

Protocol Audit Report

Version 1.0

Protocol Audit Report March 7, 2023

Protocol Audit Report

Cyfrin.io

March 7, 2023

Prepared by: Cyfrin Lead Auditors: - xxxxxxx

Table of Contents

- Table of Contents
- Protocol Summary
- Disclaimer
- Risk Classification
- Audit Details
 - Scope
 - Roles
- Executive Summary
 - Issues found
- Findings
- High
- Medium
- Low
- Informational
- Gas

Protocol Summary

Protocol does X, Y, Z

Protocol Audit Report March 7, 2023

Disclaimer

The YOUR_NAME_HERE 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
	High	Н	H/M	М
Likelihood	Medium	H/M	М	M/L
	Low	М	M/L	L

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

Audit Details

Scope

everything. ## Roles owner, user, flashloanreceiver (contract) # Executive Summary here it is ## Issues found some

Findings

[H-1] Erroneous ThunderLoan::updateExchangeRate in the deposit function causes protocol tho thing it has more fees than it really does, which blocks redemption and incorrectly sets the exchange rate

Description: In the ThunderLoan system, the exchangeRate is responsible for calculating the exchange rate between assetTokens and underlying tokens. In a way, it's responsible for keeping track of how many fees to give to liquidity providers. However, the deposit function undates this rate, without collecting any fees!

```
1
       function deposit(IERC20 token, uint256 amount) external
          revertIfZero(amount) revertIfNotAllowedToken(token) {
           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);
           assetToken.mint(msg.sender, mintAmount);
6
7
           uint256 calculatedFee = getCalculatedFee(token, amount);
           // audit high this should not update the exchange rate here
8
9 @>
           assetToken.updateExchangeRate(calculatedFee);
10 @>
           token.safeTransferFrom(msg.sender, address(assetToken), amount)
       ;
11
12
```

Impact: There are several impacts to this bug.

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

Proof of Concept:

- 1. LP deposits
- 2. User takes out a flash loan
- 3. It is now impossible for LP to redeem.

Proof of Code

Place the following into ThunderLoanTest.t.sol

```
function testRedeemAfterLoan() public setAllowedToken hasDeposits {
    uint256 amountToBorrow = AMOUNT * 10;
```

```
uint256 calculatedFee = thunderLoan.getCalculatedFee(tokenA,
               amountToBorrow);
4
           vm.startPrank(user);
           tokenA.mint(address(mockFlashLoanReceiver), calculatedFee);
6
           thunderLoan.flashloan(address(mockFlashLoanReceiver), tokenA,
7
               amountToBorrow, "");
           vm.stopPrank();
8
9
           uint256 amountToRedeem = type(uint256).max;
11
           vm.startPrank(liquidityProvider);
           thunderLoan.redeem(tokenA, amountToRedeem);
13
       }
```

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];
2
3
           uint256 exchangeRate = assetToken.getExchangeRate();
4
           uint256 mintAmount = (amount * assetToken.
               EXCHANGE_RATE_PRECISION()) / exchangeRate;
5
           emit Deposit(msg.sender, token, amount);
           assetToken.mint(msg.sender, mintAmount);
6
           uint256 calculatedFee = getCalculatedFee(token, amount);
8
           // audit high this should not update the exchange rate here
9
           assetToken.updateExchangeRate(calculatedFee);
10 -
           token.safeTransferFrom(msg.sender, address(assetToken), amount)
11
```

[H-2] Mixing up variable location causes storage collisions in ThunderLoan::s_flashLoanFee and ThunderLoan::s_currentlyFlashLoaning

Description: Thunder Loan . sol has two variables in the following order:

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

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

```
uint256 private s_flashLoanFee; // 0.3% ETH fee
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
2 import { ThunderLoanUpgraded } from "../../src/upgradedProtocol/
      ThunderLoanUpgraded.sol";
3
4 function testUpgradeBreaks() public {
           uint256 feeBeforeUpgrade = thunderLoan.getFee();
           vm.startPrank(thunderLoan.owner());
6
           ThunderLoanUpgraded upgraded = new ThunderLoanUpgraded();
7
8
           thunderLoan.upgradeTo(address(upgraded));
           uint256 feeAfterUpgrade = thunderLoan.getFee();
10
           assert(feeBeforeUpgrade != feeAfterUpgrade);
11
12
       }
```

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:

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

[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 Thunder Loan 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 Thunder Loan calculates price based on the TSwapPool this second flash loan is substantially cheaper.

```
function getPriceInWeth(address token) public view returns (
          uint256) {
    address swapPoolOfToken = IPoolFactory(s_poolFactory).
          getPool(token);

          return ITSwapPool(swapPoolOfToken).
          getPriceOfOnePoolTokenInWeth();

4 }
```

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.