

Arcade

Security assessment by HashEye · prepared for Arcade

HASHEYE AUDITED

PROJECT	Arcade
CLIENT	Arcade
CATEGORY	Blockchain
PUBLISHED	July 1, 2023
REPORT ID	research-arcade-2023-07-01-lsnflv

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 hasheye.io/audits/research-arcade-2023-07-01-lsnflv.

Arcade.xyz V3 Security Assessment July 31, 2023 Prepared for: Cary Galant Arcade.xyz
Prepared by: Alexander Remie, Guillermo Larregay, and Robert Schneider

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.
Hashey, Inc. 228 Park Ave S #80688 New York, NY 10003 <https://www.hashey.io> info@hashey.io
1 Arcade.xyz V3 Security Assessment 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 Arcade.xyz under the terms of the project statement of work and has been made public at Arcade.xyz'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 Arcade.xyz V3 Security Assessment
PUBLIC

Table of Contents About Hashey 1 Notices and Remarks 2 Table of Contents 3 Executive Summary 5 Project Summary 8 Project Goals 9 Project Targets 10 Project Coverage 11 Automated Testing 15 Codebase Maturity Evaluation 17 Summary of Findings 20 Detailed Findings 22 1. Different zero-address error thrown by single and batch NFT withdrawal functions 22
2. Solidity compiler optimizations can be problematic 25 3. callApproved does not follow approval best practices 26
4. Risk of confusing events due to missing checks in whitelist contracts 29
5. Missing check of _exists() return value 31 6. Incorrect deployers in integration tests 33 7. Risk of out-of-gas revert due to use of transfer() in claim fees 35 8. Risk of lost funds due to lack of zero-address check in functions 37 9. The maximum value for FL_09 is not set by Fee Controller 39
10. Fees can be changed while a loan is active 41 11. Asset vault nesting can lead to loss of assets 43
12. Risk of locked assets due to use of _mint instead of _safeMint 46
13. Borrowers cannot realize full loan value without risking default 49
14. itemPredicates encoded incorrectly according to EIP-712 51

15.Thefeevaluescandistortheincentivesfortheborrowersandlenders53
16.MaliciousborrowerscanuseforceRepaytogrieflenders54 A.VulnerabilityCategories56
B.CodeMaturityCategories58 C.CodeQualityRecommendations60
D.RiskswithApprovingNFTsforUseasCollateral62 hasheyeye 3Arcade.xyzV3SecurityAssessment PUBLIC
E.TokenIntegrationChecklist65 F.MutationTesting70 G.IncidentResponsePlanRecommendations73
H.FixReviewResults75 DetailedFixReviewResults76 hasheyeye 4Arcade.xyzV3SecurityAssessment PUBLIC

ExecutiveSummary EngagementOverview

ArcadeengagedhasheyetoreviewthesecurityoftheArcade.xyzV3protocol.The protocolisanNFTlendingplatformthatalloWSuserstoinitiate,rollover,andrepayloans, withuniqueNFTsandotherassetsservingascollateral tobacKloans.Itimplementsa networkofcontractstohandleloanmanagement,feeassessment,andassetvaulting, whicheffectivelyalloWSuserstobundleassetsintoasingletransferableNFTthatcanbe usedascollateral. AteamofthreeconsultantsconductedthereviewfromMay15toJune9,2023,foratotal ofeightengineer-weeksofeffort.Ourtestingeffortsfocusedonthesecurity,reliability,and functionalityoftheprotocol.Withfullaccesstotheshourcecodeanddocumentation,we performedstaticanddynamictestingoftheprotocol,usingautomatedandmanual processes. ObservationsandImpact Arcade'sNFTlendingprotocolusesadequateaccesscontrolsandisprotectedagainst potentialattackvectorsuchasreentrancyandfront-running.Nonetheless,weidentified consistentissuesacrossvariouscomponents,particularlythoserelatedtoinputvalidation, returnvaluechecks,andpotentiallossoffaccesstofunds(TOB-ARCADE-8, TOB-ARCADE-12),indicatinganeedforenhanceddatavaliditychecksandsafeguarding mechanisms.Concernsregardingtheapprovalmechanism(TOB-ARCADE-3)andevent emissions(TOB-ARCADE-1,TOB-ARCADE-4)indicateaneedformorerobustloggingand ERC-20tokenmanagement.Furthermore,weidentifiedissuesrelatedtoincorrect implementationsandoperations-liketheincorrectencodingofthe itemPredicates parameter,whichobfuscatestheverifieraddress(TOB-ARCADE-14),andmisaligned incentivesforadheringtotheexpectedorderofoperations(TOB-ARCADE-16);theseissues suggestthatfurtherattentionisneededtorefinecertainimplementationsandprevent invalidorexploitableoperations.Althoughcriticalsecuritymeasuresareimplementedin theprotocol,improvementsarenecessaryintheareasofdatavalidation,logging,timing, andconfiguration. Recommendations Basedonthecodebasematurityevaluationandfindingsidentifiedduringthesecurity review,hasheyerecommends thattheArcadeteamtakethefollowingsteps: • Remediatethefindingsdisclosedinthisreport.Thesefindingsshouldbe addressedaspartofadirectremediationoraspartofanyrefactorthatmayoccur whenaddressingotherrecommendations. hasheyeye 5Arcade.xyzV3SecurityAssessment PUBLIC

- Ensurethatallopeninputsandexpectedreturnvaluesarevalidated (TOB-ARCADE-5andTOB-ARCADE-8).Wefoundissuesrelatedtoinputandreturn valuevalidationinseveralcontracts,including LoanCore , OriginationController , RepaymentController , VaultFactory ,and AssetVault .Theseissuesuggestthatthevalidityofinputdataandresponses fromthecontractfunctions mightnotbeadequatelyenforcedorverifiedacrossthe protocol. • Developanincidentresponseplan.SuchaplanwillhelptheArcadeteamto prepareforfailurescenariosandwilloutlinetheappropriateresponsetothem. RefertoappendixGforguidanceoncreatinganincidentresponseplan. • Updatetheuser-facingdocumentationtoreflectV3oftheprotocol.The currentdocumentationisrelatedtoV2oftheprotocol.Up-to-dateuser-facing documentationwilllimittheriskofuserconfusionduetochangesbetweenV3and V2. • Improvetheinlinecomments.Somepartsoftheimplementation(suchasthe rollovermechanismandthe PunksVerifier contract)aredifficulttounderstand duetoinsufficientcommentstoexplaintheimplementation. • Improvetheunittestingsuite.Althoughtestcoverageisat100%,theunittesting suitestillhasgaps,whichhascausedissueslikeTOB-ARCADE-5andTOB-ARCADE-9 topersistunnoticed.

BreakdownofFindings Thefollowingtablesprovidethenumberoffindingsbyseverityandcategory. hasheyeye 6Arcade.xyzV3SecurityAssessment PUBLIC

EXPOSUREANALYSIS SeverityCount High0 Medium4 Low5 Informational6 Undetermined1 CATEGORYBREAKDOWN CategoryCount AccessControls1 Configuration1 DataValidation6 ErrorReporting1 Testing1 Timing2 UndefinedBehavior4 hasheyeye 7Arcade.xyzV3SecurityAssessment PUBLIC

ProjectSummary ContactInformation Thefollowingmanagerswereassociatedwiththisproject: DanGuido,AccountManagerSamGreenup,ProjectManager dan@hasheyeye.io sam.greenup@hasheyeye.io Thefollowingengineerswereassociatedwiththisproject: AlexanderRemie,ConsultantGuillermoLarregay,Consultant alexander.remie@hasheyeye.io guillermo.larregay@hasheyeye.io RobertSchneider,Consultant robert.schneider@hasheyeye.io ProjectTimeline Thesignificanteventsandmilestonesoftheprojectarelistedbelow. DateEvent May11,2023Pre-projectkickoffcall May22,2023Statusupdatemeeting#1 May30,2023Statusupdatemeeting#2

ProjectGoals The engagement was scoped to provide a security assessment of the Arcade.xyz V3 NFT lending protocol. Specifically, we sought to answer the following non-exhaustive list of questions:

- Do the NFTs used in the protocol comply with standard interfaces like ERC-721, ERC-1155, and ERC-20?
- Do the NFTs deviate from these standards in a way that could introduce unexpected behaviors or compatibility issues? Are the "safe" versions of the functions of these standards used?
- Is the protocol's claim process (which is triggered when a borrower fails to repay a loan) fair, transparent, and secure, preventing an unfair liquidation of NFTs?
- Does the protocol implement measures to prevent front-running, especially for sensitive operations like loan repayment and liquidation?
- Are the asset vaults implemented securely, protecting borrowers' funds and their access to them at all times? Additionally, does the use of asset vaults in any way prevent lenders from being able to claim collateral when their loans are not repaid?
- Does the system handle loan initialization and repayments properly, including those involving multiple assets and various types of NFTs?
- Does the protocol ensure that the token URI for each NFT, which points to its metadata, is immutable after minting, preventing a malicious user from changing it?
- Are the rules and parameters surrounding collateral requirements in the lending protocol clearly defined and secure, providing adequate safeguards in case of attempted fraud?
- Does the protocol correctly and securely implement EIP-712 for structured data hashing and signing? Are there robust measures in place to prevent potential security issues related to the misuse of domain separators or type hashes?
- Are role-based access controls securely and effectively implemented within the system? Are there safeguards preventing unauthorized access, and are the roles appropriately assigned to prevent potential exploitation or misuse?

ProjectTargets The engagement involved a review and testing of the following target: Arcade.xyz Repository <https://github.com/arcadexyz/arcade-protocol> Version 4f510e0e2287901abb21265f72aa4465166ab09d Type Solidity Platform Ethereum hasheye 10Arcade.xyzV3SecurityAssessment PUBLIC

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

- **LoanCore**: The LoanCore contract is the core contract of the protocol. Both of the controller contracts call functions in this contract. This contract contains functions to start loans, repay loans, claim the collateral backing loans that have not been repaid, rollover loans, and withdraw fees. We reviewed the implementation for vulnerabilities that could allow an attacker to steal funds or cause a denial of service, and we looked for ways that users could lose access to their funds (TOB-ARCADE-8). Additionally, we reviewed the access controls, event emission, input validation, and pausing mechanism of the contract. We also closely reviewed the correctness of the rollover mechanism and state machine and looked for opportunities to perform reentrancy and front-running attacks. Lastly, we reviewed the contract to ensure that it correctly applies fees, uses promissory notes correctly, and safely transfers ERC-20, ERC-721, and ERC-1155 tokens.
- **OriginationController**: This is one of the two main controller contracts through which users interact with the protocol. This contract performs validations on calls made to LoanCore, which performs the actual operations. This contract contains functions to start loans and to rollover loans. We reviewed the implementation to look for flaws related to input validation, access controls, missing events, loops that exhaust gas, signature verification vulnerabilities, EIP-712 adherence, ERC-2612 (permit) adherence, and front-running and reentrancy vulnerabilities. Additionally, we looked for ways to create loans with invalid terms, create loans with invalid counterparties, rollover loans without fully repaying the previous loans, or subvert the rollover mechanism in other ways.
- **RepaymentController**: This is the second of the two main controller contracts through which users interact with the protocol. This contract performs validations on calls made to LoanCore, which performs the actual operations. This contract contains functions to repay loans and to claim the collateral backing loans that ended but were not repaid. We reviewed the access controls, input validation (TOB-ARCADE-8), and fee calculations. We looked for front-running and reentrancy vulnerabilities. Additionally, we looked for ways to repay a loan without actually fully repaying it, flaws in the withdrawal of lender funds using the redeemNote function,

transaction ordering flaws between repayment and liquidation (TOB-ARCADE-13), flaws that could prevent borrowers from fully realizing the value of their loans without risking default (TOB-ARCADE-13), and ways for attackers to illegally claim borrowers' collateral. [hashey 11Arcade.xyzV3SecurityAssessment PUBLIC](#)

- **FeeController** : This contract contains the configured fees and functions to update the fee values, adhering to the maximum fee amount per fee category. We reviewed the implementation for issues related to access controls, input validation, and missing configurations of maximum fees (TOB-ARCADE-9). Additionally, we reviewed the effect of changing configured fees while loans are active (TOB-ARCADE-10).
- **PromissoryNote** : This contract implements an ERC-721 token that is used to track the lender and borrower parties involved in a loan. This NFT is minted when a loan is started and burned when the loan ends (through repayment or the claiming of collateral). We reviewed the access controls, input validation, and return value validation (TOB-ARCADE-5). Additionally, we reviewed the implementation of overridden `OpenZeppelin` functions to ensure that the contracts still adhere to the ERC-721 standard.
- **Vaults**
 - **VaultFactory** : This contract can be used by potential borrowers to deploy an `AssetVault` contract through a minimal proxy pattern. The `VaultFactory` contract is both a factory and an ERC-721 token. For each deployed `AssetVault` contract, an accompanying ERC-721 token is minted; the owner of this token is the owner of the associated `AssetVault` contract. We reviewed the implementation to look for flaws related to access controls, reentrancy, event emission, input validation (TOB-ARCADE-8), and return value validation (TOB-ARCADE-5). Additionally, we reviewed the `claimFees` function for any flaws that might prevent fees from being withdrawable (TOB-ARCADE-7), and we checked for the use of `SafeERC20` functions wherever possible (TOB-ARCADE-12).
 - **AssetVault** : This contract can be deployed by users through the `VaultFactory` contract and is used to bundle multiple assets (ERC-20, ERC-721, ERC-1155, ETH, `CryptoPunks`) inside one NFT (the `VaultFactory` NFT—refer to the bullet point above). This bundled NFT can then be used as collateral to back loans. We manually reviewed the contract to look for flaws related to access controls, reentrancy, front-running, input validation, initialization, ownership tracking, and inconsistent error messages. We also looked for ways that attackers could steal funds from an `assetVault` and that the owner of an `assetVault` could withdraw its assets while it is being used as collateral in an active loan. Additionally, we investigated whether the functionality allowing users to nest `assetVaults` could cause any problems, such as the loss of access to the funds within an `assetVault` (TOB-ARCADE-11). Lastly, we reviewed the use of safe transfer functions to withdraw assets, the approval mechanism (TOB-ARCADE-3), the access controls and implementation of the various “call” functions, and the mechanism for disabling and enabling withdrawals.
 - **CallWhitelist**, **CallWhitelistApprovals**, **CallWhitelistDelegation**, and **CallWhitelistAllExtensions** : These four contracts together (through [hashey 12Arcade.xyzV3SecurityAssessment PUBLIC](#) inheritance) make up the “whitelist” contract that is attached to deployed `AssetVault` contracts and is used to allow/disallow specific functions to be called from the `AssetVault` contract. This is mostly used to be able to participate in airdrops while an NFT is locked up in an `assetVault`. The owner of the “whitelist” contract is allowed to whitelist functions; in practice, the owner will be an `Arcade-owned` account or a governance system. We manually reviewed the contract for flaws related to inheritance, input validation, access controls, and event emission (TOB-ARCADE-4). Additionally, we reviewed the use of the blacklist and whitelist to determine whether whitelisted calls that are also present in the blacklist would still be deemed whitelisted.
- **Verifiers**
 - **ItemsVerifier** : This contract verifies that an `assetVault` has an asset or a list of assets (ERC-20, ERC-721, ERC-1155). We manually reviewed the contract to check that the described specification adheres to the implementation and to look for any edge cases that are not handled correctly. Additionally, we reviewed the wildcard process to determine whether it could be somehow used by an attacker.
 - **CollectionWideOfferVerifier** : This contract checks that the NFT collateral in the loan terms is equal to the NFT specified in the predicate. Any token within an NFT collection would satisfy this verifier—the contract does not check for a specific `tokenId` within an NFT collection. We manually reviewed the contract to check that the described specification adheres to the implementation and that all required validation is present.
 - **UnvaultedItemsVerifier** : This contract checks that the collateral token in the loan terms and its `tokenId` match those specified in the predicate. We manually reviewed the contract to check that the described specification adheres to the implementation and that all required validation is present.
 - **PunksVerifier**

:This contract checks whether a CryptoPunk (any CryptoPunk or a specific CryptoPunk) is present in the collaterals specified in the loan terms. We manually reviewed the contract to check that the described specification adheres to the implementation and that the validation is correct. We also reviewed the CryptoPunks contract to ensure that the integration is implemented correctly. • ArtBlocksVerifier: This contract checks whether a token within a list of supported ArtBlocks collections (any ArtBlock token or a specific token) is present in the collaterals specified in the loan terms. We manually reviewed the contract to check that the described specification adheres to the implementation and that the validation is correct. We also reviewed the supported ArtBlocks contract to ensure that the integration is implemented correctly. hashey 13 Arcade.xyz V3 Security Assessment PUBLIC

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: •

Decentralized governance: The Arcade protocol uses a decentralized governance system consisting of multiple smart contracts. These contracts were not part of the repository under review and were considered out of scope. We recommend performing a separate audit to review the governance-related smart contracts. • External contracts for unit tests: The provided repository contains various helper contracts that are used only to write unit tests that interact with these external contracts. For example, these external contracts include an implementation of the EIP-5639 standard and a copy of the CryptoPunks smart contract. These contracts were all considered out of scope and may warrant a separate review. •

OpenZeppelin libraries: The Arcade protocol uses the OpenZeppelin-provided smart contracts (version 4.3.2). These contracts were considered out of scope for this audit. •

Frontend: The Arcade system also includes a frontend to interact with the smart contracts. The frontend was considered out of scope for this audit and may warrant a separate review. hashey 14 Arcade.xyz V3 Security Assessment 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. Test Harness Configuration We used the following tools in the automated testing phase of this project: Tool Description Policy UniversalMutator A deterministic mutation generator that detects gaps in test coverage Appendix F Test Results The results of this focused testing are detailed below.

UniversalMutator: The following table displays the proportion of mutants for which all unit tests passed. A small number of valid mutants indicates that test coverage is thorough and that any newly introduced bugs are likely to be caught by the test suite. A large number of valid mutants indicates gaps in the test coverage where errors may go unnoticed. We used the results in the following table to guide our manual review, giving extra attention to code for which test coverage appears to be incomplete.

It is important to note that some of the valid mutants can be false positives, such as mutants that remove the public visibility modifier from a public function or variable. These results must be manually checked before drawing conclusions. Refer to appendix F for more information.

Target Valid Mutants contracts/FeeController.sol 5.88% contracts/LoanCore.sol 8.68% contracts/OriginationController.sol 5.65% contracts/PromissoryNote.sol 13.65% hashey 15 Arcade.xyz V3 Security Assessment PUBLIC

contracts/RepaymentController.sol 5.97% contracts/libraries/FeeLookups.sol 23.21% contracts/libraries/InterestCalculator.sol 13.33% contracts/libraries/LoanLibrary.sol 12.20% contracts/errors/Lending.sol 3.07% contracts/errors/Vault.sol 2.35% contracts/vault/AssetVault.sol 8.10% contracts/vault/CallBlacklist.sol 5.70% contracts/vault/CallWhitelist.sol 6.25% contracts/vault/CallWhitelistAllExtensions.sol 8.33% contracts/vault/CallWhitelistApprovals.sol 8.86% contracts/vault/CallWhitelistDelegation.sol 9.09% contracts/vault/OwnableERC721.sol 4.69% contracts/vault/VaultFactory.sol 11.35% contracts/verifiers/ArtBlocksVerifier.sol 0.0% contracts/verifiers/CollectionWideOfferVerifier.sol 0.0% contracts/verifiers/ItemsVerifier.sol 0.0% contracts/verifiers/PunksVerifier.sol 0.0% contracts/verifiers/UnvaultedItemsVerifier.sol 0.0% hashey 16 Arcade.xyz V3 Security Assessment PUBLIC

Codebase Maturity Evaluation hashey 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 This system contains almost no arithmetic apart from the arithmetic used for calculating fees. The arithmetic that is present features automatic underflow and overflow protection through the use of solc 0.8.x. There are no unchecked blocks. Satisfactory Auditing All state-changing functions emit events. Custom errors are used in the code base to signal specific reasons for reverts. We identified one potentially confusing event emission (TOB-ARCADE-4) and found that an error throws different error messages (TOB-ARCADE-1). We recommend that the Arcade team implement an incident response plan (appendix 6) and use an off-chain monitoring system to provide early warnings when problems arise in the protocol. Satisfactory Authentication/ Access Controls The protocol's contracts all implement appropriate access controls. Privileges are dropped when they are not needed anymore after deployment. Externally owned accounts do not have access to user funds. We did identify one issue related to access control on asset vaults that could cause users to lose access to funds (TOB-ARCADE-11). We recommend that the Arcade team add a page in the documentation that describes all of the privileged roles per contract and the actions that each role is allowed to perform. Satisfactory Complexity Management Overall, the contracts and functions are easy to read, performing single task or group of tasks, and are well documented through the use of NatSpec comments. We detected no code duplication or redundancy in the Moderate hashey 17 Arcade.xyz V3 Security Assessment PUBLIC

codebase. However, one exception to this is the loan rollover mechanism, which is divided into five functions across two contracts. The logic of these functions is hard to follow due to the high number of conditions that are checked in each of the functions. Additionally, all of these functions could use more inline comments to explain what they do and why. We recommend that the Arcade team redesign the functions to make them less complex and add additional inline comments in those newly designed versions. Decentralization The Arcade governance system is in charge of whitelisting allowed currencies, whitelisting certain functions that can be called on asset vaults, and pausing the system. However, when the system is paused, no liquidations can happen, but users can still repay their loans, thereby ensuring that a pause of the system does not enable unfair liquidations. Also, the governance system cannot access any user assets at any time. The governance system used by the Arcade protocol was out of scope for this audit; therefore, further investigation is required. Further Investigation Required Documentation The overall user-facing documentation on the Arcade website is thorough and provides numerous real-world use cases to walk users through how the protocol and the UI work. The implementation makes heavy use of NatSpec comments and inline comments. However, the rollover mechanism and the Punks Verifier contract could use more inline comments. Additionally, we found some misleading comments and mistakes in comments (as documented in appendix C, which lists our code quality recommendations). Finally, we recommend updating the user-facing documentation to reflect V3 of the protocol instead of V2. Moderate Transaction Ordering Risks The protocol, as currently evaluated, does not appear to pose immediate threats to user assets from unforeseen transaction ordering or maximum extractable value (MEV). However, certain design choices obscure Moderate hashey 18 Arcade.xyz V3 Security Assessment PUBLIC

incentives related to the anticipated sequence of operations within the system (TOB-ARCADE-13, TOB-ARCADE-16). To address these issues, we recommend implementing a robust testing strategy that accentuates potential risks associated with transaction ordering and timing within the system. Low-Level Manipulation The Arcade protocol does not use assembly, and the use of low-level calls is limited. We did identify one potential issue related to the use of the low-level transfer() function instead of call(), but it is not an immediate problem due to the current fee recipient contract (TOB-ARCADE-7). Satisfactory Testing and Verification The test coverage is 100%, although some of the issues found (such as TOB-ARCADE-5 and TOB-ARCADE-9) could have been prevented if the test scenarios covered edge cases. The Arcade protocol does not use more advanced testing tools such as fuzzing at the moment, which is an area the protocol could improve on in the future. Additionally, consider using mutation testing to check the robustness of the unit tests (appendix F). Moderate hashey 19 Arcade.xyz V3 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	Different zero-address error thrown by single and batch NFT withdrawal functions	Error Reporting	Informational
2	Solidity compiler optimizations can be problematic	Undefined Behavior	Undetermined
3	callApproved does not follow approval best practices	Undefined Behavior	Informational
4	Risk of confusing events due to missing checks in whitelist contracts	Data Validation	Low
5	Missing check of _exists() return value	Data Validation	Informational
6	Incorrect deployers in integration tests	Testing	Informational
7	Risk of out-of-gas revert due to use of transfer() in claimFees	Undefined Behavior	Informational
8	Risk of lost funds due to lack of zero-address check in functions	Data Validation	Medium
9	The maximum value for FL_09 is not set by FeeController	Data Validation	Low
10	Fee can be changed while a loan is active	Timing	Low
11	Asset vault nesting can lead to loss of assets	Access Controls	Low
12	Risk of locked assets due to use of _mint instead of _safeMint	Undefined Behavior	Medium

hashey 20 Arcade.xyz V3 Security Assessment PUBLIC

13Borrowerscannotrealizefullloanvaluewithout riskingdefault TimingMedium
14itemPredicatesencodedincorrectlyaccordingto EIP-712 ConfigurationLow
15Thefeevalescandistorttheincentivesforthe borrowersandlenders DataValidationInformational
16MaliciousborrowerscanuseforceRepaytogrief lenders DataValidationMedium hashey
21Arcade.xyzV3SecurityAssessment PUBLIC

DetailedFindings 1.Dierentzero-addresserrorsthrownbysingleandbatchNFTwithdrawal functions
Severity:InformationalDifficulty:High Type:ErrorReportingFindingID:TOB-ARCADE-1 Target:
contracts/vault/AssetVault.sol Description The withdrawBatch
functionthrowsanerrorthatisdifferentfromthesingleNFT withdrawalfunctions(withdrawERC721 ,
withdrawERC1155).Thiscouldconfuseusersand otherapplicationsthatinteractwiththeArcadecontracts. The
withdrawBatch functionthrowsacustomerror(AV_ZeroAddress)ifthe to
parameterissettothezeroaddress.ThesingleNFTwithdrawalfunctions withdrawERC721 and withdrawERC1155
donotexplicitlycheckthe to parameter.All threeofthesefunctionsinternallycallthe _withdrawERC721 and
_withdrawERC1155 functions,whichalsodonotexplicitlycheckthe to parameter.Thelackofsuchacheckis
notaproblem:accordingtotheERC-721andERC-1155standards,atransfermustrevertif to
isthezeroaddress,sothesingleNFTwithdrawalfunctionswillrevertonthiscondition.
However,theywillrevertwiththeerrormessagesthatdefinedinsideactualNFT contractinsteadoftheArcade
AV_ZeroAddress error,whichisthrownwhen withdrawBatch reverts. 193functionwithdrawBatch(
194address[]calldatatokens, 195uint256[]calldatatokenIds, 196TokenType[]calldatatokenTypes,
197address to 198)externaloverrideonlyOwneronlyWithdrawEnabled{
199uint256tokensLength=tokens.length; 200if(tokensLength>MAX_WITHDRAW_ITEMS)revert
AV_TooManyItems(tokensLength);
201if(tokensLength≠tokenIds.length)revertAV_LengthMismatch("tokenId");
202if(tokensLength≠tokenTypes.length)revert AV_LengthMismatch("tokenType");
203if(to==address(0))revertAV_ZeroAddress(); 204 205for(uint256i=0;i<tokensLength;i++){
206if(tokens[i]==address(0))revertAV_ZeroAddress(); hashey 22Arcade.xyzV3SecurityAssessment PUBLIC

Figure1.1:Asnippetofthe withdrawBatch functionin arcade-protocol/contracts/vault/AssetVault.sol

Additionally,theCryptoPunksNFTcontractdoesnotfollowtheERC-721andERC-1155
standardsandcontainsnocheckthatpreventsfundsfrombeingtransferredtothezero
address(andthefunctioniscalled transferPunk insteadofthestandard transfer).An
explicitchecktoensurethat to isnotthezeroaddressinsidethe withdrawPunk function
isthereforerecommended. 114functiontransferPunk(address to,uintpunkIndex){
115if(!allPunksAssigned)throw; 116if(punkIndexToAddress[punkIndex]≠msg.sender)throw;
117if(punkIndex≥10000)throw; 118if(punksOfferedForSale[punkIndex].isForSale){
119punkNoLongerForSale(punkIndex); 120} 121punkIndexToAddress[punkIndex]=to;
122balanceOf[msg.sender]--; 123balanceOf[to]++; 124Transfer(msg.sender,to,1);
125PunkTransfer(msg.sender,to,punkIndex);
126//Checkforthecasewherethereisabidfromthenewownerandrefund it. 127//Anyotherbidcanstayinplace.
128Bidbid=punkBids[punkIndex]; 129if(bid.bidder==to){ 130//Killbidandrefundvalue
131pendingWithdrawals[to]+=bid.value; 132punkBids[punkIndex]=Bid(false,punkIndex,0x0,0); 133} 134}

Figure1.2:The transferPunk functionin CryptoPunksMarket contract(Etherscan)

Lastly,thereisnostringargumenttothe AV_ZeroAddress error to indicate which variable
equaledthezeroaddressandcausedtherevert,unlikethe AV_LengthMismatch error.For
example,inthebatchfunction(figure1.1),the AV_ZeroAddress couldbethrownin line 203or206.

ExploitScenario Bob,adeveloperofafront-endblockchainapplicationthatinteractswiththeArcade
contracts,developsapagethatinteractswithan AssetVault contract.Inhis
implementation,hecatchespecificerrorsthatarethrownsothathecanshowan
informativemessagetotheuser.Becausethebatchandwithdrawalfunctionsthrow differenterrorswhen to
isthezeroaddress,heneedstowritetwoversionsoferror handlersinsteadofjustone. hashey
23Arcade.xyzV3SecurityAssessment PUBLIC

Recommendations Shortterm,addthezeroaddresscheckwiththecustomerrortothe _withdrawERC721 and
_withdrawERC1155 functions.Thiswillcausethe samecustomerrortobethrownfor
allofthesingleandbatchNFTwithdrawalfunctions.Also,addanexplicitzero-address checkinsidethe
withdrawPunk function.Lastly,addastringargumenttothe AV_ZeroAddress
customerrorthat is used to indicate the name of the variable that triggered the error (similar to the one in
AV_LengthMismatch). Longterm,ensure consistency in the errorsthrown throughout the implementation.This
willallowusersanddeveloperstounderstanderrorsthatarethrownandwillallowthe
Arcadeteamtotestfewererrors. hashey 24Arcade.xyzV3SecurityAssessment PUBLIC

2.Soliditycompileroptimizationscanbeproblematic Severity:UndeterminedDifficulty:High
Type:UndefinedBehaviorFindingID:TOB-ARCADE-2 Target: hardhat.config.ts Description
ArcadehasenabledoptionalcompileroptimizationsinSolidity.AccordingtoaNovember
2018auditoftheSoliditycompiler,theoptionaloptimizationsmaynotbesafe. 147optimizer:{

148enabledoptimizerEnabled, 149runs:200, 150}, Figure2.1:Thesolcoptimizersettingsin arcade-protocol/hardhat.config.ts High-severitysecurityissuesduetooptimizationbugshaveoccurredinthepast.A high-severitybuginthe emscripten -generated solc-js compilerusedbyTruffleand Remixpersisteduntillate2018;thefixforthisbugwasnotreportedintheSolidity changelog.Anotherhigh-severityoptimizationbugresultinginincorrectbitshiftresultswas patchedinSolidity0.5.6.AnotherbugduetotheincorrectcachingofKeccak-256was reported. Itislikelythattherearelatentbugsrelatedtooptimizationandthatfutureoptimizations willintroducenewbugs. ExploitScenario AlatenorfuturebuginSoliditycompileroptimizations- orintheEmscriptentranspilation to solc-js -causesasecurityvulnerabilityintheArcadecontracts. Recommendations Shortterm,measurethegassavingsfromoptimizationsandcarefullyweighthemagainst thepossibilityofanoptimization-relatedbug. Longterm,monitorthedevelopmentandadoptionofSoliditycompileroptimizationsto assesstheirmaturity. hashey 25Arcade.xyzV3SecurityAssessment PUBLIC

3.callApprovedoesnotfollowapprovalbestpractices Severity:InformationalDifficulty:Medium Type:UndefinedBehaviorFindingID:T0B-ARCADE-3 Target: contracts/vault/AssetVault.sol Description The AssetVault.callApprove functionhasundocumentedbehaviorsandlacksthe increase/decreaseapprovalfunctions,whichmightimpedethird-partyintegrations. Awell-knownraceconditionexistsintheERC-20approvalmechanism.Theracecondition isenabledifauserorsmartcontractcalls approve asecondtimeonaspenderspenders thathas alreadybeenallowed.Ifthespenderseesthetransactioncontainingthecallbeforeithas beenmined,theycancall transferFrom totransferthepreviousvalueandthenstill receiveauthorizationtotransferthenewvalue.Tomitigatethis, AssetVault usesthe SafeERC20.safeApprove function,whichwillrevertiftheallowanceisupdatedfrom nonzerotononzero.However,thisbehaviorisnotdocumented,anditmightbreakthe protocol'sintegrationwiththird-partycontractsoroff-chaincomponents. 282functioncallApprove(283address token, 284address spender, 285uint256 amount 286)externaloverrideonlyAllowedCallersonlyWithdrawDisablednonReentrant{ 287if(!CallWhitelistApprovals(whitelist).isApproved(token, spender)){ 288revertAV_NonWhitelistedApproval(token, spender); 289} 290 291//Doapproval 292IERC20(token).safeApprove(spender, amount); 293 294emitApprove(msg.sender, token, spender, amount); 295} Figure3.1:The callApprove functionin arcade-protocol/contracts/vault/AssetVault.sol 37/** 38*@devDeprecated.Thisfunctionhasissuessimilartotheonesfoundin 39*{IERC20- approve},anditsusageisdiscouraged. 40* 41*Wheneverpossible,use{safeIncreaseAllowance}and 42* {safeDecreaseAllowance}instead. hashey 26Arcade.xyzV3SecurityAssessment PUBLIC

43*/ 44functionsafeApprove(45IERC20 token, 46address spender, 47uint256 value 48)internal{ 49// safeApproveshouldonlybecalledwhensettinganinitialallowance, 50//orwhenresettingittozero.Toincreaseanddecreaseit,use 51// 'safeIncreaseAllowance'and'safeDecreaseAllowance' 52require(53(value==0) || (token.allowance(address(this), spender)==0), 54"SafeERC20:approvefromnon-zero tonon-zero allowance" 55); 56_callOptionalReturn(token, abi.encodeWithSelector(token.approve.selector, spender, value)); 57} Figure3.2:The safeApprove functionin openzeppelin- contracts/contracts/token/ERC20/utils/SafeERC20.sol AnalternativewaytomitigatetheERC- 20raceconditionistouse the increaseAllowance and decreaseAllowance functionstosafelyupdateallowances.Thesefunctionsare widelyusedbytheecosystemandallowuserstoupdateapprovalswithlessambiguity.

59functionsafeIncreaseAllowance(60IERC20 token, 61address spender, 62uint256 value 63)internal{ 64uint256 newAllowance=token.allowance(address(this), spender)+value; 65_callOptionalReturn(token, abi.encodeWithSelector(token.approve.selector, spender, newAllowance)); 66} 67 68functionsafeDecreaseAllowance(69IERC20 token, 70address spender, 71uint256 value 72)internal{ 73unchecked{ 74uint256 oldAllowance=token.allowance(address(this), spender); 75require(oldAllowance >= value, "SafeERC20:decreased allowance below zero"); 76uint256 newAllowance=oldAllowance-value; 77_callOptionalReturn(token, abi.encodeWithSelector(token.approve.selector, spender, newAllowance)); 78} 79} Figure3.3:The safeIncreaseAllowance and safeDecreaseAllowance functionsin openzeppelin- contracts/contracts/token/ERC20/utils/SafeERC20.sol hashey 27Arcade.xyzV3SecurityAssessment PUBLIC

ExploitScenario Alice, theownerofanassetvault, setsupanapprovalof1,000forherexternalcontractby calling callApprove .Shelaterdecidestoupdatetheapprovalamountto1,500andagain calls callApprove .Thissecondcallreverts,whichshedidnotexpect. Recommendations

Shortterm, takeoneofthefollowingactions: •
• Updatethedocumentationtomakeitcleartousersandotherintegrating smart contractdevelopers thattwotransactionsareneededtoupdateallowances. • Addtwonewfunctions inthe AssetVault contract: callIncreaseAllowance and callDecreaseAllowance ,whichinternallycall SafeERC20.safeIncreaseAllowance and SafeERC20.safeDecreaseAllowance ,respectively.

4. Risk of confusing events due to missing checks in whitelist contracts Severity: Low Difficulty: High Type: Data Validation Finding ID: TOB-ARCADE-4 Target: contracts/vault/CallWhitelist.sol , contracts/vault/CallWhitelistDelegation.sol Description The CallWhitelist contract's add and remove functions do not check whether the given call has been registered in the whitelist. As a result, add could be used to register calls that have already been registered, and remove could be used to remove calls that have never been registered; these types of calls would still emit events. For example, invoking remove with a call that is not in the whitelist would emit a CallRemoved event even though no call was removed. Such an event could confuse off-chain monitoring systems, or at least make it more difficult to retrace what happened by looking at the emitted event.

```
64 function add(address callee, bytes4 selector) external override onlyOwner {
65     whitelist[callee][selector] = true;
66     emit CallAdded(msg.sender, callee, selector);
67 }
```

Figure 4.1: The add function in arcade-protocol/contracts/vault/CallWhitelist.sol

```
75 function remove(address callee, bytes4 selector) external override onlyOwner {
76     whitelist[callee][selector] = false;
77     emit CallRemoved(msg.sender, callee, selector);
78 }
```

Figure 4.2: The remove function in arcade-protocol/contracts/vault/CallWhitelist.sol. A similar problem exists in the CallWhitelistDelegation.setRegistry function. This function can be called to set the registry address to the current registry address. In that case, the emitted RegistryChanged event would be confusing because nothing would have actually changed.

```
85 function setRegistry(address _registry) external onlyOwner {
86     registry = IDelegationRegistry(_registry);
87     emit RegistryChanged(msg.sender, _registry);
89 }
```

hashey 29Arcade.xyzV3SecurityAssessment PUBLIC

Figure 4.3: The setRegistry function in arcade-protocol/contracts/vault/CallWhitelistDelegation.sol. Arcade has explained that the owner of the whitelist contracts in ArcadeV3 will be a (set of) governance contract(s), so it is unlikely that this issue will happen. However, it is possible, and it could be prevented by more validation. Exploit Scenario No call has yet been added to the whitelist in CallWhitelist. Through the governance system, a proposal to remove a call with the address 0x1 and the selector 0x12345678 is approved. The proposal is executed, and CallWhitelist.remove is called. The transaction succeeds, and a CallRemoved event is emitted, even though the "removed" call was never in the whitelist in the first place. Recommendations Short term, add validation to the add, remove, and setRegistry functions. For the add function, it should ensure that the given call is not already in the whitelist. For the remove function, it should ensure that the call is currently in the whitelist. For the setRegistry function, it should ensure that the new registry address is not the current registry address. Adding this validation will prevent confusing events from being emitted and ease the tracing of events in the whitelist over time. Long term, when dealing with function arguments, always ensure that all inputs are validated as tightly as possible and that the subsequent emitted events are meaningful. Additionally, consider setting up an off-chain monitoring system that will track important system events. Such a system will provide an overview of the events that occur in the contracts and will be useful when incidents occur. hashey 30Arcade.xyzV3SecurityAssessment PUBLIC

5. Missing check of _exists() return value Severity: Informational Difficulty: High Type: Data Validation Finding ID: TOB-ARCADE-5 Target: contracts/PromissoryNote.sol , contracts/vault/VaultFactory.sol Description The ERC-721 _exists() function returns a Boolean value that indicates whether a token with the specified tokenId exists. In two instances in Arcade's codebase, the function is called but its return value is not checked, bypassing the intended result of the existence check. In particular, in the PromissoryNote.tokenURI() and VaultFactory.tokenURI() functions, _exists() is called before the URI for the tokenId is returned, but its return value is not checked. If the given NFT does not exist, the URI returned by the tokenURI() function will be incorrect, but this error will not be detected due to the missing return value check on _exists().

```
165 function tokenURI(uint256 tokenId) public view override (INFTWithDescriptor, ERC721) returns (string memory) {
166     _exists(tokenId);
167 }
168 return descriptor.tokenURI(address(this), tokenId);
169 }
```

Figure 5.1: The tokenURI function in arcade-protocol/contracts/PromissoryNote.sol

```
48 function tokenURI(address, uint256 tokenId) external view override returns (string memory) {
49     return bytes(baseURI).length > 0 ? string(abi.encodePacked(baseURI, tokenId.toString())) : "";
50 }
```

Figure 5.2: The tokenURI function in arcade-protocol/contracts/nft/BaseURIDescriptor.sol. Exploit Scenario Bob, a developer of a front-end blockchain application that interacts with the Arcade contracts, develops a page that lists users' promissory notes and vaults with their

respectiveURIs.Heaccidentallypassesanexistent tokenId to tokenURI() ,causinghis applicationtoshowanincorrectorincompleteURI. hasheyeye 31Arcade.xyzV3SecurityAssessment PUBLIC

Recommendations Shortterm,addacheckforthe _exists() function'sreturnvaluetobothofthe tokenURI() functionstopreventthemfromreturninganincompleteURIfornonexistent tokens. Longterm,addnewtestcasesoverifytheexpectedreturnvaluesof tokenURI() inall contractsthatuseit,withvalidandinvalidtokensasarguments. hasheyeye 32Arcade.xyzV3SecurityAssessment PUBLIC

6.Incorrectdeployersinintegrationtests Severity:InformationalDifficulty:High Type:TestingFindingID:TOB-ARCADE-6 Target: test/Integration.ts Description Thefixturedeploymentfunctionintheprovidedintegrationtestsusesdifferentsignersfor deployingtheArcadecontractsbeforeperformingthetests. AllArcadecontractsaremeanttobedeployedbytheprotocolteam,exceptforvaults, whicharedeployedbyusersusingthe VaultFactory contract.However,inthefixture deploymentfunction,somecontractsaredeployedfromthe borrower accountinsteadof the admin account. Someexamplesareshowninfigure6.1;however,thereareotherinstancesinwhich contractsarenotdeployedfromthe admin account.

```
71constsigners:SignerWithAddress[]=awaitethers.getSigners();
72const[borrower,lender,admin]=signers; 73 74constwhitelist=
<CallWhitelist>awaitdeploy("CallWhitelist",signers[0], []); 75constvaultTemplate=
<AssetVault>awaitdeploy("AssetVault",signers[0], []); 76constfeeController=
<FeeController>awaitdeploy("FeeController",admin, []); 77constdescriptor=
<BaseURIDescriptor>awaitdeploy("BaseURIDescriptor", signers[0],[BASE_URI]) 78constvaultFactory=
<VaultFactory>awaitdeploy("VaultFactory",signers[0],
[vaultTemplate.address,whitelist.address,feeController.address, descriptor.address]);
```

Figure6.1:Asnipetofthetestsin arcade-protocol/test/Integration.ts ExploitScenario

Alice,adeveloperontheArcadeteam,addsanewpermissionedfeaturetotheprotocol. Sheaddstherelevantintegrationtestsforherfeature,andalltestspass.However, becausethedeployerforthetestcontractswasnotthe admin account,thosetestsshould havefailed,andthecontractsaredeployedtothenetworkwithabug. Recommendations Shortterm,correctalloftheinstancesofincorrectdeployersforthecontractsinthe integrationtestsfile. hasheyeye 33Arcade.xyzV3SecurityAssessment PUBLIC

Longterm,addadditionaltestcasestoensurethattheaccountpermissionsinalldeployed contractsarecorrect. hasheyeye 34Arcade.xyzV3SecurityAssessment PUBLIC

7.Riskofout-of-gasrevertduetouseoftransfer()inclaimFees Severity:InformationalDifficulty:High Type:UndefinedBehaviorFindingID:TOB-ARCADE-7 Target: contracts/vault/VaultFactory.sol Description The VaultFactory.claimFees functionusesthe low-level transfer() operationto movethecollectedETHfeestoanotherarbitraryaddress.The transfer() operation sendsonly2,300unitsofgaswiththisoperation.Asaresult,iftherecipientisacontract withlogicinsidethe receive() function,whichwoulduseextragas,theoperationwill probably(dependingonthegascost)failduetoanout-of-gasrevert.

```
194functionclaimFees(addressto)externalonlyRole(FEE_CLAIMER_ROLE){
195uint256balance=address(this).balance; 196payable(to).transfer(balance); 197
198emitClaimFees(to,balance); 199} Figure7.1:The claimFees functionin arcade-
protocol/contracts/vault/VaultFactory.sol
```

TheArcadeteamhasexplainedthattherecipientwillbeatreasurycontractwithnologic insidethe receive() function,meaningthecurrentuseof transfer() willnotposeany problems.However,ifatomepointtherecipientdoescontainlogicinsidethe receive() function,then claimFees willlikelyrevertandthecontractwillnotbeabletoclaimthe funds.Note,however,thatthefeescouldbeclaimedbyanotheraddress(i.e.,thefeewill notbestuck). The withdrawETH functioninthe AssetVault contractuses Address.sendValue instead of transfer() .

```
223functionwithdrawETH(addressto)externaloverrideonlyOwner onlyWithdrawEnablednonReentrant{
224//performtransfer 225uint256balance=address(this).balance; 226payable(to).sendValue(balance);
227emitWithdrawETH(msg.sender,to,balance); 228} hasheyeye 35Arcade.xyzV3SecurityAssessment PUBLIC
```

Figure7.2:The withdrawETH functionin arcade-protocol/contracts/vault/AssetVault.sol

Address.sendValue internallyusesthe call() operation,passingalongallofthe remaininggas,sothisfunctioncouldbeagoodcandidatetoreplaceuseof transfer() in claimFees .However,doingsocouldintroduceotherriskslikereentrancyattacks.Note thatneitherthe withdrawETH functionnorthe claimFees functioniscurrentlyatriskof reentrancyattacks. ExploitScenario Alice,adeveloperontheArcadeteam,deploysanewtreasurycontractthatcontainsan updated receive() functionthatalsowritesthereceivedETHamountintoastoragearray inthetreasurycontract.Bob,whoseaccountasthe FEE_CLAIMER_ROLE roleinthe VaultFactory contract,callsthe claimFees withthenewlydeployedtreasurycontractasthe

recipient. The transaction fails because the writer tried to store gas exceeding the passed along 2,300 unit of gas. Recommendations Short term, consider replacing the claimFees function's use of transfer() with Address.sendValue ; weigh the risk of possibly introducing vulnerabilities like reentrancy attacks against the benefit of being able to add logic in the fee recipient's receive() function. If the decision is to have claimFees continue to use transfer() , update the NatSpec comments for the functions so that readers will be aware of the 2,300 gas limit on the fee recipient. Long term, when deciding between using the low-level transfer() and call() operations, consider how malicious smart contracts may be able to exploit the lack of limits on the gas available in the recipient function. Additionally, consider the likelihood that the recipient will be a smart wallet or multi-sig (or other smart contract) with logic inside the receive() function, as the 2,300 gas from transfer() might not be sufficient for those recipients. hashey 36 Arcade.xyzV3SecurityAssessment PUBLIC

8. Risk of lost funds due to lack of zero-address check in functions Severity: Medium Difficulty: High Type: Data Validation Finding ID: TOB-ARCADE-8 Target: contracts/vault/VaultFactory.sol , contracts/RepaymentController.sol , contracts/LoanCore.sol Description The VaultFactory.claimFees (figure 8.1), RepaymentController.redeemNote (figure 8.2), LoanCore.withdraw , and LoanCore.withdrawProtocolFees functions are all missing a check to ensure that the to argument does not equal the zero address. As a result, these functions could transfer funds to the zero address. 194 function claimFees(address to, external only role (FEE_CLAIMER_ROLE)) { 195 uint256 balance = address(this).balance; 196 payable(to).transfer(balance); 197 198 emit ClaimFees(to, balance); 199 } Figure 8.1: The claimFees function in arcade-protocol/contracts/vault/VaultFactory.sol

126 function redeemNote(uint256 loanId, address to) external override { 127 LoanLibrary.LoanData memory data = LoanCore.getLoan(loanId); 128 (, uint256 amountOwed) = LoanCore.getNoteReceipt(loanId); 129 130 if (data.state != LoanLibrary.LoanState.Repaid) revert RC_InvalidState(data.state); 131 address lender = lenderNote.ownerOf(loanId); 132 if (lender != msg.sender) revert RC_OnlyLender(lender, msg.sender); 133 134 uint256 redeemFee = (amountOwed * feeController.get(FL_09)) / BASIS_POINTS_DENOMINATOR; 135 136 loanCore.redeemNote(loanId, redeemFee, to); 137 } Figure 8.2: The redeemNote function in arcade-protocol/contracts/RepaymentController.sol Exploit Scenario A script that is used to periodically withdraw the protocol fees (calling LoanCore.withdrawProtocolFees) is updated. Due to a mistake, the to argument is left hashey 37 Arcade.xyzV3SecurityAssessment PUBLIC

uninitialized. The script is executed, and the to argument defaults to the zero address, causing withdrawProtocolFees to transfer the protocol fees to the zero address. Recommendations Short term, add a check to verify that to does not equal the zero address to the following functions: • VaultFactory.claimFees • RepaymentController.redeemNote • LoanCore.withdraw • LoanCore.withdrawProtocolFees Long term, use the Slither static analyzer to catch common issues such as this one. Consider integrating a Slither scan into the project's CI pipeline, pre-commit hooks, or build scripts. hashey 38 Arcade.xyzV3SecurityAssessment PUBLIC

9. The maximum value for FL_09 is not set by FeeController Severity: Low Difficulty: High Type: Data Validation Finding ID: TOB-ARCADE-9 Target: contracts/FeeController.sol Description The FeeController constructor initializes all of the maximum values for the fees defined in the FeeLookups contract except for FL_09 (LENDER_REDEEM_FEE). Because the maximum value is not set, it is possible to set any amount, with no upper bound, for that particular fee. The lender's redeem fee is used in RepaymentController's redeemNote function to calculate the fee paid by the lender to the protocol in order to receive their funds back. If the protocol team accidentally sets the fee to 100%, all of the users' funds to be redeemed would instead be used to pay the protocol. 42 constructor() { 43 /// @dev Vault mint fee - gross 44 maxFees[FL_01] = 1 ether; 45 46 /// @dev Origination fees - bps 47 maxFees[FL_02] = 10_00; 48 maxFees[FL_03] = 10_00; 49 50 /// @dev Roll over fees - bps 51 maxFees[FL_04] = 20_00; 52 maxFees[FL_05] = 20_00; 53 54 /// @dev Loan closure fees - bps 55 maxFees[FL_06] = 10_00; 56 maxFees[FL_07] = 50_00; 57 maxFees[FL_08] = 10_00; 58 } Figure 9.1: The constructor in arcade-protocol/contracts/FeeController.sol

126 function redeemNote(uint256 loanId, address to) external override { 127 LoanLibrary.LoanData memory data = LoanCore.getLoan(loanId); 128 (, uint256 amountOwed) = LoanCore.getNoteReceipt(loanId); 129 130 if (data.state != LoanLibrary.LoanState.Repaid) revert RC_InvalidState(data.state); 131 address lender = lenderNote.ownerOf(loanId); hashey 39 Arcade.xyzV3SecurityAssessment PUBLIC 132 if (lender != msg.sender) revert RC_OnlyLender(lender, msg.sender); 133 134 uint256 redeemFee = (amountOwed * feeController.get(FL_09)) / BASIS_POINTS_DENOMINATOR; 135 136 loanCore.redeemNote(loanId, redeemFee, to); 137 } Figure 9.2: The redeemNote function in arcade-

protocol/contracts/RepaymentController.sol ExploitScenario
Charlie, a member of the Arcade protocol team, has access to the privileged account that can change the protocol fees. He wants to set LENDERS_REDEEM_FEE to 5%, but he accidentally types a 0 and sets it to 50%. Users cannot now lose half of their funds to the new protocol fee, causing distress and lack of trust in the team. Recommendations
Short term, set a maximum boundary for the FL_09 fee in FeeController 's constructor.
Long term, improve the tests suite to ensure that all fee-changing functions test for out-of-bounds values for all fees, not just FL_02 . hashey 40 Arcade.xyzV3SecurityAssessment PUBLIC

10. Fees can be changed while a loan is active Severity: Low Difficulty: High Type: Timing Finding ID: TOB-ARCADE-10 Target: contracts/FeeController.sol Description

All fees in the protocol are calculated using the current fees, as informed by the FeeController contract. However, fees can be changed by the team at any time, so the effective rollover and closure fees that the users will pay can change once their loans are already initialized; therefore, these fees are impossible to know in advance. For example, in the code shown in figure 10.1, the LENDER_INTEREST_FEE and LENDER_PRINCIPAL_FEE values are read when a loan is about to be repaid, but these values can be different from the values the user agreed to when the loan was initialized. The same can happen in OriginationController and other functions in RepaymentController .
149 function _prepareRepay(uint256 loanId) internal view returns (uint256 amountFromBorrower, uint256 amountToLender) {
150 LoanLibrary.LoanData memory data = LoanCore.getLoan(loanId);
151 if (data.state == LoanLibrary.LoanState.DUMMY_DO_NOT_USE) revert RC_CannotDereference(loanId);
152 if (data.state != LoanLibrary.LoanState.Active) revert RC_InvalidState(data.state); 153
154 LoanLibrary.LoanTerms memory terms = data.terms; 155
156 uint256 interest = getInterestAmount(terms.principal, terms.proratedInterestRate); 157
158 uint256 interestFee = (interest * feeController.get(FL_07)) / BASIS_POINTS_DENOMINATOR;
159 uint256 principalFee = (terms.principal * feeController.get(FL_08)) / BASIS_POINTS_DENOMINATOR; 160
161 amountFromBorrower = terms.principal + interest; 162 amountToLender = amountFromBorrower - interestFee -
principalFee; 163 } Figure 10.1: The _prepareRepay function in arcade-
protocol/contracts/RepaymentController.sol hashey 41 Arcade.xyzV3SecurityAssessment PUBLIC

Exploit Scenario Lucy, the lender, and Bob, the borrower, agree on the current loan conditions and fees at a certain point in time. Some weeks later, when the time comes to repay the loan, they learn that the protocol team decided to change the fees while their loan was active. Lucy's earnings are now different from what she expected. Recommendations
Short term, consider storing (for example, in the LoanTerms structure) the fee values that both counterparties agree on when a loan is initialized, and use those local values for the full lifetime of the loan.
Long term, document all of the conditions that are agreed on by the counterparties and that should be constant during the lifetime of the loan, and make sure they are preserved.
Add a specific integration or fuzzing test for these conditions. hashey 42 Arcade.xyzV3SecurityAssessment PUBLIC

11. Asset vault nesting can lead to loss of assets Severity: Low Difficulty: High Type: Access Controls Finding ID: TOB-ARCADE-11 Target: contracts/vault/VaultFactory.sol , contracts/vault/AssetVault.sol Description

Allowing an asset vault to be nested (e.g., vault A is owned by vault B, and vault B is owned by vault X, etc.) could result in a situation in which multiple asset vaults own each other. This would result in a deadlock preventing assets in the affected asset vaults from ever being withdrawn again. Asset vaults are designed to hold different types of assets, including ERC-721 tokens. The ownership of an asset vault is tracked by an accompanying ERC-721 token that is minted (figure 11.1) when the asset vault is deployed through the VaultFactory contract.
164 function initializeBundle(address to) external payable override returns (uint256) {
165 uint256 mintFee = feeController.get(FL_01); 166
167 if (msg.value < mintFee) revert VF_InsufficientMintFee(msg.value, mintFee); 168
169 address vault = _create(); 170 171 mint(to, uint256(uint160(vault))); 172
173 if (msg.value > mintFee) payable(msg.sender).transfer(msg.value - mintFee); 174
175 emit VaultCreated(vault, to); 176 return uint256(uint160(vault)); 177 } Figure 11.1: The initializeBundle function in arcade-protocol/contracts/vault/VaultFactory.sol To add an ERC-721 asset to an asset vault, it needs to be transferred to the asset vault's address. Because the ownership of an asset vault is tracked by an ERC-721 token, it is possible to transfer the ownership of an asset vault to another asset vault by simply transferring the ERC-721 token representing vault ownership. To withdraw ERC-721 tokens from an asset vault, the owner (the holder of the asset vault's ERC-721 token) needs to hashey 43 Arcade.xyzV3SecurityAssessment PUBLIC

```
enableWithdrawal(enabledWithdrawal)andthenallowthe withdrawERC721 (or withdrawBatch
)function. 121functionenableWithdraw()externaloverrideonlyOwneronlyWithdrawDisabled{
122withdrawEnabled=true; 123emitWithdrawEnabled(msg.sender); 124} Figure11.2:The enableWithdraw
functionin arcade-protocol/contracts/vault/AssetVault.sol 150functionwithdrawERC721(
151addresstoken, 152uint256tokenId, 153addressto 154)externaloverrideonlyOwneronlyWithdrawEnabled{
155_withdrawERC721(token,tokenId,to); 156} Figure11.3:The withdrawERC721 functionin arcade-
protocol/contracts/vault/AssetVault.sol
```

Onlytheownerofanassetvaultcanenableandperformwithdrawals. Therefore, iftwo(or more)vaultsowneachother, itwouldbeimpossibleforauser toenableorperform withdrawalsontheaffectedvaults, permanentlylockingallassets(ERC-721,ERC-1155, ERC-20,ETH)withinthem. TheseverityoftheissuedependsontheUI, whichwasoutofscopeforthisreview. IftheUI doesnotpreventvaultsfromowningeachother, theseverityofthisissueishigher. In termsoflikelihood, thisissuewouldrequireauser tomakeamistake(althoughamistake thatisfarmorelikelythanthetransferoftokenstoarandomaddress)andwouldrequire theUI tofail todetectandpreventorwarntheuserfrommakingsuchamistake. We thereforeratedthedifficultyofthisissueashigh. ExploitScenario

AlicedecidestoborrowUSDCbyputtingupsomeofherNFTsascollateral:

1. AliceusestheUI tocreateanassetvault(vaultA)andtransfersfiveofher CryptoPunkstotheassetvault.

2. TheUIshowsthatAlicehasanotherexistingvault(vaultX), whichcontainstwo BoredApes. Shewantstousethesesetvovaultstogethertoborrowahigheramount ofUSDC. SheclicksonvaultAandselectsthe“AddAsset”option.

3. TheUIshowsalistofassetsthatAliceowns, includingtheERC-721token that representsownershipofvaultX. Aliceclickson“Add”, thetransactionsucceeds, and thevaultXNFTistransferredtovaultA. VaultXisnowownedbyvaultA. hasheyeye 44Arcade.xyzV3SecurityAssessment PUBLIC

4. AlicedecidestoaddanotherBoredApeNFTthatsheownstovaultX. Sheopensthe vaultXpageandclickson“AddAssets”, andthelistofassetsthatshcanaddshows theERC- 721token thatrepresentsownershipofvaultA.

5. AliceisconfusedandwondersifaddingvaultXtovaultAworked(step3). She decidestoaddvaultAtovaultXinstead. Thetransactionsucceeds, andnowvaultA ownsvaultXandviceversa. Aliceisnowunabletowithdrawanyoftheassetsfrom eithervault. Recommendations Shortterm, takeoneofthefollowingactions: •

Disallowthenestingofassetvaults. That is, preventusersfrombeingableto transferownershipofanassetvaulttoanotherassetvault. Thiswouldpreventthe issuealtogether. •

Ifallowingassetvaultstobenestedisadesiredfeature, updatetheUI toprevent twomoreassetvaultsfromowningeachother(ifitdoesnotalreadydoso). Also, updatethedocumentationsothatotherintegrating smartcontractprotocolsare awareoftheissue.

Longterm, whendealingwiththenestingofassets, consideredgecasesandwrite extensiveteststhatensuretheseedgecasesarehandledcorrectlyandthatusersdonot loseaccesstotheirassets. Otherthanunittests, wererecommendwritinginvariantsand testingthemusingproperty-basedtestingwithEchidna. hasheyeye 45Arcade.xyzV3SecurityAssessment PUBLIC

12. Riskoflockedassetsduetouseof_mintinsteadof_safeMint Severity:MediumDifficulty:Low Type:UndefinedBehaviorFindingID:TOB-ARCADE-12 Target: contracts/vault/VaultFactory.sol , contracts/PromissoryNote.sol Description TheassetvaultandpromissorynoteERC-721tokensaremintedvia the _mint function ratherthanthe _safeMint function. The _safeMint functionincludesanecessarysafety checkthatvalidatesarecipientcontract’sabilitytoreceiveandhandleERC-721tokens. Withoutthissafeguard, tokenscaninadvertentlybesenttoanincompatiblecontract, causingthem, andanyassetstheyhold, tobecomeirretrievable.

```
164functioninitializeBundle(addressto)externalpayableoverridereurns (uint256){
165uint256mintFee=feeController.get(FL_01); 166
167if(msg.value<mintFee)revertVF_InsufficientMintFee(msg.value, mintFee); 168
169addressvault=_create(); 170 171_mint(to,uint256(uint160(vault))); 172
173if(msg.value>mintFee)payable(msg.sender).transfer(msg.value- mintFee); 174
175emitVaultCreated(vault,to); 176returnuint256(uint160(vault)); 177} Figure12.1:The
initializeBundle functionin arcade-protocol/contracts/vault/VaultFactory.sol
135functionmint(addressto,uint256loanId)externaloverridereurns(uint256) {
136if(!hasRole(MINT_BURN_ROLE,msg.sender))revert PN_MintingRole(msg.sender); 137_mint(to,loanId);
138 139returnloanId; 140} Figure12.2:The mint functionin arcade-
protocol/contracts/PromissoryNote.sol hasheyeye 46Arcade.xyzV3SecurityAssessment PUBLIC
```

The _safeMint function’sbuilt-insafetycheckensures thattherecipientcontracthas the necessary ERC721Receiver implementation, verifyingthecontract’sabilitytoreceiveand manageERC-721tokens.

```
258function_safeMint( 259addressto, 260uint256tokenId, 261bytesmemory_data 262)internalvirtual{
263_mint(to,tokenId); 264require( 265_checkOnERC721Received(address(0),to,tokenId,_data),
```

266"ERC721:transferonERC721ReceiverImplementer" 267); 268} Figure 12.3: The `_safeMint` function in `openzeppelin-contracts/contracts/token/ERC721/ERC721.sol`. The `_checkOnERC721Received` method invokes the `onERC721Received` method on the receiving contract, expecting a return value containing the bytes4 selector of the `onERC721Received` method. A successful pass of this check implies that the contract is indeed capable of receiving and processing ERC-721 tokens. The `_safeMint` function does allow for reentrancy through the calling of `_checkOnERC721Received` on the receiver of the token. However, based on the order of operations in the affected functions in Arcade (figures 12.1 and 12.2), this poses no risk. **Exploit Scenario** Alice initializes a new asset vault by invoking the `initializeBundle` function of the `VaultFactory` contract, passing in her smart contract wallet address as the `to` argument. She transfers her valuable `CryptoPunks` NFT, intended to be used for collateral, to the newly created asset vault. However, she later discovers that her smart contract wallet lacks support for ERC-721 tokens. As a result, both her asset vault token and the `CryptoPunks` NFT become irretrievable, stuck within her smart wallet contract due to the absence of a mechanism to handle ERC-721 tokens. **Recommendations** Short term, use the `_safeMint` function instead of `_mint` in the `PromissoryNote` and `VaultFactory` contracts. The `_safeMint` function includes vital checks that ensure the recipient is equipped to handle ERC-721 tokens, thus mitigating the risk that NFTs could become frozen. Long term, enhance the unit testing suite. These tests should encompass more negative paths and potential edge cases, which will help uncover any hidden vulnerabilities or bugs like this one. Additionally, it is critical to test user-provided input extensively, covering a `hashey` 47 `Arcade.xyzV3SecurityAssessment PUBLIC`

broadspectrum of potential scenarios. This rigorous testing will contribute to building a more secure, robust, and reliable system. `hashey` 48 `Arcade.xyzV3SecurityAssessment PUBLIC`

13. Borrowers cannot realize full loan value without risking default Severity: Medium Difficulty: Low Type: Timing Finding ID: TOB-ARCADE-13 Target: `contracts/LoanCore.sol` Description To fully capitalize on their loans, borrowers need to retain their loaned assets and the owed interest for the entire term of their loans. However, if a borrower waits until the loan's maturity date to repay it, they become immediately vulnerable to liquidation of their collateral by the lender. As soon as the `block.timestamp` value exceeds the `dueDate` value, a lender can invoke the `claim` function to liquidate the borrower's collateral. `293 // First check if the call is being made after the due date.`
`294 uint256 dueDate = data.startDate + data.terms.durationSecs;`
`295 if (dueDate >= block.timestamp) revert LC_NotExpired(dueDate);` Figure 13.1: A snippet of the `claim` function in `arcade-protocol/contracts/LoanCore.sol`

Owing to the inherent nature of the blockchain, achieving precise synchronization between the `block.timestamp` and the `dueDate` is practically impossible. Moreover, repaying a loan before the `dueDate` would result in a loss of some of the loan's inherent value because the protocol's interest assessment design does not refund any part of the interest for early repayment. In a scenario in which `block.timestamp` is greater than `dueDate`, a lender can preempt a borrower's loan repayment attempt, invoke the `claim` function, and liquidate the borrower's collateral. Frequently, collateral will be worth more than the loaned assets, giving lenders an incentive to do this. Given the protocol's interest assessment design, the Arcade team should implement a grace period following the maturity date where no additional interest is expected to be assessed beyond the period agreed to in the loan terms. This buffer would give the borrower an opportunity to fully capitalize on the term of their loan without the risk of defaulting and losing their collateral. `hashey` 49 `Arcade.xyzV3SecurityAssessment PUBLIC`

Exploit Scenario Alice, a borrower, takes out a loan from Eve using Arcade's NFT lending protocol. Alice deposits her rare `CryptoPunk` as collateral, which is more valuable than the assets loaned to her, so that her position is over-collateralized. Alice plans to hold on to the lent assets for the entire duration of the loan period in order to maximize her benefit-to-cost ratio. Eve, the lender, is monitoring the blockchain for the moment when the `block.timestamp` is greater than or equal to the `dueDate` so that she can call the `claim` function and liquidate Alice's `CryptoPunk`. As soon as the loan term is up, Alice submits a transaction to the `repay` function, and Eve front-runs that transaction with her own call to the `claim` function. As a result, Eve is able to liquidate Alice's `CryptoPunk` collateral. **Recommendations** Short term, introduce a grace period after the loan's maturity date during which the lender cannot invoke the `claim` function. This buffer would give the borrowers sufficient time to repay the loan without the risk of immediate collateral liquidation. Long term, revise the protocol's interest assessment design to allow a portion of the interest to be refunded in cases of early repayment. This change could reduce the incentive for borrowers to delay repayment until the last possible moment. Additionally, provide better education for borrowers on how the lending protocol works, particularly around

14.itemPredicatesencodedincorrectlyaccordingtoEIP-712 Severity:LowDifficulty:Low
Type:ConfigurationFindingID:TOB-ARCADE-14 Target: contracts/OriginationController.sol Description
The itemPredicates parameterisnotencodedcorrectly,sothesignercannotseethe
verifieraddresswhensigning.Theverifieraddressreceiveseachbatchoflistedassetsto
checkthemforcorrectnessandexistence,whichisvitaltoensuringthesecurityand
integrityofthelendingtransaction. AccordingtoEIP-
712,structureddatashouldbehashedinconjunctionwithits typeHash . Thefollowingisthe hashStruct
functionasdefinedinEIP-712: hashStruct(s:[])=keccak256(typeHash 0 encodeData(s))
wheretypeHash=keccak256(encodeType(typeOf(s)))
Intheprotocol,therecoverItemsSignaturefunctionhashesanarrayofPredicate[]
structsthatarepassedinasthe itemPredicates argument.Thefunctionencodesand
hashesthearraywithoutaddingthe PredicateTypeHash toeachmemberofthearray.
Thehashedoutputofthatoperationisthenincludedinthe _ITEMS_TYPEHASH variableas a bytes32
type,referredtoas itemsHash . 208(bytes32sighash,addressexternalSigner)=recoverItemsSignature(
209loanTerms, 210sig, 211nonce, 212neededSide, 213keccak256(abi.encode(itemPredicates)) 214);
Figure14.1:Asnipetofthe initializeLoanWithItems functionin arcade-
protocol/contracts/OriginationController.sol 85bytes32privateconstant_ITEMS_TYPEHASH= 86keccak256(
87//solhint-disablemax-line-length 88"LoanTermsWithItems(uint32durationSecs,uint32deadline,uint160
proratedInterestRate,uint256principal,addresscollateralAddress,bytes32
itemsHash,addresspayableCurrency,bytes32affiliateCode,uint160nonce,uint8side)" 89); hashey
51Arcade.xyzV3SecurityAssessment PUBLIC

Figure14.2:The _ITEMS_TYPEHASH variablein arcade-protocol/contracts/OriginationController.sol
However,thismethodofencodinganarrayofstructsisnotconsistentwiththeEIP-712
guidelines,whichstipulatesthefollowing:

"Thearrayvaluesareencodedasthekeccak256hashoftheconcatenatedencodeDataof
theircontents(i.e.,theencodingofSomeType[5]isidenticaltothatofastructcontaining
fivemembersoftypeSomeType).

ThestructvaluesareencodedrecursivelyashashStruct(value).Thisisundefinedfor cyclicaldata."

Therefore,theprotocolshoulditerateoverthe itemPredicates array,encodingeach Predicate
instanceseparatelywithitsrespective typeHash . ExploitScenario

AlicecreatesaloanofferingthattakesCryptoPunksascollateral.Shesubmitstheloan
termstotheArcadeprotocol.Bob,aCryptoPunkholder,navigatestheArcadeUItoaccept Alice'sloanterms.AnEIP-
712signaturerequestappearsinMetaMaskforBobtosign.Bob

cannotvalidatewhetherthemessageheissigningusethCryptoPunkverifiercontract
becausethatinformationisnotincludedinthehash. Recommendations Shortterm,adjusttheencodingof
itemPredicates tocomplywithEIP-712standards. Havethecodeiteratethroughthe itemPredicates
arrayandencodeeach Predicate instanceseparatelywithitsassociated typeHash .Additionally,refactorthe
_ITEMS_TYPEHASH variablesothatthe PredicateTypeHash definitionisappendedtoit andreplacethe
bytes32itemsHash parameterwith Predicate[]items .Thisrevision
willallowthesignertoseetheverifieraddressofthemessagetheyaresigning,ensuring
thevalidityofeachbatchofitems,inadditiontocomplyingwiththeEIP-712standard.

Longterm,strictlyadheretoestablishedEthereumprotocolssuchasEIP-712.These
standardsexisttoensureinteroperability,security,andpredictablebehaviorinthe
Ethereumecosystem.Violatingthesenormscanleadto unforeseen security vulnerabilities. hashey
52Arcade.xyzV3SecurityAssessment PUBLIC

15.Thefeevalescandistorttheincentivesfortheborrowersandlenders

Severity:InformationalDifficulty:High Type:DataValidationFindingID:TOB-ARCADE-15 Target:
contracts/FeeController.sol Description

ArcadeV3containsninefeesettings.Sixofthesefeesaretobepaidbythelender,twoare
tobepaidbytheborrower,andtheremainingfeeistobepaidbytheborrowerifthey
decidetomintanewvaultfortheircollateral.Dependingonthevaluesofthesettings,
theincentivescanchangeforbothloancounterparties.

Forexample,tocreateanewloan,boththeborrowerandlenderhavetopayorigination
fees,andeventually,theloanmustberolledover,repaid,ordefaulted.Inthefirstcase,
boththenewlenderandborrowerpayrolloverfees;notthattheoriginallenderpaysno
feesatallforclosingtheloan.Inthesecondcase,thelenderpaysinterestfeesand
principalfeesonclosingtheloan.Finally,iftheloanisdefaulted,thelenderpaysdefault
feetoliquidatethecollateral. Thevariousfeespaidbasedontheoutcomeoftheloanresultin an interesting
incentivegameforinvestorsintheprotocol,dependingontheactualvaluesofthefee
settings.Ifthelenderrolloverfeeis cheaper than the origination fee, investors maybe
incentivizedtorolloverexistingloansinsteadofcreatingnewones,benefitingtheoriginal

lenders by saving them the closing fees, and harming the borrowers by indirectly raising the interest rate to compensate. Similarly, if the lender rollover fees are higher than the closing fees, lenders will be less incentivized to rollover loans. In summary, having such fine control over possible fee settings introduces hard-to-predict incentive scenarios that can scare users away or cause users who do not account for fees to inadvertently lose profits. Recommendations Short term, clearly inform borrowers and lenders of all of the existing fees and their current values at the moment a loan is opened, as well as the various possible outcomes, including the expected net profits if the loan is repaid, rolled over, defaulted, or redeemed. Long term, add interactive ways for users to calculate their expected profits, such as a loan simulator. hashey 53 Arcade.xyzV3SecurityAssessment PUBLIC

16. Malicious borrowers can use forceRepay to grief lenders Severity: Medium Difficulty: Low Type: Data Validation Finding ID: TOB-ARCADE-16 Target: contracts/RepaymentController.sol Description A malicious borrower can grief a lender by calling the forceRepay function instead of the repay function; doing so would allow the borrower to pay less in gas fees and require the lender to perform a separate transaction to retrieve their funds (using the redeemNote function) and to pay a redeem fee. At any time after the loan is set and before the lender claims the collateral if the loan is past its due date, the borrower has to pay their full debt back in order to recover their assets. For doing so, there are two functions in RepaymentController: repay and forceRepay. The difference between them is that the latter transfers the token to the LoanCore contract instead of directly to the lender. It is meant to allow the borrower to pay their obligations when the lender cannot receive tokens for any reason. For the lender to get their tokens back in this scenario, they must call the redeemNote function in RepaymentController, which in turn calls LoanCore.redeemNote, which transfers the token to an address set by the lender in the call. Because the borrower is free to decide which function to call to repay their debt, they can arbitrarily decide to do so via forceRepay, obligating the lender to send a transaction (with its associated gas fees) to recover their tokens. Additionally, depending on the configuration of the protocol, it is possible that the lender has to pay an additional fee (LENDER_REDEEM_FEE) to get back their own tokens, cutting their profits with no chance to opt out. 126 function redeemNote(uint256 loanId, address to) external override { 127 LoanLibrary loanData = LoanCore.getLoan(loanId); 128 (uint256 amountOwed) = LoanCore.getNoteReceipt(loanId); 129 130 if (data.state != LoanLibrary.LoanState.Repaid) revert RC_InvalidState(data.state); 131 address lender = lenderNote.ownerOf(loanId); 132 if (lender != msg.sender) revert RC_OnlyLender(lender, msg.sender); 133 uint256 redeemFee = (amountOwed * feeController.get(FL_09)) / BASIS_POINTS_DENOMINATOR; hashey 54 Arcade.xyzV3SecurityAssessment PUBLIC

135 136 LoanCore.redeemNote(loanId, redeemFee, to); 137 } Figure 16.1: The redeemNote function in arcade-protocol/contracts/RepaymentController.sol

Note that, from the perspective of the borrower, it is actually cheaper to call forceRepay than repay because of the gas saved by not transferring the token to the lender and not burning one of the promissory notes. Exploit Scenario Bob has to pay back his loan, and he decides to do so via forceRepay to save gas in the transaction. Lucy, the lender, wants her tokens back. She is now forced to call redeemNote to get them. In this transaction, she lost the gas fees that the borrower would have paid to send the tokens directly to her, and she has to pay an additional fee (LENDER_REDEEMER_FEE), causing her to receive less value from the loan than she originally expected. Recommendations Short term, remove the incentive (the lower gas cost) for the borrower to call forceRepay instead of repay. Consider taking one of the following actions: • Force the lender to always pull their funds using the redeemNote function. This can be achieved by removing the repay function and requiring the borrower to call forceRepay. • Remove the forceRepay function and modify the repay function so that it transfers the funds to the lender in a try/catch statement and creates a redeem note (which the lender can exchange for their funds using the redeemNote function) only if that transfer fails. Long term, when designing a smart contract protocol, always consider the incentives for each party to perform actions in the protocol, and avoid making a actor pay for the mistakes or maliciousness of others. By thoroughly documenting the incentives structure, flaws can be spotted and mitigated before the protocol goes live. hashey 55 Arcade.xyzV3SecurityAssessment 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

AuditingandLoggingInsufficientauditingofactionsorloggingofproblems
AuthenticationImproperidentificationofusers
ConfigurationMisconfiguredservers, devices, orsoftwarecomponents
CryptographyAbreachofsystemconfidentialityorintegrity DataExposureExposureofsensitiveinformation
DataValidationImproperrelianceonthestructureorvaluesofdata
DenialofServiceAsystemfailurewithanavailabilityimpact
ErrorReportingInsecureorinsufficientreportingoferrorconditions
PatchingUseofanoutdatedsoftwarepackageorlibrary
SessionManagementImproperidentificationofauthenticatedusers
TestingInsufficienttestmethodologyortestcoverage TimingRaceconditionsorotherorder-of-
operationsflaws UndefinedBehaviorUndefinedbehaviortriggeredwithinthepublic hashey
56Arcade.xyzV3SecurityAssessment PUBLIC

SeverityLevels SeverityDescription

InformationalTheissuedoesnotposean immediateriskbutisrelevanttosecuritybest practices.
UndeterminedTheextentoftheriskwasnotdeterminedduringthisengagement.
LowTheriskissmallorisnotonetheclienthasindicatedisimportant.
MediumUserinformationisatrisk;exploitationcouldposereputational, legal, or moderatefinancialrisks.
HighTheflawcouldaffectnumeroususersandhaveseriousreputational, legal, orfinancialimplications.
DifficultyLevels DifficultyDescription
UndeterminedThedifficultyofexploitationwasnotdeterminedduringthisengagement.
LowTheflawiswellknown;publictoolsforitsexploitationexistorcanbescripted.
MediumAnattackermustwriteanexploitorwillneedin-depthknowledgeofthesystem.
HighAnattackermusthaveprivilegedaccesstothesystem, mayneedtoknow
complexttechnicaldetails,ormustdiscoverotherweaknessestoexploitthis issue. hashey
57Arcade.xyzV3SecurityAssessment PUBLIC

B. CodeMaturityCategories

Thefollowingtablesdescribethecodematuritycategoriesandratingcriteriausedinthis document.

CodeMaturityCategories CategoryDescription

ArithmeticTheproperuseofmathematicaloperationsandsemantics
AuditingTheuseofeventauditingandloggingtosupportmonitoring Authentication/ AccessControls
Theuseofrobustaccesscontrolstohandleidentificationand
authorizationandtoensuresafeinteractionswiththesystem Complexity Management
Thepresenceofclearstructuresdesignedtomanagesystemcomplexity,
includingtheseparationofsystemlogicintoclearlydefinedfunctions
DecentralizationThepresenceofadecentralizedgovernancestructureformitigating
insidertthreatsandmanagingrisksposedbycontractupgrades
DocumentationThepresenceofcomprehensiveandreadablecodebaseddocumentation Transaction OrderingRisks
Thesystem'sresistancetofront-runningattacks Low-Level Manipulation
Thejustifieduseofinlineassemblyandlow-levelcalls Testingand Verification
Thepresenceofrobusttestingprocedures(e.g., unittests, integration
tests, andverificationmethods)andsufficienttestcoverage RatingCriteria RatingDescription
StrongNoissueswerefound, andthesystemexceedsindustrystandards.
SatisfactoryMinorissueswerefound, butthesystemiscompliantwithbestpractices.
ModerateSomeissueshatmayaffectsystemsafetywerefound.
WeakManyissueshatataaffectsystemsafetywerefound.
MissingArequiredcomponentissing, significantlyaffectingsystemsafety. hashey
58Arcade.xyzV3SecurityAssessment PUBLIC

NotApplicableThecategoryisnotapplicabletothisreview.

NotConsideredThecategorywasnotconsideredinthisreview. Further Investigation Required

Furtherinvestigationisrequiredtoreachameaningfulconclusion. hashey

59Arcade.xyzV3SecurityAssessment PUBLIC

C. CodeQualityRecommendations

Thefollowingrecommendationsarenotassociatedwithspecificvulnerabilities.However,
theyenhancecodereadabilityandmaypreventtheintroductionofvulnerabilitiesinthefuture. •
Makefeenamesmoreexplicitandaddgettersforeachfee.Thenamesusedfor thevariousfees(e.g., FL_0x
)donotclearlydescribethefees.Readersofthecodewillhavetobetweenavigatebetweenthecurrentcontractandthe
FeeLookups contracttodeterminethetypeofeachfee.Additionally, addingcustomgetter
functionstothe FeeController contract(e.g., getLenderFee())cansimplifythesystembyallowing FeeLookups
toberemovedfromtheinheritancechainofthe OriginationController , RepaymentController ,and
VaultFactory contracts. • Ensurethatverifiersfollowtheprovideddocumentation.Accordingtothe
_runPredicatesCheck() NatSpecdocumentation,thefunctionrevertsifaverifier returns false
.However, someoftheimplementedverifierscanreturn true or false

or instead revert. Eventhoughthisdiscrepancyhasno direct impact on the system, an external entity interacting with Arcade may be confused by getting an IV_XXX error when they expected an OC_PredicateFailed error.

- Ensure that structure names are unique throughout the system. There are two structures named SignatureItem : one in ArtBlocksVerifier and the other in ItemsVerifier . Even though they are defined in different namespaces, it can be confusing to identify them because they have different members. Moreover, in the provided test suite, they are referred to as ArtBlocksItem and SignatureItem , respectively, making it more confusing for readers.
- Use automatically generated getters for public variables. OriginationController defines the mappings allowedVerifiers , allowedCurrencies , and allowedCollateral as public. The Solidity compiler automatically adds getters for these variables, but manual getters were added by the team (isAllowedVerifier , isAllowedCurrency , and isAllowedCollateral) with no additional functionality from the default getters.
- Ensure that comments in the code reflect the code's intended behavior. Here are two examples of off-by-one comments in OriginationController : OriginationController.sol#L669 and OriginationController.sol#L673 .
- Ensure that contract names match their filenames. The verifiers/ItemsVerifier.sol file contains the ArcadeItemsVerifier contract. hashey 60Arcade.xyzV3SecurityAssessment PUBLIC

- Remove variables that are never used or are used only once. For example, id in ArcadeItemsVerifier.verifyPredicates() is used only once in the function body.
- Avoid redefining constants. FL_01 in FeeLookups was redefined in VaultFactory .
- Remove unneeded or unreachable code. For example, the else condition in the ArcadeItemsVerifier.verifyPredicates function can never be reached because abi.decode will revert for incorrect CollateralType enum values. hashey 61Arcade.xyzV3SecurityAssessment PUBLIC

D. Risks with Approving NFTs for Use as Collateral

The Arcade protocol aims to whitelist NFT contracts to be used as collateral to back loans. These NFTs could introduce problems that could allow attackers to steal funds or otherwise impede the correct functioning of the system. We recommend that the Arcade team exercise caution in approving NFTs for use as collateral to ensure that the system keeps working correctly and that no user loses access to funds.

Follow these guidelines when considering which NFTs to approve:

- Tokens should never be upgradeable. Upgradeable ERC-721 tokens can introduce substantial risks when used as collateral in an NFT lending protocol. Therefore, smart contract developers should either prevent upgradeable tokens from being used as collateral or implement robust safeguards against the associated risks. Some of these risks include the following:
 - Unpredictable token logic changes: Because the contract owner or a designated admin can alter the logic of an upgradeable token, the token's behavior could change unpredictably during the loan period. This could affect the value of the collateral, render it worthless, or prevent its return.
 - Centralization and minimized trust: Upgradeable contracts introduce an element of centralization, as the power to upgrade the contract typically lies with a specific address or addresses. This could bear risk in a decentralized environment, where the ethos is to minimize trust in individual parties. The contract's owner could, maliciously or unintentionally, make an upgrade that jeopardizes the token's role as collateral.
 - Complexity and potential bugs: Upgradeable contracts are more complex than their non-upgradeable counterparts. This added complexity increases the risk of bugs and vulnerabilities, which could be exploited to the detriment of Arcade's lending protocol and its users.
- Tokens should not have a self-destruct capability. The self-destruct function allows a contract to be destroyed by its owner, which essentially removes the contract's bytecode from the Ethereum blockchain, making it nonfunctional. Here are some of the risks of using self-destructible tokens as collateral:
 - Total loss of collateral: If an ERC-721 token used as collateral has a self-destruct function and that function is invoked during the loan's lifecycle, the token will be rendered worthless. The borrower could default on their loan and the lender would not be able to claim the collateral, leading to a complete loss.

hashey 62Arcade.xyzV3SecurityAssessment PUBLIC

- Damage to the integrity of Arcade's lending protocol: Such tokens can undermine the integrity of the lending protocol. Lenders will be unwilling to participate if they believe that the collateral could self-destruct, making it harder for the protocol to attract and retain users.
- Lack of recourse: In traditional finance, there are legal protections to prevent the destruction of assets used as collateral. In contrast, in the blockchain world, there is no way to recover a contract once it has self-destructed, making it a significant risk for lenders.

Tokens should not be pausable. A "pause" function, when present in a smart contract, allows certain privileged accounts such as contract owners and administrators to stop specific activities such as token transfers for a period of time. Although this functionality can be useful for halting activities in case of a detected vulnerability or bug, it can pose significant risks to an NFT lending protocol, such as the following:

- Possible prevention of repayment and collateral retrieval: If a token used as collateral is paused, that token cannot be transferred. This means that a borrower could not repay their loan and retrieve their collateral, and similarly, a lender could not claim the collateral if the loan defaults.
- Market manipulation: In a worst-case scenario, a malicious token owner could strategically pause and un-pause a token, disrupting the market and possibly manipulating the token's value.
- Tokens should not be burnable by some authorized third-party. Tokens that can be burned by a third-party or token admin should not be permitted as collateral in an NFT lending protocol. "Burning" is a process by which tokens are permanently removed from circulation, thereby reducing the total supply of tokens. Although this feature can be useful in certain contexts, it can introduce the following risks when used in an NFT lending protocol:
 - Total loss of collateral: If the token used as collateral can be burned by an admin or third party, it could be burned during the duration of the loan, which would leave the lender unprotected in the case of a default.
 - Loan-to-value manipulation: Those with the ability to burn tokens could engage in manipulative behavior that disrupts the loan-to-value ratio, such as artificially influencing a token's scarcity and thereby its market value, thus leading to over-collateralization or under-collateralization.
 - Tokens should not hold or have access to other assets. Tokens can be structured to hold or interact with other assets on the blockchain. An ERC-721 token can be a

63 Arcade.xyz V3 Security Assessment PUBLIC

"wrapper" for specific ERC-20 tokens, generate yields from a DeFi protocol, or represent in-game characters with their own assets. Using them as collateral in a lending protocol comes with the following risks:

- Value fluctuation: If the token holds or has access to other assets, its value can change during the loan period if the value of the underlying assets changes. If a collateral changes value, it may no longer cover the value of the loan, creating significant risk for the lender.
- Asset removal or addition: If the token allows assets to be added to or removed from it, the value of the collateral could be altered during the life cycle of the loan. A borrower or a third party could remove assets from the collateral, decreasing the collateral's value; the lender and the protocol would have no means to prevent this.
- Valuation complexity: Valuing tokens that hold other assets is more complex than valuing simple tokens. Some assets are interest-bearing, some undergo rebasing, and most are traded on public markets. The complexities involved in accurately determining the value of such tokens introduces additional risks and complexities for the lender, the borrower, and the protocol in general.
- Gaming tokens with alterable intrinsic values should be avoided. Tokens are often used to represent unique digital assets in gaming environments, such as characters, equipment, and virtual real estate. Using them as collateral in a lending protocol carries some risks, such as the following:
 - Developer control: Game developers often maintain a degree of control over in-game assets, which may include the ability to create, modify, or destroy assets. If a game developer decides to flood the market with copies of a previously rare asset, or alter its capabilities within the game, the value of the collateral could be significantly affected.
 - In-game rules and actions: In-game actions by other players or changes to in-game rules can influence the value of the token. For instance, if the game involves player competition, other players' actions could diminish the value of the collateral token.

64 Arcade.xyz V3 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](https://github.com/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 below output from Slither for the token: `slither-check-erc[contractName][optional:--ercERC_NUMBER] slither[contractName]--printhuman-summary slither[contractName]--printcontract-summary slither-prop.--contractContractName#requiresconfiguration, and use of Echidna`

andManticore GeneralConsiderations

☐Thecontracthasasecurityreview.Avoidinteractingwithcontractsthatlacka securityreview.Checkthelengthoftheassessment(i.e.,theLevelofeffort),the reputationofthesecurityfirm,andthenumberandseverityofthefindings.

☐Youhavecontactedthedevelopers.Youmayneedtoalerttheirteamt oan incident.Lookforappropriatecontactson blockchain-security-contacts .

☐Theyhaveasecuritymailinglistforcriticalannouncements.Theirteamshould adviseusers(likeyou!)whencriticalissuesarefoundorwhenupgradesoccur. ContractComposition

☐Thecontractavoidsunnecessarycomplexity.Thetokenshouldbeasimple contract;atokenwithcomplexcoderequiresahigherstandardofreview.Use Slither's human-summary printertoidentifycomplexcode. ☐Thecontractuses SafeMath .Contractsthatdonotuse SafeMath requireahigher standardofreview.Inspectthecontractbyhandfor SafeMath usage.

☐Thecontracthasonlyafewnon-token-relatedfunctions.Non-token-related functionsincreasesthelikelihoodofanissueinthecontract.UseSlither's contract-summary printertobroadlyreviewthecodeusedinthecontract. hashey 65Arcade.xyzV3SecurityAssessment PUBLIC

☐Thetokenhasonlyoneaddress.Tokenswithmultipleentrypointsforbalance updatescanbreakinternalbookkeepingbasedontheaddress(e.g., balances[token_address][msg.sender] maynotreflecttheactualbalance). OwnerPrivileges

☐Thetokenisnotupgradeable.Upgradeablecontractsmaychangetheirrulesover time.UseSlither's human-summary printertodeterminewhetherthecontractis upgradeable.

☐Theownerhaslimitedmintingcapabilities.Maliciousorcompromisedowners canabusemintingcapabilities.UseSlither's human-summary printertoreview mintingcapabilities,andconsidermanuallyreviewingthecode.

☐Thetokenisnotpausable.Maliciousorcompromisedownerscantrapcontracts relyingonpausabletokens.Identifypausablecodebyhand.

☐Theownercannotblacklistthecontract.Maliciousorcompromisedownerscan trapcontractsrelyingontokenswithblacklist.Identifyblacklistingfeaturesby hand.

☐Theteambehindthetokenisknownandcanbeheldresponsibleforabuse.

Contractswithanonymousevelopmentteamsorteamsthatresideinlegalshelters requireahigherstandardofreview. ERC20Tokens ERC20ConformityChecks Slitherincludesautility, slither-check-erc ,thatreviewstheconformanceofatoken to manyrelatedERCstandards.Use slither-check-erc toreviewthefollowing: ☐ Transfer and transferFrom returnaboolean.Severaltokensdonotreturna booleanonthesefunctions.Asaresult,theircallsinthecontractmightfail. ☐The name , decimals ,and symbol functionsarepresentifused.Thesefunctions areoptionalintheERC20standardandmaynotbepresent. ☐ Decimals returnsa uint8 .Severaltokensincorrectlyreturna uint256 .Insuch cases,ensurethatthevaluereturnedisbelow255.

☐ThetokenmitigatestheknownERC20racecondition.TheERC20standardhasa knownERC20raceconditionthatmustbemitigatedtopreventattackersfrom stealingtokens. Slitherincludesautility, slither-prop ,thatgeneratesunittestsandsecurityproperties thatcandiscovermanycommonERCflaws.Use slither-prop toreviewthefollowing: hashey 66Arcade.xyzV3SecurityAssessment PUBLIC

☐Thecontractpassesallunittestsandsecuritypropertiesfrom slither-prop . RunthegeneratedunittestsandthencheckthepropertieswithEchidnaand Manticore. RisksofERC20Extensions ThebehaviorofcertaincontractsmaydifferfromtheoriginalERCspecification.Conducta manualreviewofthefollowingconditions: ☐ThetokenisnotanERC777tokenandhasnoexternalfunctioncallin transfer or transferFrom .Externalcallsinthetransferfunctionscanleadto reentrancies. ☐ Transfer and transferFrom shouldnottakeafee.Deflationarytokenscanlead to unexpectedbehavior.

☐Potentialinterestearnedfromthetokenistakenintoaccount.Sometokens distributeinteresttotokenholders.Thisinterestmaybetrappedinthecontractif nottakenintoaccount. TokenScarcity Reviewsoftokenscarcityissuesmustbeexecutedmanually.Checkforthefollowing conditions:

☐Thesupplyisownedbymorethanafewusers.Ifafewusersownmostofthe tokens,theycaninfluenceoperationsbasedonthetokens'repartition.

☐Thetotalsupplyissufficient.Tokenswithalowtotalsupplycanbeeasily manipulated.

☐Thetokensarelocatedinmorethanafewexchanges.Ifallthetokensareinone exchange,acompromiseoftheexchangecouldcompromisethecontractrelyingon thetoken.

☐Usersunderstandtherisksassociatedwithalargeamountoffundsorflash loans.Contractsrelyingonthetokenbalancemustaccountforattackerswitha largeamountoffundsorattacksexecutedthroughflashloans.

☐Thetokendoesnotallowflashminting.Flashmintingcanleadtosubstantial swingsinthebalanceandthetotalsupply,whichnecessitatestrictand comprehensiveoverflowchecksintheoperationofthetoken. hashey 67Arcade.xyzV3SecurityAssessment PUBLIC

The behavior of certain contracts may differ from the original ERC specification. Conduct a manual review of the following conditions:

- `transferFrom`: Transfers of tokens to the `0x0` address revert. Several tokens allow transfers to `0x0` and consider tokens transferred to that address to have been burned; however, the ERC721 standard requires that such transfers revert. `safeTransferFrom` functions are implemented with the correct signature.
- Several token contracts do not implement these functions. A transfer of NFTs to one of those contracts can result in a loss of assets.
- The `name`, `decimals`, and `symbol` functions are present if used. These functions are optional in the ERC721 standard and may not be present.
- If it is used, the `decimals` function returns a `uint8(0)`. Other values are invalid.
- The `name` and `symbol` functions can return an empty string. This behavior is allowed by the standard.
- The `ownerOf` function reverts if the `tokenId` is invalid or is set to a token that has already been burned. The function cannot return `0x0`. This behavior is required by the standard, but it is not always properly implemented.
- A transfer of an NFT clears its approvals. This is required by the standard.
- The `tokenId` of an NFT cannot be changed during its lifetime. This is required by the standard.

Common Risks of the ERC721 Standard

To mitigate the risks associated with ERC721 contracts, conduct a manual review of the following conditions:

- The `onERC721Received` callback is taken into account. External calls in the transfer functions can lead to reentrancies, especially when the callback is not explicit (e.g., in `safeMint` calls).

- When an NFT is minted, it is safely transferred to a smart contract. If there is a `minting` function, it should behave similarly to `safeTransferFrom` and properly handle the minting of new tokens to a smart contract. This will prevent a loss of assets.
- The burning of a token clears its approvals. If there is a `burning` function, it should clear the token's previous approvals.

F. Mutation Testing The goal of mutation testing is to gain insight into a codebase's test coverage. Mutation tests go line-by-line through the target file, mutate the given line in some way, run tests, and flag changes that do not trigger test failures. Depending on the complexity of the logic in any given line and the tool used to mutate, mutation tests could test upwards of 50 mutants per line of source code. Mutation testing is a slow process, but by highlighting areas of the code with incomplete test coverage, it allows auditors to focus their manual review on the parts of the code that are most likely to contain latent bugs.

In this section, we provide information on available mutation testing tools that could be used in the ArcadeV3 codebase, and we describe the mutation testing campaign that we conducted during this audit. The following are available mutation testing tools:

- **Universalmutator**: This tool generates deterministic mutants from regular expressions; it supports many source code languages, including Solidity and Vyper. Refer to the 2018 ICSE paper on the tool and this guest blog post about the tool on the [hasheyeblog](#) for more information.
- **Necessist**: This tool was developed in-house by [hasheyeblog](#). It operates on tests rather than source code, although it has a similar end goal. Necessist could provide a nice complement to source-focused mutation testing. Due to the time-boxed nature of this review, we deprioritized the use of Necessist to conduct an additional mutation testing campaign.
- **Vertigo**: This tool was developed by security researchers at Consensus Diligence. Integration with Foundry is planned, but the current progress on that work is unclear. Known scalability issues are present in the tool.
- **Gambit**: This tool generates stochastic mutants by modifying the Solidity AST. It is optimized for integration with the Certora prover.

We used `universalmutator` to conduct a mutation testing campaign during this engagement because the mutants it generates are deterministic and because it is a relatively mature tool with few known issues. This tool can be installed with the following command: `pip install universalmutator`

Figure F.1: The command used to install `universalmutator`

Once installed, a mutation campaign can be run against Solidity source files using the following bash script:

```
1 find contracts \
2 -name '*.sol' \
3 -not -path '*/interfaces/*' \
4 -not -path '*/test/*' \
5 -not -path '*/external/*' \
6 -print0 | while IFS= read -r -d '' file; do
7   name="$(basename "$file".sol)"
8   dir="mutants/$name"
9   mkdir -p "$dir"
10  echo "Mutating $file"
11  mutate "$file" \
12  --cmd "timeout 200s npx hardhat test" \
13  --mutantDir "$dir" \
14  -- "mutants/$name.log"
15 done
```

Figure F.2: A bash script that runs a mutation testing campaign against each Solidity file in the `contracts` directory. Consider the following notes about the above bash script:

- The overall runtime of the above script against all non-excluded Solidity files in the target contracts

repository is approximately one week on modern M2 Mac. This execution time is directly related to the npx hardhat test tool runtime and the number of contracts to be mutated.

- The `--cmd` argument on line 13 specifies the command to run for each mutant. This command is prefixed by `timeout 200s` (`timeout` is a tool included in the `coreutils` package on macOS) because a healthy run of the test suite was measured to take approximately 150 seconds. A timeout longer than the average test suite runtime is used only to cut off test runs that are badly stalled.

The results of each target's mutation tests are saved in a file, per line 15 of the script in figure F.2. An illustrative example of such output is shown in figure F.3. *****UNIVERSAL MUTATOR*****

```

MUTATING WITH RULES: audit-arcade/custom-solidity.rules FAILED TO FIND RULE audit-arcade/custom-
solidity.rules AS BUILT-IN ... SKIPPED 458 MUTANTS ONLY CHANGING STRING LITERALS 2761 MUTANTS GENERATED BY RULES
... PROCESSING MUTANT: 121: if(_feeController==address(0)) revert
OC_ZeroAddress();=>if(_feeController!=address(0)) revert OC_ZeroAddress();... INVALID
PROCESSING MUTANT: 121: if(_feeController==address(0)) revert
OC_ZeroAddress();=>if(_feeController<=address(0)) revert OC_ZeroAddress();... VALID [writtento
mutants/OriginationController/OriginationController.mutant.25.sol] hashey
71 Arcade.xyzV3SecurityAssessment PUBLIC

```

```

PROCESSING MUTANT: 121: if(_feeController==address(0)) revert
OC_ZeroAddress();=>if(_feeController>=address(0)) revert OC_ZeroAddress();... INVALID ...
PROCESSING MUTANT: 375: )public override returns(uint256 newLoanId){=>
)public override returns(uint256{... INVALID
PROCESSING MUTANT: 375: )public override returns(uint256 newLoanId){=>
)public override returns(uint256 newLoanId)... INVALID
PROCESSING MUTANT: 375: _validateLoanTerms(loanTerms);=>
/*_validateLoanTerms(loanTerms);*/... VALID [writtento
mutants/OriginationController/OriginationController.mutant.46.sol]
PROCESSING MUTANT: 375: _validateLoanTerms(loanTerms);=> selfdestruct(msg.sender);... INVALID
PROCESSING MUTANT: 375: _validateLoanTerms(loanTerms);=> revert();... INVALID ... 156 VALID MUTANTS
2605 INVALID MUTANTS 0 REDUNDANT MUTANTS ValidPercentage: 5.650126765664615%

```

Figure F.3: Abbreviated output from the mutation testing campaign on `OriginationController.sol`

The output of the universal mutator starts with the number of mutants generated and ends with a summary of how many of these mutants are valid. A small percentage of valid mutants indicates thorough test coverage.

The first highlighted snippet in the middle of the output is focused on mutations made to line 121 of the `OriginationController` source code. This particular line shows a

mutation with a false positive: this means that while the mutant compiles and passes all tests, the mutation does not imply failure in test coverage because the address cannot be negative. Other types of common false positives include removing the public visibility modifier from variable or function declarations.

However, the second highlighted snippet shows that commenting out line 375 of the `OriginationController` source code makes the test runs succeed. Because this change

can have consequences in the results of the function, this mutant is expected to be invalid given thorough test coverage. In that particular case, it means that none of the implemented tests for the `OriginationController` contract tried to rollover a loan with

invalid loan terms. For auditors, this is a cue to take an extra close look at the implementation of this method and at its use throughout the rest of the codebase.

We recommend running mutation tests on the code every time a major change is made to

the code or to the test suite, and we recommend filtering the results to ensure that the test coverage is correct.

hashey 72 Arcade.xyzV3SecurityAssessment PUBLIC

6. Incident Response Plan 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.).
- Clearly describe the intended contract deployment process.
- Outline the circumstances under which the Arcade protocol will compensate users affected by an issue (if any).
- Issues that warrant compensation could include an individual or aggregate loss or 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

privateDiscordchannelwhichabotwillpostthelatestvulnerability news;thiswillprovidetheteamwithawaytotrackallupdatesinoneplace. Lastly,considerassigningcertainteammembertotracknewsabout vulnerabilitiesinspecificcomponentsofthesystem. •
Determinewhenthe teamwillseekassistancefromexternalparties(e.g., auditors,affectedusers,otherprotocoldevelopers,etc.)andhowitwill onboardthem. ◦
Effectiveremediationofcertainissuesmayrequirecollaborationwith externalparties. •
Definecontractbehaviorthatwoulbbeconsideredabnormalbyoff-chain monitoringsolutions.
Itisbestpracticetoperformperiodicdryrunsofscenariosoutlinedintheincident responseplantofindomissionsandopportunitiesforimprovementandtodevelop “musclememory.”Additionally,documentthefrequencywithwhichtheteamshould performdryrunsofvariousscenarios,andperformdryrunsofmorelikelyscenariosmore hashey 73Arcade.xyzV3SecurityAssessment PUBLIC

regularly.Createatemplatetobefilledoutwithdescriptionsofanynecessary improvementsaftereachdryrun. hashey 74Arcade.xyzV3SecurityAssessment PUBLIC

H. Fix Review Results Whenundertakingafixreview,hasheyreviewsthefixesimplementedforissues identifiedintheoriginalreport.Thisworkinvolvesareviewofspecificareasofthesource codeandsystemconfiguration,notcomprehensiveanalysisofthesystem.

OnJuly24toJuly25,2023,hasheyreviewedthefixesandmitigationsimplementedby theArcadeteamfortheissuesidentifiedinthisreport.Wereviewedeachfixtodetermine itseffectivenessinresolvingtheassociatedissue.

Insummary,ofthe16issuesdescribedinthisreport,Arcadehasresolved12issuesand hasnotresolvedtheremainingfourissues.Foradditionalinformation,pleaseseethe DetailedFixReviewResultsbelow. IDTitleSeverityStatus 1Differentzero-addresserrorsthrownbysingleand batchNFTwithdrawalfunctions InformationalResolved
2SoliditycompileroptimizationscanbeproblematicUndeterminedUnresolved
3callApprovedoesnotfollowapprovalbest practices InformationalResolved
4Riskofconfusingeventsduetomissingchecks in whitelistcontracts LowResolved
5Missingchecksof_exists()returnvalueInformationalResolved
6IncorrectdeployersinintegrationtestsInformationalResolved 7Riskofout-of-gasrevertduetouseoftransfer()in claimFees InformationalResolved 8Riskoflostfundsduetolackofzero-addresscheck infunctions MediumResolved hashey 75Arcade.xyzV3SecurityAssessment PUBLIC

9ThemaximumvalueforFL_09isnotsetby FeeController LowResolved

10FeescanbechangedwhilealoanisactiveLowResolved

11AssetvaultnestingcanleadtolossofassetsLowUnresolved 12Riskoflockedassetsduetouseof_mintinsteadof _safeMint MediumResolved 13Borrowerscannotrealizefullloanvaluewithout riskingdefault MediumResolved

14itemPredicatesencodedincorrectlyaccordingto EIP-712 LowResolved

15Thefeevaluescandistorttheincentivesforthe borrowersandlenders InformationalUnresolved

16MaliciousborrowerscanuseforceRepaytogrief lenders MediumUnresolved DetailedFixReviewResults TOB-ARCADE-1:Differentzero-addresserrorsthrownbysingleandbatchNFT withdrawalfunctions Resolvedincommits 00e8130 and 8542c46 .The AV_ZeroAddress errorwasupdatedto includea stringaddressType argumentthatisusedtoindicatewhichaddress parameterviolatedazero-addresscheckrequirement.Additionalzero-addresschecks wereaddedtofunctions inthe AssetVault contract,unittestswereimplementedto

ensurethatthesechecksworkasexpected,andtheNatSpeccommentswereupdatedto reflectthisupdate. TOB-

ARCADE-2:Soliditycompileroptimizationscanbeproblematic

Unresolved.Arcadeprovidedthefollowingstatementaboutthisissue:

TheArcadeteamunderstandsthatSoliditycompileroptimizationsmaypotentiallybe

problematic.However toremoveourcompileroptimizationwewouldneedtodownsize

four of four smart contracts inextensiveways,breakingthemupintosmallercontracts

andconsiderablyincreasingourcodefootprint,introducingmorecomplexityand possiblynewrisks. hashey

76Arcade.xyzV3SecurityAssessment PUBLIC

Weelectednottodothisatthistime,giventhattheexistenceofavulnerabilityremains

undetermined.Beforethenextmajorprotocolrelease,theArcadeteamwillrevisithis issue. TOB-ARCADE-

3:callApprovedoesnotfollowapprovalbestpractices Resolvedincommits a3ce932 and 77c1db0 .The

AssetVault contractnowincludestwo newfunctions, callIncreaseAllowance and callDecreaseAllowance

,whichenable safeinteractionswithArcadeforthird-partyintegrations.The callApprove functionwas

temporarilyremovedincommit a3ce932 butwassubsequentlyaddedbackincommit 77c1db0 .Toaidthird-

partyintegratorsandtesttheexpectedfunctionalityofthenewly

addedfunctions,documentationandunittestshavebeenaddedappropriately. TOB-ARCADE-

4:Riskofconfusingeventsduetomissingchecks inwhitelistcontracts Resolvedincommit 2434705

.Twonewerrortypes, CW_AlreadyWhitelisted and CW_NotWhitelisted

, have been added and implemented for whitelisting functions. If the address has already been added or the address targeted for removal is not found, the white listing functions will now revert. NatSpec comments have been added to describe each error, and unit tests have been included to test the add and remove functions for the expected revert. TOB-ARCADE-5: Missing check of `_exists()` return value Resolved in commit `e04502b`. New reasons for `DoesNotExist` reverts were added to the Lending and Vault contracts. The VaultFactory and PromissoryNote contracts now use these revert reasons in the tokenURI functions when the requested tokenId is nonexistent. Additionally, new tests were implemented for VaultFactory and PromissoryNote that check for the expected revert reason when a nonexistent tokenId is used. TOB-ARCADE-6: Incorrect deployers in integration tests Resolved in commit `dddc905`. The incorrect deployers in integration test cases were changed from `signers[0]` to `admin`. A new test was implemented to check that the correct permissions are set when the protocol is deployed. TOB-ARCADE-7: Risk of out-of-gas revert due to use of `transfer()` in `claimFees` Resolved in commit `a948cfc`. Comments were added to inform users and developers about the issue, but no further changes were made to the contract. TOB-ARCADE-8: Risk of lost funds due to lack of zero-address check in functions Resolved in commit `a6dbd53`. Existing error types related to `ZeroAddress` were modified to include a string parameter indicating the address that failed the zero-address check (also refer to the fix status for issue TOB-ARCADE-1). The uses of the old error type with no arguments were replaced with the new version. `hashey 77Arcade.xyzV3SecurityAssessment PUBLIC`

New zero-address checks for the token and destination addresses were implemented in the `LoanCore.withdraw` and `LoanCore.withdrawProtocolFees` functions. Checks for the destination address were added to the `RepaymentController.redeemNote` and `VaultFactory.claimFees` functions. Existing tests were modified to account for the new string parameter in error types, and new tests were implemented for zero-address parameters in the fixed functions. TOB-ARCADE-9: The maximum value for `FL_09` is not set by `FeeController` Resolved in commit `a51dfd8`. The value of `maxFees[FL_09]` is now set properly in the constructor of the `FeeController` contract. The unit test suite has also been expanded to include tests that ensure that all maximum fee values are properly set. TOB-ARCADE-10: Fees can be changed while a loan is active Resolved in commit `f7b87a7`. The fix implemented for this issue consists of several parts. Fee names were changed. Previously, the `FeeLookups` constants ranged from `FL_01` to `FL_09`, where `FL_01` was the vault minting fee and `FL_02` to `FL_09` were the different fees that the borrowers and lenders should pay for a loan. The Arcade team renamed `FL_02` through `FL_09` to `FL_01` through `FL_08` and removed the former `FL_01` from `FeeLookups` and replaced it with `vaultMintFee` in `FeeController`. The functions for setting and getting the fees were renamed to `setLendingFee` and `getLendingFee`, respectively. The new `getFeesOrigination` and `getFeesRollover` functions were added to simplify the process of retrieving the fees for the loan origination and rollover processes. A new `FeeSnapshot` structure was created to take a snapshot of the fee values at the moment a loan is originated to ensure that future changes to fees do not affect existing loans. However, only the values for the default, interest, and principal fees (fees `FL_05` through `FL_07`) are stored, and the `redeemFee` (`FL_08`) is read from `feeController` at the moment of redeeming. Even though this feels counterintuitive, it is consistent with the statement given by Arcade for the fix status of finding TOB-ARCADE-16; having the `redeemFee` read from `feeController` allows protocol admin to change the fee to prevent griefing. Existing tests were modified to comply with the new changes. New tests were added in `RepaymentController` and `feeController`. TOB-ARCADE-11: Asset vault nesting can lead to loss of assets Unresolved. Arcade provided the following statement about this issue: The Arcade team understands the likelihood of this problem occurring is quite low because our UI does not allow for vault keys (vault tracking ERC721 tokens) to be `hashey 78Arcade.xyzV3SecurityAssessment PUBLIC`

deposited inside another vault contract. A power user would need to execute this type of vault key transfer via Etherscan. We elect to address this issue by:

- Thoroughly documenting this risk and providing clear and comprehensive warnings against this specific action in the documentation
- Maintaining our user interface to ensure that it does not present the option of using vault keys as collateral for loans

TOB-ARCADE-12: Risk of locked assets due to use of `_mint` instead of `_safeMint` Resolved in commit `20b7c66`. The `mint` function in the `PromissoryNote` contract has been updated to use `_safeMint` instead of `_mint`. Similarly, the `initializeBundle` function in the `VaultFactory` contract now uses `_safeMint` instead of `_mint`. These changes ensure that an ERC-721 token is not sent to a contract address that is not configured to receive it. The NatSpec comments have also been updated to reflect these changes. Additionally, the unit testing suite and mock contracts have been updated to adequately test the new expected behavior of the two altered functions. TOB-ARCADE-

13: Borrowers cannot realize full loan value without risking default Resolved in commits 6586c37 and f1eb8ae
. A new grace period after the original loan's
due date was introduced with the first commit. The grace period added in this commit was
a configurable setting that can be between one hour and seven days. An admin-only
function was added to set the new value, which emits events on changes or errors. A new
set of unit tests was added for the setGracePeriod functionality, and existing tests were
modified to take the grace period into account.
However, in the second commit, the variable grace period was replaced with a constant 10-
minute period. The variable period tests were removed, and the remaining tests were
modified to account for the change. TOB-ARCADE-14: item predicates encoded incorrectly according to EIP-712
Resolved in commit c95e21c . Item predicates are now encoded in compliance with the EIP-
712 standard. Rather than a hash representing an array of item predicates, an array of the actual Predicate
structs to be signed is now presented to the signer. A _PREDICATE_TYPEHASH has been created, and the
_ITEMS_TYPEHASH has been updated to correctly account for the array of Predicate
structs that is now represented in the
signature. The unit tests dealing with signatures that include items have been updated to
reflect the changes to the signature scheme. TOB-ARCADE-
15: The fee values can distort the incentives for the borrowers and lenders
Unresolved. Arcade provided the following statement about this issue: hashey
79 Arcade.xyzV3SecurityAssessment PUBLIC

Our V3 documentation will comprehensively outline all fees within the lending protocol,
pointing the user to their values at loan initiation. The Arcade team's objective is to help
users grasp potential profits and anticipated fees linked with loan repayment, rollover,
default, or redemption scenarios. TOB-ARCADE-16: Malicious borrowers can use forceRepay to grieve lenders
Unresolved. Arcade provided the following statement about this issue:
The Arcade.xyz team is aware that for honest lenders, having forceRepay called incurs
additional gas cost and possible fees. Nevertheless, the team has elected to keep the implementation as-
is: we feel that having two separate functions is more explicit, less
"surprising" design compared to having a single function whose effects may change based on external state.
In general, we believe the vector allowing borrower grieving is best mitigated through
proper incentivization and counterparty relationship management: borrowers
who have grieved lenders in the past are likely to receive lending offers with higher
premiums, as lenders try to mitigate their risk. In a larger sense, if grieving becomes a protocol-
wide issue, redeem fees can be set to 0. hashey 80 Arcade.xyzV3SecurityAssessment PUBLIC