

Security Assessment Report xORCA Staking Program

September 24, 2025

Summary

The Sec3 team was engaged to conduct a thorough security analysis of the xORCA Staking Program.

The artifact of the audit was the source code of the following programs, excluding tests, in a private repository.

The initial audit focused on the following versions and revealed 9 issues or questions.

| Task | Туре | Commit |
|-----------------------|--------|--|
| xORCA Staking Program | Solana | 8affaea601723bb9a2ed815c9f6e5586f68f7b55 |

This report provides a detailed description of the findings and their respective resolutions.

Table of Contents

| Result Overview | 3 |
|--|----|
| Findings in Detail | 4 |
| [H-01] Potential xorca vault inflation attack risk | 2 |
| [L-01] Potential pre-created PDA and ATA account risk | 6 |
| [L-02] Incorrect state account validation | 8 |
| [L-03] Missing validation of INITIAL_UPGRADE_AUTHORITY_ID | 16 |
| [L-04] Potential DoS if PendingWithdraw account has lamports before initialization | 11 |
| [I-01] Unnecessary writable modifier | 12 |
| [I-02] Incorrect event parameter | 13 |
| [I-03] Unsafe account closure procedure | 14 |
| [I-04] Optimize AccountDiscriminator | 15 |
| Appendix: Methodology and Scope of Work | 16 |

Result Overview

| Issue | Impact | Status |
|--|--------|--------------|
| XORCA STAKING PROGRAM | | |
| [H-01] Potential xorca vault inflation attack risk | High | Resolved |
| [L-01] Potential pre-created PDA and ATA account risk | Low | Acknowledged |
| [L-02] Incorrect state account validation | Low | Resolved |
| [L-03] Missing validation of INITIAL_UPGRADE_AUTHORITY_ID | Low | Resolved |
| [L-04] Potential DoS if PendingWithdraw account has lamports before initialization | Low | Resolved |
| [I-01] Unnecessary writable modifier | Info | Resolved |
| [I-02] Incorrect event parameter | Info | Resolved |
| [I-03] Unsafe account closure procedure | Info | Resolved |
| [I-04] Optimize AccountDiscriminator | Info | Resolved |

Findings in Detail

XORCA STAKING PROGRAM

[H-01] Potential xorca vault inflation attack risk

```
Identified in commit 8affaea.
```

The protocol allows users to stake ORCA tokens in order to mint XORCA tokens, where the XORCA token exchange rate is calculated as non_escrowed_orca_amount / xorca_supply.

```
/* solana-program/src/util/math.rs */
004 | pub fn convert_orca_to_xorca(
        orca_amount_to_convert: u64,
006 |
         non_escrowed_orca_amount: u64,
007 |
        xorca_supply: u64,
008 | ) -> Result<u64, ProgramError> {
        if (xorca_supply == 0) || (non_escrowed_orca_amount == 0) {
             return Ok(orca_amount_to_convert);
011 |
013 |
       // Perform calculations using u128 to prevent overflow for intermediate products.
014
        // Convert all relevant u64 inputs to u128 for the calculation.
015 |
        let xorca_supply_u128 = xorca_supply as u128;
016
         let orca_amount_to_convert_u128 = orca_amount_to_convert as u128;
017
         let non_escrowed_orca_amount_u128 = non_escrowed_orca_amount as u128;
        let out_xorca_amount_u128 = orca_amount_to_convert_u128
019
020 |
           .checked_mul(xorca_supply_u128)
021 |
             .ok_or(ErrorCode::ArithmeticError)?
022 |
             .checked_div(non_escrowed_orca_amount_u128)
023 |
             .ok_or(ErrorCode::ArithmeticError)?;
025 |
         // Cast the final u128 result back to u64.
026 I
         let out_xorca_amount: u64 = out_xorca_amount_u128
027 I
             .try_into()
028 |
             .map_err(|_| ErrorCode::ArithmeticError)?; // Return an error if the value is too large for u64
030 |
         0k(out_xorca_amount)
031 | }
```

In particular,

- non_escrowed_orca_amount = protocol ORCA vault ATA balance escrowed_orca_amount
- escrowed_orca_amount = ORCA token amount that have already been requested for withdrawal
- xorca_supply = the circulating supply of XORCA tokens

```
/* solana-program/src/instructions/stake.rs */
081 | let vault_account_data =
082 | make_owner_token_account_assertions(vault_account, state_account, orca_mint_account)?;
084 | // Calculate xOrca to mint
085 | // Use checked math to guard against vault < escrow (should not happen, but defensive)
086 | let non_escrowed_orca_amount = vault_account_data
087 | .amount</pre>
```

```
088
          .checked_sub(state.escrowed_orca_amount)
089
          .ok_or(ErrorCode::InsufficientVaultBacking)?;
091 | let xorca_to_mint = convert_orca_to_xorca(
         *orca_stake_amount,
092 I
093 I
         non_escrowed_orca_amount,
094 I
         xorca_mint_data.supply,
095 | )?;
097 | if xorca_to_mint == 0 {
         return Err(ErrorCode::InsufficientStakeAmount.into());
098 |
099 | }
```

In other words, the formula can be expressed as (vault ATA account balance - escrowed_orca_amount) / xorca_supply.

As a result, a malicious user can donate and directly transfer ORCA tokens into the vault ATA account to manipulate the XORCA token exchange rate. This creates a <u>classic vault inflation attack scenario</u>.

Consider the following example:

- The first staking user deposits 1 unit of ORCA, minting 1 XORCA (exchange rate = 1).
- The same user then transfers 1000e6 units of ORCA directly to the vault ATA account (exchange rate = 1000e6).

After this point, any staking attempt with an amount less than 1000e6 ORCA will fail with an Insufficie ntStakeAmount error.

Even though some large stakings are successful, the value of the minted tokens can be much lower than the value of the staked tokens. As a result, the malicious user can benefit from the rounding errors and steal from other stakers.

To mitigate this issue, it is recommended to <u>defend with a virtual offset</u> or permanently freeze a "dead share" during the first staking process. For example, enforce the minting of 100 or 1000 XORCA to a protocol-owned PDA address when the first staker joins.

Resolution

Fixed by commits a6bf7cb and 7ab1114.

[L-01] Potential pre-created PDA and ATA account risk

```
Identified in commit 8affaea.
```

In the <u>initialize</u> instruction, the protocol creates and initializes both the <u>state</u> PDA account and the <u>vault ATA account</u>.

```
/* solana-program/src/instructions/initialize.rs */
126 | create_program_account_borsh(
          system_program_account,
128 L
          payer_account,
129
          state account.
130
          &[state_seeds.as_slice().into()],
131
          &state_data,
132 | )?;
134 | // Create the vault ATA using CPI
135 | let create_ata_ix = pinocchio::instruction::Instruction {
          program_id: &ASSOCIATED_TOKEN_PROGRAM_ID,
137 I
          accounts: &[
              pinocchio::instruction::AccountMeta::writable_signer(payer_account.key()),
138 I
139
              pinocchio::instruction::AccountMeta::writable(vault_account.key()),
140 |
              pinocchio::instruction::AccountMeta::readonly(state_account.key()),
141
              pinocchio::instruction::AccountMeta::readonly(orca_mint_account.key()),
142
              pinocchio::instruction::AccountMeta::readonly(system_program_account.key()),
143
              pinocchio::instruction::AccountMeta::readonly(token_program_account.key()),
              \verb|pinocchio::instruction::AccountMeta::readonly(&ASSOCIATED_TOKEN_PROGRAM_ID)|,\\
144
145 |
          ],
146
          data: &[],
147 | };
148 | pinocchio::program::invoke(
149
          &create_ata_ix,
150 L
151 I
              payer_account,
152 I
              vault_account,
153 |
              state_account,
154 |
              orca_mint_account,
155 |
              system_program_account,
156
              token_program_account,
              associated_token_program_account,
157 I
158 I
159 | )?;
```

However, since the seeds for the state PDA account and vault ATA account are deterministic, once the program is deployed, any user can predict the state PDA account address and pre-create the vault ATA account.

```
/* solana-program/src/instructions/initialize.rs */
035 | let mut state_seeds = State::seeds();
036 | let state_bump = assert_account_seeds(state_account, &crate::ID, &state_seeds)?;
108 | // Verify vault address using centralized seeds
109 | let vault_seeds: Vec<Seed> = crate::pda::seeds::vault_seeds()
```

```
110 | state_account.key(),
111 | &SPL_TOKEN_PROGRAM_ID,
112 | orca_mint_account.key(),
113 | );
114 | assert_account_seeds(vault_account, &ASSOCIATED_TOKEN_PROGRAM_ID, &vault_seeds)?;
```

A malicious user could exploit this weakness and break the initialization process by:

- transferring SOL to the state PDA account address,
- or pre-creating the vault ATA account

It is recommended that the protocol owner promptly invoke the <u>initialize</u> instruction immediately after program deployment.

Resolution

The team acknowledged this finding.

[L-02] Incorrect state account validation

```
Identified in commit 8affaea.
```

In the unstake instruction, before reading the escrowed_orca_amount value from the state_account, the program first validates whether the state_account is legitimate.

```
/* solana-program/src/instructions/unstake.rs */
102 | // Calculate withdrawable ORCA amount using checked math
103 | let initial_escrowed_orca_amount = {
         let state_view = assert_account_data::<State>(state_account)?;
104 I
105
106
         // Verify vault address using stored vault_bump
107
         State::verify_vault_address_with_bump(
108
             state_account,
109 |
             vault_account,
110 |
            orca_mint_account,
111
            state_view.vault_bump,
112
         .map_err(|_| ErrorCode::InvalidSeeds)?;
113 |
114 |
115
          state_view.escrowed_orca_amount
116 | };
```

However, the validation logic is incorrectly implemented — it attempts to validate the vault account instead of the state account. The vault account had already been validated earlier.

```
/* solana-program/src/instructions/unstake.rs */
056 | // 3. Vault Account Assertions
057 | // Use stored vault_bump for verification - more efficient than assert_account_seeds
058 | let vault_account_data =
059 | make_owner_token_account_assertions(vault_account, state_account, orca_mint_account)?;
```

Since assert_account_data validates the account discriminator, and the state account owner has already been validated, this does not pose a security risk.

```
/* solana-program/src/assertions/account.rs */
130 | pub fn assert_account_data<T: ProgramAccount>(
        account: &AccountInfo,
132 | ) -> Result<Ref<'_, T>, ProgramError> {
133 |
        assert_account_len(account, T::LEN)?;
         assert_account_discriminator(account, &[T::DISCRIMINATOR])?;
134 I
135 |
136 I
         let data = account.try_borrow_data()?;
137
         Ok(T::from_bytes(data))
138 | }
/* solana-program/src/instructions/unstake.rs */
050 | // 2. xOrca State Account Assertions
```

```
051 | assert_account_role(state_account, &[AccountRole::Writable])?;
052 | assert_account_owner(state_account, &crate::ID)?;
```

Consider adding the validation logic to verify the state account properly. For example,

```
State::verify\_address\_with\_bump(state\_account, \&crate::ID, state\_view.bump).map\_err(|\_| ErrorCode::InvalidSeeds)?; \\
```

Resolution

Fixed by commit c18bd89.

[L-03] Missing validation of INITIAL_UPGRADE_AUTHORITY_ID

Identified in commit 8affaea.

In the initialize instruction, state_data.update_authority is set to the update_authority_account, which is the INITIAL_UPGRADE_AUTHORITY_ID.

```
/* solana-program/src/instructions/initialize.rs */
078 | // 5. Update Authority Account Assertions
079 | assert_account_address(update_authority_account, &INITIAL_UPGRADE_AUTHORITY_ID)?;

124 | state_data.update_authority = *update_authority_account.key();
```

The update authority account can modify protocol settings through the set instruction, which requires the update_authority_account to be both signer and writable.

```
/* solana-program/src/instructions/set.rs */
020 | // 1. Update Authority Account Assertions
021 | assert_account_role(
022 | update_authority_account,
023 | &[AccountRole::Signer, AccountRole::Writable],
024 | )?;
```

It is recommended to add explicit signer and writable checks for the INITIAL_UPGRADE_AUTHORITY_ID.

Resolution

Fixed by commit dfe2152.

[L-04] Potential DoS if PendingWithdraw account has lamports before initialization

```
Identified in commit 8affaea.
```

Throughout the program, all account creation operations utilize the create_account function, which directly invokes the system program's createAccount instruction via CPI.

```
/* solana-program/src/util/account.rs */
029 | pub fn create_account(
036 | ) -> ProgramResult {
037 I
        if new_account.is_owned_by(&SYSTEM_PROGRAM_ID) {
038 I
            let rent = Rent::get()?;
            let lamports = rent.minimum_balance(space);
039 I
041 I
            CreateAccount {
                 program: system_program,
042 |
043 |
                 from: funder,
044 |
                 to: new_account,
045 |
                 lamports,
046 |
                 space: space as u64,
047 |
                 owner,
048 |
049
             .invoke_signed(signers)?;
050 |
         }
         0k(())
052 |
053 | }
```

The system_instruction::create_account method creates new accounts and will fail if the account's
lamports are non-zero.

The PendingWithdraw account's PDA is generated using the seeds ["pending_withdraw", unstaker, withdraw_index], where withdraw_index is of type u8. If the account address of the unstaker is known, an attacker can transfer a small amount of SOL within the range of 0-255 to prevent the unstaker from creating any PendingWithdraw account, effectively blocking the unstake operation.

It's recommended to implement Anchor's initialization logic: When account lamports are not zero, use a combination of transfer + allocate + assign for account creation. This strategy helps prevent potential DoS attacks where malicious actors might pre-fund target accounts with lamports before creation attempts.

Resolution

Fixed by commit b78f3c4.

[I-01] Unnecessary writable modifier

```
Identified in commit 8affaea.
```

In the Unstake instruction, the vault_account is marked as writable.

```
/* solana-program/src/instructions/mod.rs */
034 | #[account(0, writable, signer, name = "unstaker_account")]
035 | #[account(1, writable, name = "state_account")]
036 | #[account(2, writable, name = "vault_account")]
037 | #[account(3, writable, name = "pending_withdraw_account")]
038 | #[account(4, writable, name = "unstaker_xorca_ata")]
039 | #[account(5, writable, name = "xorca_mint_account")]
040 | #[account(6, name = "orca_mint_account")]
041 | #[account(7, name = "system_program_account")]
042 | #[account(8, name = "token_program_account")]
043 | Unstake {
         xorca_unstake_amount: u64,
044
045 I
          withdraw_index: u8,
046 | },
```

However, during the execution of the Unstake instruction, the vault_account is never modified. Therefore, the writable modifier is unnecessary. The vault_account writable check in the make_owner_token_account_assertions function is also redundant.

```
/* solana-program/src/assertions/account.rs */
197 | pub fn make_owner_token_account_assertions<'a>(
198 | owner_token_account: &'a AccountInfo,
199 | owner_account: &AccountInfo,
200 | token_mint_account: &AccountInfo,
201 | ) -> Result<TokenAccount, ProgramError> {
202 | assert_account_role(owner_token_account, &[AccountRole::Writable])?;

/* solana-program/src/instructions/unstake.rs */
056 | // 3. Vault Account Assertions
057 | // Use stored vault_bump for verification - more efficient than assert_account_seeds
058 | let vault_account_data =
059 | make_owner_token_account_assertions(vault_account, state_account, orca_mint_account)?;
```

Resolution

Fixed by commit b949ad2.

[I-02] Incorrect event parameter

```
Identified in commit 8affaea.
```

In the Unstake event, the vault_xorca_amount parameter should be vault_orca_amount.

In Stake, Unstake, and Withdraw, events like vault_orca_amount and xorca_mint_supply reflect the outdated state from before the instruction was executed.

```
/* solana-program/src/instructions/stake.rs */
101 | // Transfer Orca from staker ATA to vault
102 | let transfer_instruction = Transfer {
103 |
         from: staker_orca_ata,
104 |
         to: vault_account,
105 | authority: staker_account,
106 |
         amount: *orca_stake_amount,
107 | };
108 | transfer_instruction.invoke()?;
110 | // Mint xOrca to staker xOrca ATA
111 | let mint_to_instruction = MintTo {
112 |
      mint: xorca_mint_account,
113
         account: staker_xorca_ata,
114
        mint_authority: state_account,
115
         amount: xorca_to_mint,
116 | };
117 | mint_to_instruction.invoke_signed(&[state_seeds.as_slice().into()])?;
119 | Event::Stake {
120 | orca_stake_amount: orca_stake_amount,
        vault_orca_amount: &vault_account_data.amount,
121
       vault_escrowed_orca_amount: &state.escrowed_orca_amount,
122 I
123
       xorca_mint_supply: &xorca_mint_data.supply,
124
         xorca_to_mint: &xorca_to_mint,
125 | }
126 | .emit()?;
```

Resolution

Fixed by commit b949ad2.

[I-03] Unsafe account closure procedure

```
Identified in commit 8affaea.
```

In the current implementation of the program, when closing an account, the close_program_account function performs the following actions:

- Sets the discriminator of account_to_close to AccountDiscriminator::Closed.
- 2. Transfers the lamports from account_to_close to the receiver.
- 3. Sets the lamports of account_to_close to 0.

```
/* solana-program/src/util/account.rs */
104 | pub fn close_program_account(
105 | account_to_close: &AccountInfo,
         receiver: &AccountInfo,
106
107 | ) -> ProgramResult {
         let mut account_to_close_data = account_to_close.try_borrow_mut_data()?;
108
109 |
         account_to_close_data[0] = AccountDiscriminator::Closed as u8;
110 |
         *receiver.try_borrow_mut_lamports()? += account_to_close.lamports();
111 |
         *account_to_close.try_borrow_mut_lamports()? = 0;
112
         0k(())
113 | }
```

Although it's safe in the current implementation because of the discriminator checks, it's still recommended to assign the account owner to the system program and reallocate the account size to 0.

Resolution

Fixed by commit 24d21bd.

[I-04] Optimize AccountDiscriminator

```
Identified in commit 8affaea.
```

The current implementation of the program defines a custom AccountDiscriminator enum, where the default value represents the State account.

It would be better to set the first enum variant (value 0) to Uninitialized to cover all cases of uninitialized accounts.

However, since the State Account in this program is a global PDA, the current implementation is considered safe.

Resolution

Fixed by commit b949ad2.

Appendix: Methodology and Scope of Work

Assisted by the Sec3 Scanner developed in-house, the manual audit particularly focused on the following work items:

- Check common security issues.
- Check program logic implementation against available design specifications.
- Check poor coding practices and unsafe behavior.
- The soundness of the economics design and algorithm is out of scope of this work

DISCLAIMER

The instance report ("Report") was prepared pursuant to an agreement between Coderrect Inc. d/b/a Sec3 (the "Company") and Orca Management Company, S.A (the "Client"). This Report solely includes the results of a technical assessment of a specific build and/or version of the Client's code specified in the Report ("Assessed Code") by the Company. The sole purpose of the Report is to provide the Client with the results of the technical assessment of the Assessed Code. The Report does not apply to any other version and/or build of the Assessed Code. Regardless of the contents of the Report, the Report does not (and should not be interpreted to) provide any warranty, representation or covenant that the Assessed Code: (i) is error and/or bug free, (ii) has no security vulnerabilities, and/or (iii) does not infringe any third-party rights. Moreover, the Report is not, and should not be considered, an endorsement by the Company of the Assessed Code and/or of the Client. Finally, the Report should not be considered investment advice or a recommendation to invest in the Assessed Code and/or the Client.

This Report is considered null and void if the Report (or any portion thereof) is altered in any manner.

ABOUT

The Sec3 audit team comprises a group of computer science professors, researchers, and industry veterans with extensive experience in smart contract security, program analysis, testing, and formal verification. We are also building automated security tools that incorporate static analysis, penetration testing, and formal verification.

At Sec3, we identify and eliminate security vulnerabilities through the most rigorous process and aided by the most advanced analysis tools.

For more information, check out our website and follow us on twitter.

