

## Acronym Foundation

Security assessment by HashEye · prepared for Acronym Foundation

HASHEYE AUDITED

PROJECT	Acronym Foundation
CLIENT	Acronym Foundation
CATEGORY	Blockchain
PUBLISHED	December 1, 2023
REPORT ID	research-acronym-foundation-2023-12-01-9gi7xe

This report was produced under HashEye's layered review process – **automated detection**, **pattern correlation**, and **senior manual verification** – with every finding signed off by a human reviewer. Full findings detail and on-chain attestation are available on the report page at [hashey.io/audits/research-acronym-foundation-2023-12-01-9gi7xe](https://hashey.io/audits/research-acronym-foundation-2023-12-01-9gi7xe).

AcronymFoundation SecurityAssessment December13,2023 Preparedfor: AcronymFoundationTeam  
AcronymFoundation Preparedby:PriyankaBoseandAnishNaik

About hashey Founded in 2012 and headquartered in New York, hashey provides technical security assessment and advisory services to some of the world's most targeted organizations. We combine high-end security research with a real-world attacker mentality to reduce risk and fortify code. With 100+ employees around the globe, we've helped secure critical software elements that support billions of end users, including Kubernetes and the Linux kernel. We maintain an exhaustive list of publications at <https://github.com/hashey-io/publications>, with links to papers, presentations, public audit reports, and podcast appearances. In recent years, hashey consultants have showcased cutting-edge research through presentations at CanSecWest, HCSS, Devcon, Empire Hacking, GrrCon, LangSec, NorthSec, the O'Reilly Security Conference, PyCon, REcon, Security BSides, and SummerCon. We specialize in software testing and code review projects, supporting client organizations in the technology, defense, and finance industries, as well as government entities. Notable clients include HashiCorp, Google, Microsoft, Western Digital, and Zoom. hashey also operates a center of excellence with regard to blockchain security. Notable projects include audits of Algorand, Bitcoin SV, Chainlink, Compound, Ethereum 2.0, MakerDAO, Matic, Uniswap, Web3, and Zcash. To keep up to date with our latest news and announcements, please follow hashey on Twitter and explore our public repositories at <https://github.com/hashey-io>. To engage us directly, visit our "Contact" page at <https://www.hashey.io/contact>, or email us at [info@hashey.io](mailto:info@hashey.io). hashey, Inc. 228 Park Ave S #80688 New York, NY 10003 <https://www.hashey.io> [info@hashey.io](mailto:info@hashey.io) hashey  
1 AcronymFoundation SecurityAssessment PUBLIC

Notices and Remarks Copyright and Distribution ©2023 by hashey, Inc.

All rights reserved. hashey hereby asserts its right to be identified as the creator of this report in the United Kingdom.

This report is considered by hashey to be public information; it is licensed to Acronym Foundation under the terms of the project statement of work and has been made public at Acronym Foundation's request. Material within this report may not be reproduced or distributed in part or in whole without the express written permission of hashey.

This is the canonical source for hashey publications; the hashey Publications page.

Reports accessed through any source other than that page may have been modified and should not be considered authentic. Test Coverage Disclaimer

All activities undertaken by hashey in association with this project were performed in accordance with a statement of work and agreed upon project plan. Security assessment projects are time-boxed and often reliant on information that may be provided by a client, its affiliates, or its partners. As a result, the findings documented in this report should not be considered a comprehensive list of security issues, flaws, or defects in the target system or codebase.

hashey uses automated testing techniques to rapidly test the controls and security properties of software. These techniques augment our manual security review work, but each has its limitations: for example, a tool may not generate a random edge case that violates a property or may not fully complete its analysis during the allotted time. Their use is also limited by the time and resource constraints of a project. hashey  
2 AcronymFoundation SecurityAssessment PUBLIC

Table of Contents About hashey 1 Notices and Remarks 2 Table of Contents 3 Project Summary 4 Executive Summary 5 Project Goals 7 Project Targets 8 Project Coverage 9 Automated Testing 11 Codebase Maturity Evaluation 13 Summary of Findings 16 Detailed Findings 17

1. Partial redemptions may prevent insolvent LOCs from being liquidatable 17  
2. LOC validity may last longer than maxLocDurationSeconds 21 3. Lack of zero-value checks in setter functions 23  
4. Infinite partial redemptions for manually converted LOCs 25  
5. Partial redemptions can cause unexpected liquidations 28  
6. Incorrect price reporting may cause unexpected liquidations 32 7. LOCs may be immediately liquidatable 35  
A. Vulnerability Categories 38 B. Code Maturity Categories 40 C. Incident Response Recommendations 42  
D. Code Quality Recommendations 44 E. Token Integration Checklist 45 F. Fix Review Results 49  
Detailed Fix Review Results 50 G. Fix Review Status Categories 51 hashey  
3 AcronymFoundation SecurityAssessment PUBLIC

ProjectSummary ContactInformation Thefollowingmanagerswereassociatedwiththisproject: DanGuido, AccountManagerSamGreenup, ProjectManager dan@hasheye.iosam.greenup@hasheye.io Thefollowingengineerswereassociatedwiththisproject: PriyankaBose, ConsultantAnishNaik, Consultant priyanka.bose@hasheye.ioanish.naik@hasheye.io ProjectTimeline Thesignificanteventsandmilestonesoftheprojectarelistedbelow. DateEvent September8,2023Pre-projectkickoffcall September15,2023Statusupdatemeeting#1 September22,2023Deliveryofreportdraft September25,2023Reportreadoutmeeting October12,2023Deliveryofcomprehensivereport December13,2023Deliveryofcomprehensivereportwithfixreview hasheye 4AcronymFoundationSecurityAssessment PUBLIC

#### ExecutiveSummary EngagementOverview

AcronymFoundationengagedhasheyetoreviewthesecurityoftheAnvilprotocol whichisalendingandborrowingplatform.

AteamoftwoconsultantsconductedthereviewfromSeptember11toSeptember22, 2023,foratotaloffourengineer-weeksofeffort.Ourtestingeffortsfocusedonidentifying

anyinstanceshatcouldresultinalossoffunds,unexpectedliquidations,andarithmetic inconsistencies.Withfullaccesstosourcecodeanddocumentation,weperformedstatic anddynamictestingofthecodebase,usingautomatedandmanualprocesses. ObservationsandImpact

TheAnvilprotocolisalendingandborrowingplatformthatfacilitatesthetransparentuse ofcollateralbyapprovedpartieswithinthesystem.Creditorswillopenalineofcreditthat isbackedbycollateralforaspecifiedbeneficiarytousebeforeanexpirationtime.We identifiedtwocorepatternsthatledtotheissuesidentifiedinthisreport.

First,thelogicsurroundingpartialredemptionsledtoissuesTOB-ANVIL-1,TOB-ANVIL-4, andTOB-ANVIL-5.Theseissuesallowthetheftoffundsandunexpectedliquidations,which poseasignificantrisktotheprotocol'soperations.Theseproblemsuggestasystemic patterninvolvingthelogicsurroundingpartialredemptions,andtheremaybeadditional relatedissueshatremainundetectedatpresent.Second,TOB-ANVIL-2andTOB-ANVIL-6 highlightweaknessesintheunittestingsuite.Increasingbranchcoverage,testingalleged cases,andaddingmorethoroughpost-conditionchecksouldsignificantlyimprovethe testingsuite.

Despitetheseissues,thedocumentationandinlinecommentshighlighttheANVILteam's strongunderstandingoftheirsystem'sscoreinvariantsandhoweachprotocoloperation affectsthestateofthesystem.Integratingfuzztestingtodynamicallytesttheseinvariants wouldalsosignificantlyimprovetheprotocol'ssecurityposture. Recommendations Basedonthecodebasematurityevaluationandfindingsidentifiedduringtheseecurity review,hasheyerecommendsthatAcronymFoundationtakethefollowingsteps: •

Remediatethefindingsdisclosedinthisreport.These findings should be addressedaspartofadirectremediationoraspartofanyrefactorthatmayoccur whenaddressingotherrecommendations. • Reworkthelogicsurroundingpartialredemption.Duetoseveralissues connectedtopartialredemptions,conductathoroughreviewandoverhaulofthe hasheye 5AcronymFoundationSecurityAssessment PUBLIC

associatedlogic.Thiswillhelppaddresstheidentifiedissuesandenhancethe functionalityandreliabilityofthepartialredemptionprocess. •

Addcomplexunitandfuzzingtestsintothecodebase.Addrobustunittests that encompassallthearithmeticandroundingcomputationswithinthesystem.Ensure thattheunittestshavethoroughpost-conditioncheckstoevaluateallstate changes.Additionally,integrateadynamicfuzzingsolutionlikeEchidnatotest criticalfunction-and-system-levelinvariants. FindingSeveritiesandCategories

Thefollowingtablespvidethenumberoffindingsbyseverityandcategory. EXPOSUREANALYSIS SeverityCount High4 Medium1 Low1 Informational1 Undetermined0 CATEGORYBREAKDOWN CategoryCount DataValidation7 hasheye 6AcronymFoundationSecurityAssessment PUBLIC

ProjectGoals TheengagementwasscopedtoprovideasecurityassessmentoftheAcronym

Foundation'sDeFiprotocol.Specifically,wesoughttoanswerthefollowingnon-exhaustive listofquestions: •

Isitpossibletodrainfundsfromthe Collateral vaultand LetterOfCredit contract? •

Arethereanyarithmeticroundingissuesaffectingthecode? •

Arethereappropriateaccesscontrolsoncriticalfunctions? • Arethereanyreentrancyord denial-of-

serviceattackvectors? • Aretheinputsvalidatedcorrectly? •

Canlettersofcredit(LOCs)beforcedtobecomeinsolvent? • Doesthesystemproperlycalculatefees? •

Isthepricingfortokenpairscomputedcorrectly? • Isitpossibletofront-

runtransactionsandnegativelyaffectthesystem? hasheye 7AcronymFoundationSecurityAssessment PUBLIC

ProjectTargets Theengagementinvolvedareviewandtestingofthefollowingtarget. DeFiprotocol

Repository<https://github.com/AmperaFoundation/sol-contracts> Version

94d6dc5a3adfd9b7229c8e087d381c95387dd8 TypeSolidity PlatformEVM

**Project Coverage** This section provides an overview of the analysis coverage of the review, as determined by our high-level engagement goals. Our approaches and results included the following:

- **Collateral vault contract.** This contract allows users to deposit or withdraw funds that can later be used as collateral by a collateralizable contract such as `LetterOfCredit`. The users can directly interact with this contract to check balances, reserve collateral, and approve one or more collateralizable contracts to access their collateral. We verified the deposit and withdrawal workflows thoroughly to make sure that no funds are lost from this contract. Additionally, we checked whether all necessary state variable updates are executed accurately across all potential workflows. We also thoroughly examined all critical functions within the contract to identify any potential access control violations.
- **LetterOfCredit contract.** This contract primarily serves the purpose of enabling a user to generate an LOC that can be redeemed by a beneficiary before a specified expiration date set by the creator. To create the LOC, the user reserves collateral based on a predetermined collateralization factor and has the option to convert the collateral asset into the credited asset, which the beneficiary can then receive. If the LOC becomes unhealthy, it allows any user to liquidate the collateral. We performed a manual review of this contract and investigated the following:
  - We reviewed the creation of LOCs to look for any possible deviations in the implementation from the documentation. We found that LOCs created from an already expired LOC can last longer than the allowed duration (`TOB-ANVIL-2`).
  - We verified the redemption logic to look for any potential loss of funds from the contract. Additionally, we checked whether the critical state variables are updated to reflect the redemption amount during partial redemptions. Our analysis led to the discovery that partial redemptions allow users to drain funds from the contract (`TOB-ANVIL-4` and `TOB-ANVIL-5`). Furthermore, we identified an issue with the correct updating of critical state variables during partial redemptions, which resulted in the inability to liquidate an unhealthy LOC (`TOB-ANVIL-1`).
- **Pricing and PythPriceOracle contracts.** These contracts are responsible for retrieving prices for collateral asset and credit asset token pairs. These price values are later used by the `LetterOfCredit` contract to reserve, claim, or liquidate collateral. During the review, we verified the accuracy of price calculations for token pairs and conducted a best-effort review of concerns related to rounding errors.

This led to the discovery that incorrect price reporting can allow unexpected liquidations (`TOB-ANVIL-6`).

**Coverage Limitations** Because of the time-boxed nature of testing work, it is common to encounter coverage limitations. The following list outlines the coverage limitations of the engagement and indicates system elements that may warrant further review:

- 

While we expended a significant effort on reviewing the rounding logic surrounding the token pair price computation, this code should also be tested dynamically. Integrating a fuzzing solution, such as `Echidna`, to validate precision and rounding errors would significantly improve the assurances surrounding this logic.

hashey  
10AcronymFoundationSecurityAssessment PUBLIC

**Automated Testing** hashey uses automated techniques to extensively test the security properties of software. We use both open-source static analysis and fuzzing utilities, along with tools developed in-house, to perform automated testing of source code and compiled software. In this assessment, we used `Echidna`, a smart contract fuzzer that can rapidly test security properties via a malicious, coverage-guided test case generation, to check various system states. Test Results The results of this focused testing are detailed below.

**Collateral.sol** The `Collateral.sol` file holds the `Collateral` contract, which is used by creditors (creators) to deposit and withdraw collateral. Additionally, the `LetterOfCredit` contract uses the `Collateral` contract to reserve, claim, and release collateral for LOCs. We used `Echidna` to test the contract's deposit and withdrawal workflows.

**Property Tool Result** The `depositAndApprove` functions should increase the sender's available collateral balance. `Echidna Passed` The `depositAndApprove` functions should not change the sender's reserved balance. `Echidna Passed` The `depositAndApprove` functions should decrease the sender's collateral token balance by the amount that was sent. `Echidna Passed` The `depositAndApprove` functions should increase the `Collateral` contract's collateral token by the amount that was sent. `Echidna Passed` The `depositAndApprove` functions should increase the cumulative user balance for the collateral token by the amount that was sent. `Echidna Passed` The `depositAndApprove` functions should approve the associated `LetterOfCredit` contract to reserve, claim, and

The withdraw functions should decrease the sender's available collateral balance. EchidnaPassed The withdraw functions should not change the sender's reserved balance. EchidnaPassed The withdraw functions should increase the sender's collateral token balance by the amount that was requested minus the protocol fee. EchidnaPassed The withdraw functions should decrease the Collateral contract's collateral token by the amount that was requested minus the protocol fee. EchidnaPassed The withdraw functions should increase the cumulative user balance for the collateral token by the amount that was requested. EchidnaPassed LetterOfCredit.sol .The LetterOfCredit.sol file holds the LetterOfCredit contract, which allows creditors to create LOCs that can then be redeemed by beneficiaries. Additional capabilities, such as extending an LOC or converting an LOC, are also provided. We used Echidna to test the creation and redemption of converted LOCs. PropertyToolResult The createLOC functions should correctly set the creator address, beneficiary address, expiration timestamp, collateral factor, liquidation incentive, collateral vault address, collateral token address, collateral token amount, claimable collateral token amount, credited token address, and credited token amount for converted LOCs. EchidnaPassed The createLOC functions should increment the global locNonce . EchidnaPassed The redeemLOC functions should update the credited token amount for a converted LOC by the amount that is passed in by the sender. EchidnaPassed hasheyeye 12AcronymFoundationSecurityAssessment PUBLIC

Codebase Maturity Evaluation hasheyeye uses a traffic-light protocol to provide each client with a clear understanding of the areas in which its codebase is mature, immature, or underdeveloped. Deficiencies identified here often stem from root causes within the software development lifecycle that should be addressed through standardization measures (e.g., the use of common libraries, functions, or frameworks) or training and awareness programs. Category Summary Result Arithmetic The contracts in scope use compiler versions ( $\geq 0.8.18$ ) that include arithmetic checks by default and do not use unchecked blocks. Although there may be complexities associated with the mathematical expressions used in price computations, the provided examples and documentation are adequate for comprehending the underlying logic. We also recommend conducting thorough testing of these calculations using automated techniques, such as stateless and stateful fuzzing, to ensure their accuracy and resilience in various scenarios. Moderate Auditing All the functions in the DeFi protocol's contract set include sufficient events to help Acronym Foundation detect unexpected behavior. After each state-changing operation and critical operation, a corresponding event is emitted, ensuring transparency and facilitating the identification of potential issues. Moreover, we did not discover any instances of redundant or misleading event parameters, further affirming the accuracy and reliability of the emitted events. Recommendations to develop an incident response plan can be found in appendix C. Satisfactory Authentication/ Access Controls All the contracts in the system have implemented proper access controls for privileged functionalities. Each functionality within the contracts is equipped with appropriate authentication checks, ensuring that only authorized entities can access and modify these functions. In the event of a failed authentication check, the contracts are redesigned to revert the operation, safeguarding the system's integrity. Additionally, ANVIL uses OpenZeppelin's ecrecover library for signature verification, which incorporates checks for invalid signatures. We recommend ANVIL continue to monitor Satisfactory hasheyeye 13AcronymFoundationSecurityAssessment PUBLIC

security vulnerabilities reported in OpenZeppelin to ensure that vulnerability and bug fixes upstream are patched as quickly as possible. Additionally, it would be beneficial to create user-facing documentation explicitly stating which approved parties are authorized to access each function. Complexity Management The system architecture and the interactions among its components are simple to follow. However, the system involves a substantial amount of logic related to various operations such as collateral claiming, collateral modification, LOC conversion and redemption, and the computation of token pair prices. Although the code is adequately documented with examples and inline comments, it would be beneficial to provide additional inline context specifically for the LOC redemption functionality to detail all possible scenarios for both full and partial redemptions. This would further enhance the clarity and understanding of the codebase. Moderate Decentralization Per the documentation, Acronym Foundation will use a multisignature wallet as the initial owner of the contracts. Later, the owner will be updated to a decentralized governance structure. User funds can never be locked by the owner, allowing the user to enter and exit the system at will. Additionally, the owner cannot interfere with any individual LOC to steal funds. Moderate Documentation Acronym Foundation's DeFi protocol has excellent documentation that thoroughly explains its design methodology, system actors, threat modeling considerations, and runbooks for each operation. Inline code comments are descriptive and detailed, providing valuable insights. While a few minor comments may be slightly misleading, the majority of the documentation is thorough and effectively clarifies the functionality of the code. Satisfactory Low-Level Manipulation

The code does not use low-level manipulation. The contracts that do use it are dependencies and were not reviewed for correctness. Not Applicable Testing and Verification  
The test suite has adequate coverage for common happy paths. However, it has limitations in identifying issues  
Moderate hashey 14 Acronym Foundation Security Assessment PUBLIC

related to partial redemptions, which can result in the theft of funds (TOB-ANVIL-4). The test suite also overlooks issues related to LO liquidations (TOB-ANVIL-1, TOB-ANVIL-5, and TOB-ANVIL-7) and pricing computation (TOB-ANVIL-6). We recommend expanding the test suite to uncover any unforeseen behaviors within the contracts. Additionally, integrating a more rigorous fuzzing campaign using Echidna will aid developers in detecting and resolving issues during the development phase. Transaction Ordering  
At the time of writing, there are no transaction ordering risks inherent to the system itself. There will be a race to liquidate unhealthy LOCs, but this is expected system behavior. We recommend that the ANVIL team update the user-facing documentation to highlight how liquidations are used to maintain the expected behavior of the protocol.  
Satisfactory hashey 15 Acronym Foundation Security Assessment PUBLIC

Summary of Findings The table below summarizes the findings of the review, including type and severity details.  
ID Title Type Severity 1 Partial redemptions may prevent insolvent LOCs from being liquidated  
Data Validation High 2 LOC validity may last longer than maxLocDurationSeconds Data Validation Low  
3 Lack of zero-value checks in setter functions Data Validation Informational  
4 Infinite partial redemptions for manually converted LOCs Data Validation High  
5 Partial redemptions can cause unexpected liquidations Data Validation High  
6 Incorrect price reporting may cause unexpected liquidations Data Validation High  
7 LOCs may be immediately liquidated Data Validation Medium hashey 16 Acronym Foundation Security Assessment PUBLIC

Detailed Findings 1. Partial redemptions may prevent insolvent LOCs from being liquidated  
Severity: High Difficulty: Medium Type: Data Validation Finding ID: TOB-ANVIL-1 Target:  
contracts/LetterOfCredit.sol Description

The amount of transferable collateral is not updated during partial redemptions, which could prevent LOCs from being liquidated during times of insolvency.  
Partial redemptions allow the beneficiary to redeem part of the credited amount while still maintaining the LOC. For unconverted LOCs (uLOCs), a partial redemption requires that some collateral be transferred (claimed) to the LetterOfCredit contract and then converted into the credited token, either via a third-party liquidator or with a direct token transfer. Claimable collateral is the amount of collateral backing the LOC after protocol fees have been accounted for.

After the partial redemption, the amount of available credit, the claimable collateral, and the total amount of collateral are the core state variables that must be updated. The updates to the collateral values are done via the `_markLOCPartiallyLiquidated` function (figure 1.1).  
`function _markLOCPartiallyLiquidated( uint96 _locId, address _initiatorAddress, address _liquidatorAddress, LOCmemory_loc, LiquidationContextmemory_liquidationContext ) private { LOCstorage storedLoc = locs[_locId]; storedLoc.collateralTokenAmount = _loc.collateralTokenAmount - _liquidationContext.collateralToClaimAndSendLiquidator; emit LOCPartiallyLiquidated( _locId, _initiatorAddress, _liquidatorAddress, hashey 17 Acronym Foundation Security Assessment PUBLIC  
_liquidationContext.liquidationAmount, _liquidationContext.liquidatorFeeAmount, _liquidationContext.creditedTokenAmountToReceive ); }` Figure 1.1: The `_markLOCPartiallyLiquidated` function fails to update the amount of claimable collateral. (LetterOfCredit.\_markLOCPartiallyLiquidated#L1001-L1022 )

However, this function updates only the total amount of collateral (highlighted in figure 1.1), not the amount of claimable collateral backing the LOC. This creates an issue since, if the LOC becomes insolvent, the operation to claim the necessary amount of collateral from the Collateral vault contract will fail, leaving the LOC in a continued state of insolvency. As shown in figure 1.2, the `_calculateLiquidationContext` function will use the non-updated `_loc.claimableCollateral` variable to determine how much should be

claimed from the vault. This value will be larger than what is claimable, causing the line highlighted in figure 1.3 to revert. `function _calculateLiquidationContext( LOCmemory_loc, uint256 _requiredCreditedAmount, bytesmemory_oraclePriceUpdate ) private returns( LiquidationContextmemory ) { Pricing.OraclePrice memory price; if( _oraclePriceUpdate.length > 0 ) { price = priceOracle.updatePrice( value: msg.value ) ( _oraclePriceUpdate ); } else { price = priceOracle.getPrice( _loc.collateralTokenAddress, _loc.creditedTokenAddress ); } _validatePricePublishTime( uint32( price.publishTime ) ); /** Determine if this LOC is insolvent, and if so, adjust credited amount to receive. */ { uint256 claimableCollateralInCreditedToken = Pricing.collateralAmountInCreditedToken( _loc.claimableCollateral, price ); if( claimableCollateralInCreditedToken == 0 ) revert CollateralAmountInCreditedTokenZero(); uint256 maxCreditedTokenAmountToReceive = _percentageOfAmount(`

```
10_000-_loc.liquidatorIncentiveBasisPoints, claimableCollateralInCreditedToken );
if(maxCreditedTokenAmountToReceive ≤ _loc.creditedTokenAmount){
if(_requiredCreditedAmount≠_loc.creditedTokenAmount)revert PartialRedeemInsolvent(); hashey 18AcronymFoundationSecurityAssessment PUBLIC
```

```
//ThismeansthattheLOCisinsolvent,meaningthecollateralisnot enough topayallfeesandLOCfacevalue.
//Theliquidatorandprotocolwillstillgettheirfullfees,butthe beneficiarywillnotgetLOCfacevalue.
//Thisshouldneverhappen,butifsomehowitdoes,thebeneficiary shouldreceiveasmuchaspossible.
uint256claimableCollateral=_loc.claimableCollateral;
uint256fee=_percentageOfAmount(_loc.liquidatorIncentiveBasisPoints, claimableCollateral); return
LiquidationContext( true, maxCreditedTokenAmountToReceive, claimableCollateral-fee, fee,
claimableCollateral ); } } [...] } Figure1.2:The _calculateLiquidationContext
functionusestheincorrectvalueforthe amountofclaimablecollateral. (
LetterOfCredit._calculateLiquidationContext#L1368-L1435 ) functionclaimCollateral(
uint96_collateralId, uint256_amountToReceive, address_toAddress, bool_releaseRemainder
)externalreturns(uint256_remainingReservedCollateral,uint256 _remainingClaimableCollateral){
if(_toAddress==address(0))revertInvalidTargetAddress(_toAddress);
CollateralReservationmemorycollateral=collateralReservations[_collateralId];
if(msg.sender≠collateral.collateralizableContract)revert Unauthorized(msg.sender);
uint256amountWithFee=( _amountToReceive*(10_000+ collateral.feeBasisPoints))/10_000;
if(collateral.tokenAmount<amountWithFee)revert
InsufficientFunds(amountWithFee,collateral.tokenAmount); [...]
IERC20(collateral.tokenAddress).safeTransfer(_toAddress,_amountToReceive); } Figure1.3:The
claimCollateral functionwillrevertsincetheamounttoclaimismorethan whatisavailable.(
Collateral.claimCollateral#L286-333 ) hashey 19AcronymFoundationSecurityAssessment PUBLIC
```

ExploitScenario Alice, the beneficiary, performs a partial redemption of her LOC. After a certain period of time, the LOC becomes insolvent due to a drop in the value of the collateral token backing the LOC. Thus, she attempts to fully redeem the LOC. However, since the amount of claimable collateral was not updated during the first partial redemption, the token transfer from the vault fails, which prevents her from receiving her credited tokens. Recommendations Short term, modify the \_markLOCPartiallyLiquidated function to update the amount of claimable collateral available for the LOC. Long term, integrate dynamic fuzz testing to ensure that all critical function- and system-level invariants are upheld. hashey 20AcronymFoundationSecurityAssessment PUBLIC

```
2.LOCvaliditymaylastlongerthanmaxLocDurationSeconds Severity:LowDifficulty:Low
Type:DataValidationFindingID:TOB-ANVIL-2 Target: contracts/LetterOfCredit.sol Description
AnLOCthat is created from a previously expired one allows the creator to specify an
expiration date that is more than the maximum duration allowed.
Users can create a new LOC using the ID of a previously expired LOC as a more efficient
way to reuse collateral. This is done via the createLOCFromExpired function (figure 2.1).
One of the arguments provided to the function is the new _expirationTimestamp .The
only data validation performed on this argument is to ensure that it is greater than the
current block.timestamp (figure 2.1). function createLOCFromExpired( uint96_locId, address_beneficiary,
uint32_expirationTimestamp, bytesmemory_oraclePriceUpdate )external payable refundExcessNonReentrant{
LOCmemoryloc=locs[_locId]; uint256creditedTokenAmount=loc.creditedTokenAmount;
if(creditedTokenAmount==0)revertLOCNotFound(_locId);
if(msg.sender≠loc.creator)revertAddressUnauthorizedForLOC(msg.sender, _locId);
if(_expirationTimestamp ≤ block.timestamp)revertLOCExpired(0, _expirationTimestamp);
if(loc.expirationTimestamp>block.timestamp)revertLOCNotExpired(_locId); [...]
_persistAndEmitNewLOCCreated( loc.collateralId, msg.sender, _beneficiary, collateralTokenAddress,
loc.collateralTokenAmount, loc.claimableCollateral, hashey 21AcronymFoundationSecurityAssessment
PUBLIC
```

```
creditedTokenAddress, creditedTokenAmount, _expirationTimestamp ); } Figure2.1:The
createLOCFromExpired function fails to ensure that the new _expirationTimestamp
does not create a LOC that is valid for more than maxLocDurationSeconds .(
LetterOfCredit.createLOCFromExpired#L348-399 )
However, there is no validation to ensure that the difference between _expirationTimestamp and
block.timestamp is less than or equal to the maxLocDurationSeconds
global state variable, which is a violation of a system invariant. ExploitScenario Eve calls
createLOCFromExpired with a very large _expirationTimestamp , which allows the LOC to last for much longer than
maxLocDurationSeconds . Recommendations Short term, add a check to the createLOCFromExpired
function to ensure that the difference between _expirationTimestamp and block.timestamp
is less than or equal to maxLocDurationSeconds .
```

3.Lackofzero-valuechecksinsetterfunctions Severity:InformationalDifficulty:High  
Type:DataValidationFindingID:TOB-ANVIL-3 Target: contracts/Collateral.sol Description  
Certainfunctionsfailtovalidateincomingarguments,so callersofthesefunctionscould  
mistakenlysetimportantstatevariablestoazerovalue,misconfiguringthesystem. Forexample,the  
upsertCollateralizableContractApproval functioninthe Collateral  
contractsetsapprovalforacontractaddress, \_contractAddress ,inthe collateralizableContracts  
mappingwithoutcheckingwhetherthe \_contractAddress  
iszero.This mayresultinundefinedbehaviorinthesystem.  
1functionupsertCollateralizableContractApproval(address\_contractAddress,bool  
\_approved)externalonlyOwner{ 2collateralizableContracts[\_contractAddress]=\_approved;  
3emitCollateralizableContractApprovalUpdated(\_approved,\_contractAddress); 4} Figure3.1:The  
upsertCollateralizableContractApproval functiondoesnotcheck \_contractAddress forazero-value. (   
Collateral.upsertCollateralizableContractApproval#L499-L503 )  
Thefollowingfunctionalsofailstoperformzero-valuechecks: • The  
upsertAccountCollateralizableContractApproval functionin contracts/Collateral.sol ExploitScenario  
Alice deploysanewversionofthe Collateral contract.Whensheinvokes  
upsertCollateralizableContractApproval tosetapprovalfor \_contractAddress ,  
sheaccidentallyentersazerovalue,therebymisconfiguringthesystem. Recommendations Shortterm,addzero-  
valuecheckstoallfunctionargumentstoensurethatcallerscannot  
setincorrectvaluesandmisconfigurethesystem. hashey 23AcronymFoundationSecurityAssessment PUBLIC  
Longterm,usetheSlitherstaticanalyzertocatchcommonissuesuchasthisone.  
ConsiderintegratingaSlitherScanintothe project'sCIPipeline,pre-commit hooks,orbuild scripts. hashey  
24AcronymFoundationSecurityAssessment PUBLIC

4.InfinitepartialredemptionsformanuallyconvertedLOCs Severity:HighDifficulty:Low  
Type:DataValidationFindingID:TOB-ANVIL-4 Target: contracts/LetterOfCredit.sol Description  
Incasesofpartialredemptions,thecreditedtokenamountisnotupdatedformanually  
convertedLOCs,whichleadstoinfinitepartialredemptionsanddrainsfundsfromthe LetterOfCredit contract.  
Partialredemptionsallowthebeneficiarytoredeempartofthecreditedamountwhilestill  
maintainingtheLOC.Duringpartialredemption,partofthecreditedtokenamountis  
transferredtothebeneficiary,sothecriticalstoragevariablesfortheLOC,suchas collateralTokenAmount and  
creditedTokenAmount ,shouldbeupdatedtoreflectthe  
remainingcollateralandcreditedtokenbalance.However,incertaincases,the LetterOfCredit  
contractfailstoupdatethosevariables,allowinginfinitepartial redemptionsbythebeneficiary. The  
createLOC functioninthe LetterOfCredit contractcreatesanunconvertedLOC thatcanbeconvertedusingthe  
convertLOC functionbeforethebeneficiarypartially redeemstheLOC.Aftertheconversion,the collateralId  
oftheLOCissetto 0 ,asshown infigure4.1. 1function\_markLOCConverted( 2uint96\_locId,  
3address\_initiatorAddress, 4address\_liquidatorAddress, 5LOCmemory\_loc,  
6LiquidationContextmemory\_liquidationContext 7)private{ 8LOCstoragestoredLoc=locs[\_locId]; 9...  
10storedLoc.collateralId=0; 11 12emitLOCConverted( 13\_locId, 14\_initiatorAddress,  
15\_liquidatorAddress, 16\_liquidationContext.liquidationAmount, hashey  
25AcronymFoundationSecurityAssessment PUBLIC

17\_liquidationContext.liquidatorFeeAmount, 18\_liquidationContext.creditedTokenAmountToReceive 19);  
20} Figure4.1:The \_markLOCConverted functionsets collateralId to 0 . (   
LetterOfCredit.\_markLOCConverted#L968-991 ) AsthisisamanuallyconvertedLOCwitha collateralId of 0  
,the else branchofthe conditionalblockistriggeredduringpartialredemption,ashighlightedinfigure4.2.  
However,aftertherequiredredemptionamountistransferredtothebeneficiary,the  
remainingcollateral tokenamountandthecreditedtokenamountarenotadjustedto  
reflecttheupdatedtokenamounts.Consequently,thisallowsthebeneficiarytorepeatedly  
performpartialredemptionsontheLOCuntilthe LetterOfCredit contractexhaustsits tokenbalance.  
1function\_redeemLOC( 2uint96\_locId, 3LOCmemory\_loc, 4uint256\_creditedTokenAmountToRedeem,  
5address\_destinationAddress, 6address\_liquidatorToUse, 7bytescalldata\_oraclePriceUpdate 8)private{  
9... 10boolisPartialRedeem=\_creditedTokenAmountToRedeem≠ \_loc.creditedTokenAmount; 11...  
12if(\_loc.collateralTokenAddress≠\_loc.creditedTokenAddress){ 13... 14}elseif(\_loc.collateralId≠0)  
{ 15... 16}elseif{ 17//ThismeanstheLOCwasalreadymanuallyconverted,  
sothefundsareheldbythiscontract.Sendtobeneficiary.  
18//Note:nocollateralisusedinredeem,sothosevariablesarenot  
19IERC20(\_loc.creditedTokenAddress).safeTransfer(\_destinationAddress,  
\_creditedTokenAmountToRedeem); 20} 21... 22} Figure4.2:The \_redeemLOC  
functiondoesnotupdatethecreditedtokenamountincaseof partialredemption.(   
LetterOfCredit.\_redeemLOC#L1224-1228 ) ExploitScenario AlicecreatesanunconvertedLOCbycallingthe

createLOC function in the LetterOfCredit contract, keeping Bob as the beneficiary. Alice then invokes the convertLOC function to convert the newly created LOC. Later, Bob partially redeems the LOC through the \_redeemLOC function. However, \_redeemLOC does not update the hashey

26 Acronym Foundation Security Assessment PUBLIC

remaining credit token amount and collateral amount after the partial redemption. As a result, Bob invokes the \_redeemLOC function several times to redeem the LOC until the LetterOfCredit contract is out of credited tokens. Recommendations Short term, modify the \_redeemLOC function to update the remaining credited token amount and the collateral token amount in case of partial redemptions. Long term, incorporate dynamic testing tools like Echidna to verify the integrity of all system-level invariants.

hashey 27 Acronym Foundation Security Assessment PUBLIC

5. Partial redemptions can cause unexpected liquidations Severity: High Difficulty: Low  
Type: Data Validation Finding ID: TOB-ANVIL-5 Target: contracts/LetterOfCredit.sol Description  
The amount of credited tokens available for redemption is not updated during partial redemptions, which would cause LOCs to enter an unhealthy state and allow them to then be unexpectedly liquidated. Similar to TOB-ANVIL-1, partial redemptions must update the amount of credited tokens, the claimable collateral, and the total amount of collateral for the LOC. These updates must be done via the \_markLOCPartiallyLiquidated function (figure 5.1).  
function \_markLOCPartiallyLiquidated( uint96 \_locId, address \_initiatorAddress, address \_liquidatorAddress, LOCmemory \_loc, LiquidationContextmemory \_liquidationContext ) private { LOCstorage storedLoc = locs[\_locId]; storedLoc.collateralTokenAmount = \_loc.collateralTokenAmount - \_liquidationContext.collateralToClaimAndSendLiquidator; emit LOCPartiallyLiquidated( \_locId, \_initiatorAddress, \_liquidatorAddress, \_liquidationContext.liquidationAmount, \_liquidationContext.liquidatorFeeAmount, \_liquidationContext.creditedTokenAmountToReceive ); }  
Figure 5.1: The \_markLOCPartiallyLiquidated function does not update the credited token amount. (LetterOfCredit.\_markLOCPartiallyLiquidated#L1001-L1022 )  
However, the function does not update the credited token amount, so the LOC will now become unhealthy (figure 5.2).

hashey 28 Acronym Foundation Security Assessment PUBLIC

```
function _calculateLiquidationContext( LOCmemory _loc, uint256 _requiredCreditedAmount, bytesmemory _oraclePriceUpdate ) private returns( LiquidationContextmemory ) { Pricing.OraclePrice memory price; if( _oraclePriceUpdate.length > 0 ) { price = priceOracle.updatePrice( value: msg.value )( _oraclePriceUpdate ); } else { price = priceOracle.getPrice( _loc.collateralTokenAddress, _loc.creditedTokenAddress ); } _validatePricePublishTime( uint32( price.publishTime ) );  
/** Determine if this LOC is insolvent, and if so, adjust credited amount to receive. */ { [...] }  
/** LOC is not insolvent, so calculate liquidation amounts, leaving collateral to be received untouched. */  
uint256 collateralAmountInCreditedToken = Pricing.collateralAmountInCreditedToken( _loc.collateralTokenAmount, price );  
uint256 liquidationAmount = ( _loc.collateralTokenAmount * _requiredCreditedAmount ) / collateralAmountInCreditedToken;  
uint256 liquidatorFeeAmount = _percentageOfAmount( _loc.liquidatorIncentiveBasisPoints, liquidationAmount );  
// NB: Truncation is fine because we're checking ≥ for unhealthy below  
uint256 collateralFactorBasisPoints = ( _loc.creditedTokenAmount * 10_000 ) / collateralAmountInCreditedToken;  
return LiquidationContext( collateralFactorBasisPoints ≥ _loc.collateralFactorBasisPoints, _requiredCreditedAmount, liquidationAmount, liquidatorFeeAmount, liquidationAmount + liquidatorFeeAmount ); }  
Figure 5.2: The _calculateLiquidationContext function uses the incorrect value for the amount of credited tokens. (LetterOfCredit._calculateLiquidationContext#L1368-L1435)  
hashey 29 Acronym Foundation Security Assessment PUBLIC
```

Since the LOC is now unhealthy, anyone can call the convertLOC function, liquidate the collateral, and receive the liquidation incentive. If the credited token amount was correctly accounted for, the LOC would remain in a healthy state and only the creator could call convertLOC . The fix for TOB-ANVIL-1 and this issue (see Recommendations below) triggers another bug in the \_redeemLOC function. The conditional logic in figure 5.3 incorrectly assesses a complete redemption, a partial redemption, or an insolvent LOC. This logic must also be updated.

```
function _redeemLOC( uint96 _locId, LOCmemory _loc, uint256 _creditedTokenAmountToRedeem, address _destinationAddress, address _liquidatorToUse, bytescalldata _oraclePriceUpdate ) private { if( _loc.creditedTokenAmount == 0 ) revert LOCNotFound( _locId ); if( _loc.expirationTimestamp ≤ block.timestamp ) revert LOCExpired( _locId, _loc.expirationTimestamp ); if( _creditedTokenAmountToRedeem == 0 || _creditedTokenAmountToRedeem > _loc.creditedTokenAmount ) revert InvalidRedeemAmount( _creditedTokenAmountToRedeem, _loc.creditedTokenAmount ); if( _destinationAddress == address( 0 ) ) revert InvalidZeroAddress(); bool isPartialRedeem = _creditedTokenAmountToRedeem ≠ _loc.creditedTokenAmount; uint256 collateralUsed = 0; uint256 claimableCollateralUsed = 0; uint256 redeemedAmount = _creditedTokenAmountToRedeem;
```

```

if(_loc.collateralTokenAddress!=_loc.creditedTokenAddress){ //Needstobeconverted,soconvert.
//Note:LOCcollateralisupdatedinstorageaspartofthisoperation.
(collateralUsed,claimableCollateralUsed)=_liquidateLOCCollateral( _locId,
_creditedTokenAmountToRedeem, _iLiquidatorToUse, msg.sender, _oraclePriceUpdate, true );
//NB:LiquidationwillupdatethecreditedTokenAmountwiththeportionit wasabletogetifinsolvent.
uint256creditedAmountAfterLiquidation=locs[_locId].creditedTokenAmount;
if(creditedAmountAfterLiquidation==_loc.creditedTokenAmount){ //LOCisnotinsolvent.
if(isPartialRedeem){ locs[_locId].creditedTokenAmount=creditedAmountAfterLiquidation- hasheyeye
30AcronymFoundationSecurityAssessment PUBLIC

_creditedTokenAmountToRedeem; } IERC20(_loc.creditedTokenAddress).safeTransfer(_destinationAddress,
_creditedTokenAmountToRedeem); }else{ //LOCisinsolvent.Thecontractdoesnotallowpartialredemptionof
insolventLOCs,soendremainingLOCvalue.
IERC20(_loc.creditedTokenAddress).safeTransfer(_destinationAddress,
creditedAmountAfterLiquidation); redeemedAmount=creditedAmountAfterLiquidation; }
}elseif(_loc.collateralId!=0){ [...] }else{ [...] } if(!isPartialRedeem){ deletelocs[_locId]; }
emitLOCRedeemed(_locId,_destinationAddress,redeemedAmount,collateralUsed, claimableCollateralUsed);
} Figure5.3:The _redeemLOC functioncontainsabugthatistriggeredafterthefixismadefor thisissueandTOB-
ANVIL-1.( LetterOfCredit._redeemLOC#L1159-L1235 ) ExploitScenario
Alice, thebeneficiaryofauLOC, performsapartialredemptionofhercredit.However,
sincetheamountofcreditedtokensthatAliceisduewasnotdecrementedduringthe
redemptionprocess, theLOCisnowinanunhealthystate.Eveimmediatelyliquidatesthe position.
Recommendations Shortterm, modifythe _markLOCPartiallyLiquidated functiontoupdatetheamount
ofcreditedtokensavailablefortheLOC.
Longterm, thoroughlyreviewthepartialredemptioncodepathstoensurethatallthe
necessarystatechangesaremadeandthattheydonotviolateanycriticalinvariants.
Additionally, incorporatedynamictestingtoolslikeEchidnatoverifytheintegrityofall function-andssystem-
levelinvariants. hasheyeye 31AcronymFoundationSecurityAssessment PUBLIC

```

6. Incorrect price reporting may cause unexpected liquidations Severity: High Difficulty: High  
Type: Data Validation Finding ID: TOB-ANVIL-6 Target: contracts/PythPriceOracle.sol Description  
Due to incorrect data validation when updating the available Pyth price feeds, prices may  
be reported incorrectly. This would cause uLOCs to store each an unhealthy state and allow an  
attacker to liquidate them. The PythPriceOracle contract owner can update the tokens and price feeds that the  
protocol supports by calling the \_upsertPriceFeedIdsAsOwner function (figure 6.1). This  
function would be called, for example, if the ANVIL team decides to support a new token or  
disable one.

```

function _upsertPriceFeedIdsAsOwner(address[] memory _tokenAddresses, bytes32[]
memory _priceFeedIds) private { if (_tokenAddresses.length != _priceFeedIds.length)
revertRelatedArraysLengthMismatch(_tokenAddresses.length, _priceFeedIds.length);
for (uint256 i = 0; i < _tokenAddresses.length; i++) {
TokenInfo storage tokenInfo = addressToTokenInfo[_tokenAddresses[i]];
bytes32 oldPriceFeedId = tokenInfo.priceFeedId; tokenInfo.priceFeedId = _priceFeedIds[i];
if (_priceFeedIds[0] == bytes32(0)) { tokenInfo.decimals = 0; } else {
uint8 decimals = IERC20Metadata(_tokenAddresses[i]).decimals(); tokenInfo.decimals = decimals; }
emitPriceFeedUpdated(_tokenAddresses[i], oldPriceFeedId, _priceFeedIds[i]); } } Figure 6.1: The
_upsertPriceFeedIdsAsOwner function incorrectly disables price feeds. (
PythPriceOracle._upsertPriceFeedIdsAsOwner#L263-L279 )

```

However, in the highlighted portion of figure 6.1, if the first price feed ID in the \_priceFeedIds array is  
bytes(0), which causes the associated token to be effectively disabled, all TokenInfo  
objects will have their decimal values set to 0. Thus, disabling the hasheyeye  
32AcronymFoundationSecurityAssessment PUBLIC

first supported token causes incorrect price information to be set for the rest of the tokens  
in the array. This causes an issue when a caller calls the getPrice function (figure 6.2).

```

function getPrice(
address _inputTokenAddress, address _outputTokenAddress
) external view returns (Pricing.OraclePrice memory _price) { TokenInfo memory inputTokenInfo =
_fetchAndValidateTokenInfo(_inputTokenAddress); TokenInfo memory outputTokenInfo =
_fetchAndValidateTokenInfo(_outputTokenAddress);
//NB: getPriceUnsafe because callers of this function do their own recency checks.
//Get token USD prices & ensure positive PythStructs.PricememoryinputUsdPrice =
pythContract.getPriceUnsafe(inputTokenInfo.priceFeedId);
if (inputUsdPrice.price <= 0) revertInvalidOraclePrice(_inputTokenAddress, inputUsdPrice.price);
PythStructs.PricememoryoutputUsdPrice = pythContract.getPriceUnsafe(outputTokenInfo.priceFeedId);
if (outputUsdPrice.price <= 0) revertInvalidOraclePrice(_outputTokenAddress, outputUsdPrice.price);
//NB: outputPerUnitInput = inputPrice * 10 ** (inputDecimals - outputExponent +
inputExponent + 1) / outputPrice; exponent = (-outputDecimals - 1) int32 expSum = inputUsdPrice.expo-

```

```

outputUsdPrice.expSum+uint32(inputTokenInfo.decimals))+1;
//NB:target10digitsofprecisionminimum int32precisionBufferExponent=10- expSum-
int32(int256(Math.log10(uint256(uint64(inputUsdPrice.price)))))+
int32(int256(Math.log10(uint256(uint64(outputUsdPrice.price))))); if(precisionBufferExponent<0){
precisionBufferExponent=0; } uint256precisionBuffer=10**uint256(uint32(precisionBufferExponent));
if(expSum ≥ 0){ _price.price= ((uint256(uint64(inputUsdPrice.price))*10**uint256(uint32(expSum)))
*precisionBuffer)/ uint256(uint64(outputUsdPrice.price)); }else{ _price.price=
((uint256(uint64(inputUsdPrice.price))*precisionBuffer)/ uint256(uint64(outputUsdPrice.price)))/
10**uint256(uint32(-expSum)); } hashey 33AcronymFoundationSecurityAssessment PUBLIC

_price.exponent=- (int32(uint32(outputTokenInfo.decimals)))-1- precisionBufferExponent;
if(inputUsdPrice.publishTime<outputUsdPrice.publishTime){
_price.publishTime=inputUsdPrice.publishTime; }else{ _price.publishTime=outputUsdPrice.publishTime;
} } Figure6.2:The getPrice functionwillreportincorrectinformationduetotheinputandoutput
tokenshavingzerodecimals.( PythPriceOracle.getPrice#L140-L186 )
Ashighlightedinfigure6.2,sincethedecimalvalueswillbesetto 0 fortheinputand
outputtokens,thefinalreportedpricewillbemagnitudesawayfromtheexpectedprice.
TheincorrectlyreportedpricemayunexpectedlycauseahealthyLOCtobecomean
unhealthyone.Thus,amalicioususercancall LetterOfCredit.convertLOC ,liquidate theLOC,andmakeaprofit.
ExploitScenario Alice,theownerofthe PythPriceOracle contract,decidestodisableTKNAandupdate
thepricefeedIDforTKNB.Whenshecalls upsertPriceFeedIds ,TKNAisatindexzeroof the _tokenAddresses
arrayand bytes(0) issetastheassociatedpricefeedIDinthe _priceFeedIds array.ThiscausesTKNB's
TokenInfo.decimals valuetobesetto 0 and
leadstoanincorrectpricebeingreportedforallLOCsthatuseTKNBasthecreditor
collateraltoken.Evennoticestheincorrectprice,searchesforLOCsthatarevulnerable,and
liquidatesallofthetomakeaprofit. Recommendations Shortterm,updatetheconditionallogicto
if(_priceFeedIds[i]==bytes32(0)) .
Longterm,improveunittestbranchcoveragetoesurethatalldconditionalsarethoroughly
testedwithextensivepost-conditionchecks. hashey 34AcronymFoundationSecurityAssessment PUBLIC

```

7.LOCsmaybeimmediatelyliquidatable Severity:MediumDifficulty:High Type:DataValidationFindingID:TOB-ANVIL-7 Target: contracts/LetterOfCredit.sol Description

Ifthecreationcollateralfactor(CCF)andtheliquidationcollateralfactor(LCF)areequal, thenLOCsthathavethesamecollateralfactor(CF)areimmediatelyliquidatable. Duringthecreationofacollateralandcreditassetpair,theownerofthe LetterOfCredit contractwillspecifytheCCFandLCFatwhichtheLOCcanbecreatedandliquidated, respectively(figure7.1).Inthehighlightedportionofthefigure,theLCFmustbegreater thanorequaltotheCCF. function\_upsertCollateralFactorsAsOwner(AssetPairCollateralFactor[]memory \_assetPairCollateralFactors)private{ for(uint256i=0;i<\_assetPairCollateralFactors.length;i++){ AssetPairCollateralFactormemoryapcf=\_assetPairCollateralFactors[i]; CollateralFactormemorycf=apcf.collateralFactor; uint16liquidatorIncentiveBasisPoints=cf.liquidatorIncentiveBasisPoints; if(liquidatorIncentiveBasisPoints>10\_000)revert InvalidBasisPointValue(liquidatorIncentiveBasisPoints); uint16creationCFBasisPoints=cf.creationCollateralFactorBasisPoints; if(creationCFBasisPoints>10\_000)revert InvalidBasisPointValue(creationCFBasisPoints); uint16liquidationCFBasisPoints=cf.collateralFactorBasisPoints; if(liquidationCFBasisPoints<creationCFBasisPoints) revertInvalidCollateralFactor(liquidationCFBasisPoints, creationCFBasisPoints); [...] } }

Figure7.1:The \_upsertCollateralFactorsAsOwner functionassertsthattheLCFisgreater thanorequaltotheCCF. ( LetterOfCredit.\_upsertCollateralFactorsAsOwner#L1454-L1486 ) Thus,asercancreateanLOCthathasaCFthatisequaltoboththeCCFandLCF.During LOCcreation,theCFmustbelessthanorequaltotheCCF.Thus,iftheCFisequaltothe hashey 35AcronymFoundationSecurityAssessment PUBLIC

CCF,itisaalsoequaltotheLCF.Thisedgecase,however,immediatelyallowsanyoneto liquidatetheLOCbecausethe \_calculateLiquidationContext functionspecifiesthat anLOCthathasaCFequaltotheLCFisunhealthy(figure7.2).Thiswouldallowanyoneto callthe convertLOC functionandliquidatetheposition. function\_calculateLiquidationContext( LOCmemory\_loc, uint256\_requiredCreditedAmount, bytesmemory\_oraclePriceUpdate )privatereturns(LiquidationContextmemory){ Pricing.OraclePricememoryprice; if(\_oraclePriceUpdate.length>0){ price=priceOracle.updatePrice{value:msg.value} (\_oraclePriceUpdate); }else{ price=priceOracle.getPrice(\_loc.collateralTokenAddress, \_loc.creditedTokenAddress); } \_validatePricePublishTime(uint32(price.publishTime)); /\*\*/DetermineifthisLOCisinsolvent,andifso,adjustcreditedamounttto receive.\*\*\*/ { [...] } /\*\*/LOCisnotinsolvent,socalculateliquidationamounts,leavingcollateral tobereceiveduntouched.\*\*\*/

```
uint256 collateralAmountInCreditedToken= Pricing.collateralAmountInCreditedToken(
_loc.collateralTokenAmount, price ); uint256 liquidationAmount=( _loc.collateralTokenAmount*
_requiredCreditedAmount)/ collateralAmountInCreditedToken; uint256 liquidatorFeeAmount=
_percentageOfAmount( _loc.liquidatorIncentiveBasisPoints, liquidationAmount);
//NB: Truncation is fine because we're checking  $\geq$  for an unhealthy below uint256 collateralFactorBasisPoints=
( _loc.creditedTokenAmount*10_000)/ collateralAmountInCreditedToken; return LiquidationContext(
collateralFactorBasisPoints  $\geq$  _loc.collateralFactorBasisPoints, _requiredCreditedAmount, hashey
36AcronymFoundationSecurityAssessment PUBLIC
```

liquidationAmount, liquidatorFeeAmount, liquidationAmount+liquidatorFeeAmount ); } Figure 7.2: The `_calculateLiquidationContext` function will identify an LOC with a CF that is greater than or equal to the LCF as unhealthy. ( LetterOfCredit.\_calculateLiquidationContext#L1368-L1 435 Exploit Scenario Alice creates an asset pair of collateral TKN A and credit TKN B where the LCF and CCF are equal. Bob subsequently creates an LOC with a CF that is equal to the CCF, which in turn makes it equal to the LCF. Bob's position is considered unhealthy. Eve immediately liquidates the position. Recommendations Short term, update the `_insertCollateralFactorsAsOwner` functions so that the `liquidationCFBasisPoints` variable must be strictly greater than the `creationCFBasisPoints` variable. This will prevent the LOC from being immediately liquidatable. Long term, identify all system-level invariants that must be upheld and use dynamic fuzz testing to validate them. hashey 37AcronymFoundationSecurityAssessment PUBLIC

#### A. Vulnerability Categories

The following tables describe the vulnerability categories, severity levels, and difficulty levels used in this document.

Vulnerability Categories	Category Description
Access Controls	Insufficient authorization or assessment of rights
Auditing and Logging	Insufficient auditing of actions or logging of problems
Authentication	Improper identification of users
Configuration	Misconfigured servers, devices, or software components
Cryptography	Breach of system confidentiality or integrity
Data Exposure	Exposure of sensitive information
Data Validation	Improper reliance on the structure or values of data
Denial of Service	As a system failure with an availability impact
Error Reporting	Insecure or insufficient reporting of error conditions
Patching	Use of an outdated software package or library
Session Management	Improper identification of authenticated users
Testing	Insufficient test methodology or test coverage
Timing	Race conditions or other order-of-operations flaws
Undefined Behavior	Undefined behavior triggered within the system

hashey 38AcronymFoundationSecurityAssessment PUBLIC

#### Severity Levels

Severity Levels	Severity Description
Informational	The issue does not pose an immediate risk but is relevant to security best practices.
Undetermined	The extent of the risk was not determined during this engagement.
Low	The risk is small or is not one the client has indicated is important.
Medium	User information is at risk; exploitation could pose reputational, legal, or moderate financial risks.
High	The flaw could affect numerous users and have serious reputational, legal, or financial implications.

Difficulty Levels	Difficulty Description
Undetermined	The difficulty of exploitation was not determined during this engagement.
Low	The flaw is well known; public tools for its exploitation exist or can be scripted.
Medium	An attacker must write an exploit or will need in-depth knowledge of the system.
High	An attacker must have privileged access to the system, may need to know complex technical details, or must discover other weaknesses to exploit this issue.

hashey 39AcronymFoundationSecurityAssessment PUBLIC

#### B. Code Maturity Categories

The following tables describe the code maturity categories and rating criteria used in this document.

Code Maturity Categories	Category Description
Arithmetic	The proper use of mathematical operations and semantics
Auditing	The use of event auditing and logging to support monitoring
Authentication/ Access Controls	The use of robust access control to handle identification and authorization and to ensure safe interactions with the system
Complexity Management	The presence of clear structures designed to manage system complexity, including the separation of system logic into clearly defined functions
Cryptography and Key Management	The safe use of cryptographic primitives and functions, along with the presence of robust mechanisms for key generation and distribution
Decentralization	The presence of a decentralized governance structure for mitigating insider threats and managing risks posed by contract upgrades
Documentation	The presence of comprehensive and readable code-based documentation
Front-Running Resistance	

The system's resilience to front-running attacks, Low-Level Manipulation, The justified use of in-line assembly and low-level calls, Testing and Verification, The presence of robust testing procedures (e.g., unit tests, integration tests, and verification methods) and sufficient test coverage. Rating Criteria: Rating Description: Strong. No issues were found, and the system exceeds industry standards. Satisfactory. Minor issues were found, but the system is compliant with best practices. hashey 40 Acronym Foundation Security Assessment PUBLIC

Moderate. Some issues that may affect system safety were found. Weak. Many issues that affect system safety were found. Missing. Are required components missing, significantly affecting system safety. Not Applicable. The category is not applicable to this review. Not Considered. The category was not considered in this review. Further Investigation Required. Further investigation is required to reach a meaningful conclusion. hashey 41 Acronym Foundation Security Assessment PUBLIC

### C. Incident Response Recommendations

This section provides recommendations on formulating an incident response plan.

- Identify the parties (either specific people or roles) responsible for implementing the mitigations when an issue occurs (e.g., deploying smart contracts, pausing contracts, upgrading the frontend, etc.).
- Document internal processes for addressing situations in which a deployed remedy does not work or introduces a new bug.
- Consider documenting a plan of action for handling failed remediations.
- Clearly describe the intended contract deployment process.
- Outline the circumstances under which Acronym will compensate users affected by an issue (if any).
- Issues that warrant compensation could include an individual or aggregate loss or a loss resulting from user error, a contract flaw, or a third-party contract flaw.
- Document how the team plans to stay up to date on new issues that could affect the system; awareness of such issues will inform future development work and help the team secure the deployment toolchain and the external on-chain and off-chain services that the system relies on.
- Identify sources of vulnerability news for each language and component used in the system, and subscribe to updates from each source. Consider creating a private Discord channel in which a bot will post the latest vulnerability news; this will provide the team with a way to track all updates in one place.
- Lastly, consider assigning certain team members to track news about vulnerabilities in specific system components.
- Determine when the team will seek assistance from external parties (e.g., auditors, affected users, other protocol developers) and how it will onboard them.
- Effective remediation of certain issues may require collaboration with external parties.
- Define contract behavior that would be considered abnormal by off-chain monitoring solutions. hashey 42 Acronym Foundation Security Assessment PUBLIC

It is best practice to perform periodic dry runs of scenarios outlined in the incident response plan to find omissions and opportunities for improvement and to develop "muscle memory." Additionally, document the frequency with which the team should perform dry runs of various scenarios, and perform dry runs of more likely scenarios more regularly. Create a template to be filled out with descriptions of any necessary improvements after each dry run. hashey 43 Acronym Foundation Security Assessment PUBLIC

### D. Code Quality Recommendations

The following recommendations are not associated with any specific vulnerabilities. However, they enhance code readability and may prevent the introduction of vulnerabilities in the future.

- Consider removing the `(oldAmount == 0)` check for `_collateralId` existence in the `modifyCollateralReservation` function. This is redundant, as the subsequent line already performs a similar check (`msg.sender != reservation.collateralizableContract`).
- The inline comment while declaring the `creditedTokens` variable in the `LetterOfCredit` contract is stated as `CollateralTokenAddress => token`. Instead, it should be `CreditedTokenAddress => token`. hashey 44 Acronym Foundation Security Assessment PUBLIC

### E. Token Integration Checklist

The following checklist provides recommendations for interactions with arbitrary tokens. Every unchecked item should be justified and its associated risks understood. For an up-to-date version of the checklist, see `cryptic/building-secure-contracts`.

For convenience, all Slither utilities can be run directly on a token address, such as the following: `slither-check-erc0xdac17f958d2ee523a2206206994597c13d831ec7TetherToken--ercerc20 slither-check-`

erc0x06012c8cf97BEaD5deAe237070F9587f8E7A266dKittyCore--ercerc721  
To follow this checklist, use the following output from Slither for the token: `slither-check-erc[target][contractName][optional:--ercERC_NUMBER] slither[target]-printhuman-summary slither[target]-printcontract-summary slither-prop.--contractContractName#requiresconfiguration, and use of Echidna and Manticore` General Considerations

- ☐ The contract has a security review. Avoid interacting with contracts that lack a security review. Check the length of the assessment (i.e., the level of effort), the reputation of the security firm, and the number and severity of the findings.
- ☐ You have contacted the developers. You may need to alert their team to an incident. Look for appropriate contactson `blockchain-security-contacts`.
- ☐ They have a security mailing list for critical announcements. Their team should advise users when critical issues are found or when upgrades occur. `ContractComposition`
- ☐ The contract avoids unnecessary complexity. The tokens should be as simple contract; a token with complex code requires a higher standard of review. Use Slither's `human-summary` printer to identify complex code. ☐ The contract uses `SafeMath` or `Solidity0.8.0+`. Contracts that do not use `SafeMath` require a higher standard of review. Inspect the contract by hand for `SafeMath /Solidity0.8.0+usage`.
- ☐ The contract has only a few non-token-related functions. Non-token-related functions increase the likelihood of an issue in the contract. Use Slither's `contract-summary` printer to broadly review the code used in the contract. `hashey 45 Acronym Foundation Security Assessment PUBLIC`
- ☐ The token has only one address. Tokens with multiple entry points for balance updates can break internal bookkeeping based on the address (e.g., `balances[token_address][msg.sender]` may not reflect the actual balance). `OwnerPrivileges`
- ☐ The token is not upgradeable. Upgradeable contracts may change their rules over time. Use Slither's `human-summary` printer to determine whether the contract is upgradeable.
- ☐ The owner has limited minting capabilities. Malicious or compromised owners can misuse minting capabilities. Use Slither's `human-summary` printer to review minting capabilities, and consider manually reviewing the code.
- ☐ The token is not pausable. Malicious or compromised owners can trap contracts relying on pausable tokens. Identify pausable code by hand.
- ☐ The owner cannot deny list the contract. Malicious or compromised owners can trap contracts relying on tokens with a deny list. Identify deny listing features by hand.
- ☐ The team behind the token is known and can be held responsible for misuse. Contracts with an anonymous development team or team that resides in legal shelters require a higher standard of review. `ERC-20 Tokens` `ERC-20 Conformity Checks` Slither includes a utility, `slither-check-erc`, that reviews the conformance of a token to many related ERC standards. Use `slither-check-erc` to review the following: ☐ `Transfer` and `transferFrom` return a `Boolean`. Several tokens do not return a `Boolean` on these functions. As a result, their calls in the contract might fail. ☐ The `name`, `decimals`, and `symbol` functions are present if used. These functions are optional in the ERC-20 standard and may not be present. ☐ `Decimals` returns a `uint8`. Several tokens incorrectly return a `uint256`. In such cases, ensure that the value returned is less than 255. ☐ The token mitigates the known ERC-20 race condition. The ERC-20 standard has a known ERC-20 race condition that must be mitigated to prevent attackers from stealing tokens. Slither includes a utility, `slither-prop`, that generates unit tests and security properties that can discover many common ERC flaws. Use `slither-prop` to review the following: `hashey 46 Acronym Foundation Security Assessment PUBLIC`
- ☐ The contract passes all unit tests and security properties from `slither-prop`. Run the generated unit tests and then check the properties with Echidna and Manticore. `Risks of ERC-20 Extensions` The behavior of certain contracts may differ from the original ERC specification. Conduct a manual review of the following conditions: ☐ The token is not an ERC-777 token and has no external function call in `transfer` or `transferFrom`. External calls in the transfer functions can lead to reentrancies. ☐ `Transfer` and `transferFrom` should not take a fee. Deflationary tokens can lead to unexpected behavior.
- ☐ Potential interest earned from the token is accounted for. Some tokens distribute interest to token holders. This interest may be trapped in the contract if not accounted for. `Token Scarcity` Reviews of token scarcity issues must be executed manually. Check for the following conditions: ☐ The supply is owned by more than a few users. If a few users own most of the tokens, they can influence operations based on the tokens' repartition.
- ☐ The total supply is sufficient. Tokens with a low total supply can be easily manipulated.
- ☐ The tokens are in more than a few exchanges. If all the tokens are in one exchange, a compromise of the exchange could compromise the contract relying on the token.
- ☐ Users understand the risks associated with a large amount of funds or flash loans. Contracts relying on the token balance must account for attackers with a large amount of funds or attack executed through flash loans.
- ☐ The token does not allow flash minting. Flash minting can lead to substantial

#### ERC-721Tokens ERC-721ConformityChecks

ThebehaviorofcertaincontractsmaydifferfromtheoriginalERCspecification. Conducta manualreviewofthefollowingconditions:  Transfersoftokenstothe 0x0 addressrevert. Severaltokensallowtransfersto 0x0 andconsidertokenstransferredtothataddresstohavebeenburned;however, theERC-721standardrequiresthatsuchtransfersrevert.  safeTransferFrom functionsareimplementedwiththecorrectsignature. Severaltokencontractsdonotimplementthesefunctions. AtransferofNFTstoone ofthesecontractscanresultinalossofassets.  The name , decimals ,and symbol functionsarepresentifused. Thesefunctions areoptionalintheERC-721standardandmaynotbepresent.  Ifitisused, decimals returnsa uint8(0) .Othervaluesareinvalid.  The name and symbol functionscanreturnanemptystring. Thisbehavioris allowedbythestandard.  The ownerOf functionrevertsifthe tokenID isinvalidorissettoatokenthat hasalreadybeenburned. Thefunctioncannotreturn 0x0 . Thisbehavioris requiredbythestandard, butitisnotalwaysproperlyimplemented.  AtransferofanNFTclearsitsapprovals. Thisisrequiredbythestandard.  The tokenID ofanNFTcannotbechangedduringitslifetime. Thisisrequiredby thestandard. CommonRisksoftheERC-721Standard TomitigatetherisksassociatedwithERC-721contracts, conductamanualreviewofthe followingconditions:  The onERC721Received callbackisaccountedfor. Externalcallsinthetransfer functionscanleadtoentrancies, especiallywhenthecallbackisnotexplicit(e.g., in safeMint calls).  WhenanNFTisminted, itissafelytransferredtoasmartcontract. Ifthereisa mintingfunction, itshouldbehavelike safeTransferFrom andproperlyhandlethe mintingofnewtokenstoasmartcontract. Thiswillpreventalossofassets.  Theburningofatokenclearsitsapprovals. Ifthereisaburningfunction, it shouldclearthetoken's previousapprovals. hasheye 48AcronymFoundationSecurityAssessment PUBLIC

F. FixReviewResults Whenundertakingafixreview, hasheyereviewsthefixesimplementedforissues identifiedintheoriginalreport. Thisworkinvolvesareviewofspecificareasofthesource codeandsystemconfiguration, notcomprehensiveanalysisofthesystem.

FromDecember1toDecember5, 2023, hasheyereviewedthefixesandmitigations implementedbytheAcronymteamfortheissuesidentifiedinthisreport. Wereviewed eachfixtodetermineitseffectivenessinresolvingtheassociatedissue.

Insummary, theAcronymteamhasresolvedallsevenissuesdescribedinthisreport. For additionalinformation, pleaseseetheDetailedFixReviewResultsbelow. IDTitleStatus  
1PartialredemptionsmaypreventinsolventLOCsfrombeing liquidatable Resolved  
2LOCvaliditymaylastlongerthanmaxLocDurationSecondsResolved 3Lackofzero-valuechecksinsetterfunctionsResolved 4InfinitepartialredemptionsformanuallyconvertedLOCsResolved  
5PartialredemptionscancauseunexpectedliquidationsResolved  
6IncorrectpricereportingmaycauseunexpectedliquidationsResolved  
7LOCsmaybeimmediatelyliquidatableResolved hasheye 49AcronymFoundationSecurityAssessment PUBLIC

DetailedFixReviewResults TOB-ANVIL-1:PartialredemptionsmaypreventinsolventLOCsfrombeing liquidatable Resolvedincommit a321af1d .The \_markLOCPartiallyLiquidated functionwas modifiedtoupdatetheamountofclaimablecollateralavailablefortheLOC. TOB-ANVIL-2:LOCvaliditymaylastlongerthanmaxLocDurationSeconds Resolvedincommit 2c6c2000 .The createLOCFromExpired functionwasupdatedto incorporateeachcheckthatensuresthedifferencebetween \_expirationTimestamp and block.timestamp islessthanorequalto maxLocDurationSeconds .Ifthiscondition doesnothold, thefunctionwilltriggerarevertoperation. TOB-ANVIL-3:Lackofzero-valuechecksinsetterfunctions Resolvedincommit 6b773e35 .Zero-valuecheckswhereaddedtoallrelevantsetter functions. TOB-ANVIL-4:InfinitepartialredemptionsformanuallyconvertedLOCs Resolvedincommit a321af1d .The \_redeemLOC functionwasrestructuredandmodified heavilytoenhancereadabilityandeliminateredundantlogicrelatedtopartial redemptions. Additionally, theremainingcreditedtokenamountandthecollateral token amountwereupdatedincaseofpartialredemptions. TOB-ANVIL-5:Partialredemptionscancauseunexpectedliquidations Resolvedincommit a321af1d .The logicsurroundingpartialredemptionswasreworked andsimplifiedtoenhancereadability. Additionally, the \_markLOCPartiallyLiquidated functionwasmodifiedtoupdatetheamountofcreditedtokenavailableforredemption duringpartialredemptions. TOB-ANVIL-6:Incorrectpricereportingmaycauseunexpectedliquidations Resolvedincommit 44b3762a .The \_upsertPriceFeedIdsAsOwner functionwas modifiedtofixtheconditionallogicforupdatingthepricefeed. TOB-ANVIL-7:LOCsmaybeimmediatelyliquidatable Resolvedincommit 63cd324b .The

\_upsertCollateralFactorsAsOwner functionwas modifiedtorequirethe liquidationCFBasisPoints  
variabletobestrictlygreaterthan the creationCFBasisPoints  
variable.Ifthisconditionisnotmet,itwilltriggerarevert operation. hashey  
50AcronymFoundationSecurityAssessment PUBLIC

#### 6.FixReviewStatusCategories

Thefollowingtabledescribesthestatusesusedtoindicatethetheranissuehasbeensufficientlyaddressed.  
FixStatus StatusDescription UndeterminedThestatusoftheissuewasnotdeterminedduringthisengagement.  
UnresolvedTheissuepersistsandhasnotbeenresolved.  
PartiallyResolvedTheissuepersistsbuthasbeenpartiallyresolved.  
ResolvedTheissuehasbeensufficientlyresolved. hashey 51AcronymFoundationSecurityAssessment PUBLIC