# BaseLedger Contract Accounting Vulnerability Report

# BaseLedger.\_updateAccounting Function Fails to Update User Accounting State During Zero-Fee Outflow Operations

**MEDIUM SEVERITY** 

### **Summary**

When feePercent is set to 0, the BaseLedger contract skips the entire outflow processing logic, leaving user share balances and cost basis unchanged despite actual asset withdrawals.

## **Finding Description**

The BaseLedger.\_updateAccounting function contains a critical flaw in its outflow processing logic. When processing outflow operations, the function contains a conditional check that only processes accounting updates if config.feePercent != 0:

```
} else {
    // Only process outflow if feePercent is not set to 0
    if (config.feePercent != 0) {
        uint256 amountAssets = _getOutflowProcessVolume(
            amountSharesOrAssets,
            usedShares,
            pps,
            IYieldSourceOracle(config.yieldSourceOracle).decimals(yieldSource)
        );

        feeAmount = _processOutflow(user, yieldSource, amountAssets, usedShares
        // ... accounting updates occur here ...
```

```
return feeAmount;
} else {
    emit AccountingOutflowSkipped(user, yieldSource, yieldSourceOracleId, arreturn 0;
}
```

#### When feePercent is 0, the function:

- 1. Emits AccountingOutflowSkipped event
- 2. Returns 0 fee amount
- 3. Fails to call \_processOutflow which contains \_calculateCostBasis
- 4. Leaves usersAccumulatorShares and usersAccumulatorCostBasis unchanged

The \_calculateCostBasis function is only called within \_processOutflow, meaning zero-fee withdrawals bypass all accounting updates entirely.

# **Impact Explanation**

- **Inflated Balances:** User's share balance and cost basis remain inflated after withdrawals
- Accounting Mismatch: The contract's accounting does not reflect the user's actual position
- **Persistent Corruption:** The corrupted state remains even after fee percentages are restored to non-zero values
- Protocol Integrity: Future calculations based on corrupted state will produce incorrect results
- **Financial Risk:** Users may be able to withdraw more than their fair share due to inflated accounting

### **Proof of Concept**

#### A test contract in the test folder. Run with the command:

```
forge test --mc CostBasisCorruptionTest -vvvv
// SPDX-License-Identifier: UNLICENSED
pragma solidity 0.8.30;
import "forge-std/Test.sol";
import "../src/core/accounting/SuperLedger.sol";
import "../src/core/accounting/SuperLedgerConfiguration.sol";
import "../src/core/accounting/oracles/ERC4626YieldSourceOracle.sol";
import { ERC20 } from "@openzeppelin/contracts/token/ERC20/ERC20.sol";
import { Mock4626Vault } from "test/mocks/Mock4626Vault.sol";
import { MockERC20 } from "test/mocks/MockERC20.sol";
contract CostBasisCorruptionTest is Test {
    SuperLedger ledger;
    SuperLedgerConfiguration config;
    ERC4626YieldSourceOracle oracle;
    Mock4626Vault vault;
   MockERC20 asset;
    address user = address(0x1);
    address executor = address(0x3);
    bytes4 yieldSourceOracleId = bytes4(0x12345678);
    address vieldSource;
    function setUp() public {
        // Deploy mock contracts first
        asset = new MockERC20("Test Asset", "TST", 18);
        vault = new Mock4626Vault(address(asset), "Test Vault", "TVLT");
        yieldSource = address(vault);
        // Deploy contracts
        address[] memory allowedExecutors = new address[](1);
        allowedExecutors[0] = executor;
        config = new SuperLedgerConfiguration();
        ledger = new SuperLedger(address(config), allowedExecutors);
        oracle = new ERC4626YieldSourceOracle();
        ISuperLedgerConfiguration.YieldSourceOracleConfigArgs[] memory configs
            new ISuperLedgerConfiguration.YieldSourceOracleConfigArgs[](1);
        configs[0] = ISuperLedgerConfiguration.YieldSourceOracleConfigArgs({
            yieldSourceOracleId: yieldSourceOracleId,
            yieldSourceOracle: address(oracle),
```

```
feePercent: 1000, // 10% fee
        feeRecipient: address(0x999).
        ledger: address(ledger)
    });
   config.setYieldSourceOracles(configs);
}
function testCostBasisCorruptionWithZeroFee() public {
    vm.startPrank(executor):
    // Step 1: User deposits 100 shares (inflow)
    ledger.updateAccounting(
        user,
        yieldSource,
        yieldSourceOracleId,
        true, // isInflow
        100e18, // amountSharesOrAssets
        0 // usedShares (not used for inflow)
    );
    // Verify initial state
    uint256 initialShares = ledger.usersAccumulatorShares(user, yieldSource
    uint256 initialCostBasis = ledger.usersAccumulatorCostBasis(user, yield
    assertEq(initialShares, 100e18);
    assertEq(initialCostBasis, 100e18); // 1:1 ratio
    // Step 2: Change fee to 0
    ISuperLedgerConfiguration.YieldSourceOracleConfigArgs[] memory newConfi
        new ISuperLedgerConfiguration.YieldSourceOracleConfigArgs[](1);
    newConfigs[0] = ISuperLedgerConfiguration.YieldSourceOracleConfigArgs({
        yieldSourceOracleId: yieldSourceOracleId,
        yieldSourceOracle: address(oracle),
        feePercent: 0, // Zero fee
        feeRecipient: address(0x999),
        ledger: address(ledger)
   });
    vm.stopPrank();
    config.proposeYieldSourceOracleConfig(newConfigs);
    // Fast forward past proposal expiration time (1 week)
    vm.warp(block.timestamp + 8 days);
    bytes4[] memory idsToAccept = new bytes4[](1);
    idsToAccept[0] = yieldSourceOracleId;
    config.acceptYieldSourceOracleConfigProposal(idsToAccept);
    vm.startPrank(executor);
```

```
// Step 3: User withdraws 50 shares with zero fee (outflow)
uint256 feeAmount = ledger.updateAccounting(
    user,
    yieldSource,
    yieldSourceOracleId,
    false, // isOutflow
    50e18, // amountSharesOrAssets
    50e18 // usedShares
);
// Verify fee is 0 (as expected)
assertEq(feeAmount, 0);
// Step 4: Check accounting corruption - shares and cost basis should N
uint256 sharesAfterWithdrawal = ledger.usersAccumulatorShares(user, yie
uint256 costBasisAfterWithdrawal = ledger.usersAccumulatorCostBasis(use
// BUG: These should be reduced by 50e18 each, but they remain unchange
assertEq(sharesAfterWithdrawal, 100e18, "Shares should be reduced but w
assertEq(costBasisAfterWithdrawal, 100e18, "Cost basis should be reduce
// Step 5: Change fee back to non-zero to demonstrate persistent corrup
ISuperLedgerConfiguration.YieldSourceOracleConfigArgs[] memory restoreC
    new ISuperLedgerConfiguration.YieldSourceOracleConfigArgs[](1);
restoreConfigs[0] = ISuperLedgerConfiguration.YieldSourceOracleConfigAr
    yieldSourceOracleId: yieldSourceOracleId,
    yieldSourceOracle: address(oracle),
    feePercent: 1000, // 10% fee restored
    feeRecipient: address(0x999),
    ledger: address(ledger)
});
vm.stopPrank();
config.proposeYieldSourceOracleConfig(restoreConfigs);
vm.warp(block.timestamp + 8 days);
config.acceptYieldSourceOracleConfigProposal(idsToAccept);
vm.startPrank(executor);
// Calculate expected cost basis for remaining 50 shares
uint256 expectedCostBasis = ledger.calculateCostBasisView(user, yieldSo
// This will show 50e18 instead of 25e18 due to corruption
assertEq(expectedCostBasis, 50e18, "Cost basis calculation affected by
vm.stopPrank();
```

#### Recommendation

#### **Solution: Always Update Accounting for Outflow Operations**

Modify the \_updateAccounting function to always update user accounting for outflow operations, regardless of fee percentage:

```
} else {
    uint256 amountAssets = _getOutflowProcessVolume(
        amountSharesOrAssets,
        usedShares,
        pps,
        IYieldSourceOracle(config.yieldSourceOracle).decimals(yieldSource));

if (config.feePercent != 0) {
        feeAmount = _processOutflow(user, yieldSource, amountAssets, usedSet emit AccountingOutflow(user, config.yieldSourceOracle, yieldSource)} else {
        // Update accounting even with zero fees _ _calculateCostBasis(user, yieldSource, usedShares);
        emit AccountingOutflow(user, config.yieldSourceOracle, yieldSource)}
    return feeAmount;
}
```

#### **Key Changes:**

- Always call \_calculateCostBasis for outflow operations
- Properly update usersAccumulatorShares and usersAccumulatorCostBasis
- Emit appropriate events for all outflow operations
- Maintain accounting integrity regardless of fee configuration

### **Additional Considerations**

This vulnerability highlights the importance of:

- Separating fee calculation from core accounting logic
- Comprehensive testing of edge cases, including zero-value configurations
- Clear documentation of intended behavior for all configuration states
- Regular audits of state-changing functions to ensure data consistency