforeBalance));
                 IRewardDistributor(rewardDistributor).sendYieldBoosterRewards(
259
                      poolInfo.rewarder, address(xGrailToken), (xGrailAfterBalance -
                      xGrailBeforeBalance));
             }
        }
261
262 }
```

Remediation Improve the implementation of the depositLp() function to properly harvest and distribute the rewards.

[M-2] Double Claim Risk in GraiRush2::convert()

Target	Category	IMPACT	LIKELIHOOD	STATUS
GrailRush2.sol	Business Logic	Medium	Medium	<i>⊗</i> Addressed

The function GrailRush2::convert() is used to convert the GRAIL tokens deposited by the user into mGRAIL and stake the converted mGRAIL tokens into the masterCampie contract on behalf of the user. During this process, the user will also receive the ARB rewards. When reviewing the implementation of this function, we notice that it adds the amount of tokens converted by the user (_amount) to

userInfo.converted (line 260). This means that the state variable is used to track the total amount of tokens the user has converted. However, the GrailRush2 contract also provides another function, claim(), which uses the value of userInfo.converted to determine whether the user has any mGRAIL tokens available to claim. This implies that the user could potentially use the claim() function to claim an additional set of mGRAIL tokens, leading to the risk of a double claim.

```
GrailRush2::convert()
      function convert(uint256 _amount) external whenNotPaused nonReentrant {
        if (!validConvertor(msg.sender)) revert InvalidConvertor();
244
        if (_amount == 0) revert InvalidAmount();
        UserInfo storage userInfo = userInfos[msg.sender];
247
        uint256 originalFactor = userInfo.factor;
        uint256 originalWeightedFactor = userInfo.weightedFactor;
249
251
        uint256 rewardToSend = this.quoteReward(_amount, msg.sender);
        IERC20(GRAIL).safeTransferFrom(msg.sender, address(this), _amount);
253
        IERC20(GRAIL).safeApprove(address(mGrailConvertor), _amount);
        IConvertor(mGrailConvertor).convert(msg.sender, _amount, 1);
255
        (userInfo.factor, totalFactor, userInfo.weightedFactor, weightedTotalFactor)
            this.quoteConvert(_amount, msg.sender);
258
        userInfo.converted += _amount;
260
        claimedMGrail[msg.sender] += _amount;
261
        userInfo.rewardClaimed += rewardToSend;
262
        totalConverted += _amount;
263
        userInfo.convertedTimes += 1;
        if (rewardToSend > 0) {
266
            ARB.safeTransfer(msg.sender, rewardToSend);
        }
268
        emit Convert(
270
           msg.sender,
271
272
            _amount,
            userInfo.factor - originalFactor,
            userInfo.weightedFactor - originalWeightedFactor,
274
            block.timestamp,
275
            currentWeighting()
276
        );
277
        emit ARBRewarded(msg.sender, rewardToSend);
278
279 }
```

Remediation Remove the claim() function from the GrailRush2 contract.

[L-1] Potential Risks Associated with Centralization

Target	Category	IMPACT	LIKELIHOOD	STATUS
Multiple Contracts	Security	Low	Low	Acknowledged

In the Campie protocol, the existence of a series of privileged accounts introduces centralization risks, as they hold 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 accounts.

```
Example Privileged Operations in Campie
   function setPoolManagerStatus(address _account, bool _allowedManager) external
        PoolManagers[_account] = _allowedManager;
687
689
        emit PoolManagerStatus(_account, PoolManagers[_account]);
690 }
   function setCampie(address _campie) external onlyOwner {
        if (address(campie) != address(0)) revert CampieSetAlready();
693
        if (!Address.isContract(_campie)) revert MustBeContract();
697
        campie = IERC20(_campie);
698
        emit CampieSet(_campie);
699 }
   function setVlCampie(address _vlCampie) external onlyOwner {
701
        address oldvlCampie = address(vlCampie);
702
        vlCampie = IVLCampie(_vlCampie);
        emit VlCampieUpdated(address(vlCampie), oldvlCampie);
704
705 }
```

Remediation To mitigate the identified issue, it is recommended to introduce multi-sig mechanism to undertake the role of the privileged accounts. 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.

[I-1] Meaningful Events for Key Operations

Target	Category	IMPACT	LIKELIHOOD	STATUS
MasterCampie.sol	Coding Practices	N/A	N/A	<i>⊗</i> Addressed

The event feature is vital for capturing runtime dynamics in a contract. Upon emission, events store transaction arguments in logs, supplying external analytics and reporting tools with crucial information. They play a pivotal role in scenarios like modifying system-wide parameters or handling token operations.

However, in our examination of protocol dynamics, we observed that certain key operations lack meaningful events to document their changes. We highlight the representative routines below.

```
MasterCampie::updateWhitelistedAllocManager()

835  function updateWhitelistedAllocManager(
836    address _account,
837    bool _allowed
838  ) external onlyOwner {
839    AllocationManagers[_account] = _allowed;
840 }
```

Remediation Ensure the proper emission of meaningful events containing accurate information to promptly reflect state changes.

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	+86 176 2267 4194
Email	contact@astrasec.ai
Twitter https://twitter.com/AstraSecAl	