

# Fabric Labs Zipper Protocol

Security assessment by HashEye · prepared for Fabric Labs

HASHEYE AUDITED

PROJECT	Fabric Labs Zipper Protocol
CLIENT	Fabric Labs
CATEGORY	Blockchain
PUBLISHED	May 1, 2025
REPORT ID	research-fabric-labs-zipper-protocol-2025-05-01-zksb0e

This report was produced under HashEye's layered review process – **automated detection**, **pattern correlation**, and **senior manual verification** – with every finding signed off by a human reviewer. Full findings detail and on-chain attestation are available on the report page at [hashey.io/audits/research-fabric-labs-zipper-protocol-2025-05-01-zksb0e](https://hashey.io/audits/research-fabric-labs-zipper-protocol-2025-05-01-zksb0e).

# FIVA Yield Tokenization Protocol Security Assessment May 30, 2025

Prepared for: Andrei Yazepchyk FIVA

Prepared by: Tarun Bansal, Nicolas Donboly, Coriolan Pinhas, Quan Nguyen

## Table of Contents Table of Contents 1

### Project Summary 3

### Executive Summary 4

### Project Goals 5

### Project Targets 7

### Project Coverage 8

### Codebase Maturity Evaluation 10

### Summary of Findings 13

### Detailed Findings 15

1. Lack of a two-step process for critical operations 15
2. Lack of validation checks in the upgrade\_storage operation handler 16
3. An attacker can prevent the redemption of YT and PT tokens from the YTMinter contract 18
4. Users can lose funds because of incorrect SY token configurations in the YTMinter contract 21
5. The SYWallet contract is not tested 23
6. Lack of a gas check in the wrap operation handler 24
7. Curve stable swap AMM is not usable 26
8. An incorrect balance check for the PT-to-SY swap can lead to a loss of funds 28
9. An attacker can grieve users by completing their liquidity provision operation 30
10. An integer overflow in the cube stable market invariant calculation can make the AMM unusable for swaps 32
11. The YTMinter contract's get\_claimable\_interest function deducts the protocol fee twice 34
12. Incorrect forward value when minting PT in function mint\_py\_jettons 36
13. Race condition in YT swap and index update can lead to loss of funds 38
14. Lack of validation checks in admin action handlers 41
- A. Vulnerability Categories 42
- B. Code Maturity Categories 44
- C. Code Quality Recommendations 46
- D. Fix Review Results 47

### Detailed Fix Review Results 49

## About HashEye 52

### HashEye 1 FIVA Yield Tokenization Protocol

#### PUBLIC Security Assessment

### Notices and Remarks 53

### HashEye 2 FIVA Yield Tokenization Protocol

#### PUBLIC Security Assessment

Project Summary Contact Information The following project manager was associated with this project: Mary O'Brien, Project Manager mary.obrien@hasheye.io The following engineering director was associated with this project: Jim Miller, Engineering Director, Cryptography james.miller@hasheye.io The following consultants were associated with this project: Tarun Bansal, Consultant Nicolas Donboly, Consultant tarun.bansal@hasheye.io nicolas.donboly@hasheye.io

Coriolan Pinhas, Consultant Quan Nguyen, Consultant coriolan.pinhas@hasheye.io quan.nguyen@hasheye.io Project Timeline The significant events and milestones of the project are listed below. Date Event February 27, 2025 Pre-project kickoff call March 10, 2025 Status update meeting #1 March 14, 2025 Status update meeting #2 March 28, 2025 Status update meeting #3 April 04, 2025 Status update meeting #4 April 11, 2025 Status update meeting #5 April 16, 2025 Status update meeting #6 April 25, 2025 Delivery of report draft April 25, 2025 Report readout meeting May 30, 2025 Delivery of final comprehensive report

### HashEye 3 FIVA Yield Tokenization Protocol

#### PUBLIC Security Assessment

Executive Summary Engagement Overview FIVA engaged HashEye to review the security of the yield tokenization protocol. This protocol allows users to break their yield-earning tokens into principal and yield tokens to provide fixed-yield assets and high-leverage investments. The protocol also implements an AMM to allow users to swap the yield-earning tokens with the principal and yield tokens. A team of one consultant conducted the review from March 3 to April 25, 2025, for a total of six engineer-weeks of effort. Our testing efforts focused on analyzing the access control system, input data validation, and error handling flow, identifying race conditions among user actions, corruption of contract state, arithmetic operation precision loss, and vulnerabilities to denial-of-service attacks. With full access to source code and documentation, we performed static and dynamic testing of the FIVA protocol smart contracts, using automated and manual processes. We did not review the deployment scripts and off-chain components during this engagement. Observations and Impact The codebase is structured well and broken down into small smart contracts that handle limited functionality to manage complexity. The documentation and inline code comments help developers and reviewers navigate the code and follow user action message flows through different smart contracts.

We discovered four high-severity issues arising from insufficient or incorrect data validation checks (TOB-FIVA-2, TOB-FIVA-8) and incorrect use of an intermediate contract to store temporary state (TOB-FIVA-3, TOB-FIVA-9). We identified race conditions that could lead to unexpected protocol behavior (TOB-FIVA-13). We also found low-severity and informational issues related to input data validation, incorrect gas checks, use of incorrect hard-coded values, arithmetic operation integer overflow, and inefficient access control checks. Additionally, administrative functions are implemented to update every storage value of the smart contract without validation checks. This introduces issues related to incorrect configuration (TOB-FIVA-4) and inconsistent system state. A human mistake in any administrative operation can break the protocol and lock user funds. Recommendations Based on the codebase maturity evaluation findings identified during the security review, HashEye recommends that FIVA take the following steps before deploying the protocol smart contracts in production:

- Remediate the findings disclosed in this report. These findings should be addressed as part of a direct remediation or any refactoring that may occur when addressing other recommendations.

## HashEye 4 FIVA Yield Tokenization Protocol

### PUBLIC Security Assessment

- Analyze and document the effect of race conditions. Document in diagrams all the different paths of user action flow, including the number of transactions and their state changes. Analyze these flow diagrams to detect race conditions and determine their effects' scope, and document them to discover and resolve security issues.
- Remove unnecessary administrative functions. Review all of the administrative functions to analyze if they are required for the core functionality of the protocol; if not, remove them. Group configuration update function to keep configuration values in sync in a single contract or multiple contracts.
- Improve the test suite. Consider invalid or malicious user inputs to test protocol stability against them. Add test cases for getter functions and cover more code paths, such as the locked token amount in the Pool contract. Finding Severities and Categories

The following tables provide the number of findings by severity and category. EXPOSURE ANALYSIS  
Severity Count High 5 Medium 1 Low 2 Informational 6 Undetermined 0

CATEGORY BREAKDOWN Category Count Configuration 2 Data Validation 6 Denial of Service 1 Testing 1  
Timing 1 Undefined Behavior 3

Project Goals The engagement was scoped to provide a security assessment of the FIVA yield tokenization protocol. Specifically, we sought to answer the following non-exhaustive list of questions:

## HashEye 5 FIVA Yield Tokenization Protocol

### PUBLIC Security Assessment

- Are gas checks effective?
- Can access control checks be bypassed?
- Are user inputs validated sufficiently?
- Can users withdraw more than their share?
- Can an attacker steal funds from other users?
- Can the system reach an inconsistent state?
- Can an attacker make any of the smart contracts unusable?
- Can administrator actions break the smart contracts?
- Can an attacker grieve other users by blocking their operations?
- Can race conditions lead to unexpected outcomes?
- Are the mathematical formulas implemented correctly?
- Can an attacker exploit precision loss?

## HashEye 6 FIVA Yield Tokenization Protocol

### PUBLIC Security Assessment

Project Targets The engagement involved reviewing and testing the following target. contracts\_v2  
Repository [https://github.com/Fiva-protocol/contracts\\_v2](https://github.com/Fiva-protocol/contracts_v2) Version commit e74ada0 Type FunC Platform  
TVM

## HashEye 7 FIVA Yield Tokenization Protocol

### PUBLIC Security Assessment

Project Coverage 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:

- General: We reviewed the whole codebase for common FunC and TON blockchain flaws, such as missing or incorrect gas checks, issues with bounced message handling, and message parsing and building errors. We checked the use of modifying functions, message and storage cell limits, error handling logic, maintenance of the contracts' TON balance, and contract deployment and initialization, all for correctness.
- SYMinter contract: The SYMinter contract is used to wrap all of the yield-bearing tokens in the SY Jetton, which allows the FIVA protocol to interact with all the yield-bearing tokens with a standard interface of the SY Jetton. We checked whether user actions are completed and errors are handled correctly without leaving the system in an inconsistent state. We checked whether users can lose their assets and whether attackers can steal user funds. We also looked for vulnerabilities of denial-of-service attacks on the SY Jetton smart contracts.
- YTMinter contract: The YTMinter contract breaks the SY tokens into PT and YT tokens for yield tokenization. The PT token represents the principal part, and the YT token represents the yield part of the underlying yield-bearing token. In addition to the checks done on the SYMinter contract, we looked for issues related to the use of the RedeemDeposit contract, focusing on the access control checks and race conditions.
- Pool contract: The Pool contract implements a cube stable AMM for the SY, PT, and YT

tokens. We expanded the cube stable mathematical functions for the correct implementation of the AMM formulas. We looked for issues related to the index value sync between the Pool and the YTMinter contract. We checked if users can manipulate the pool reserves to steal funds from other users. We also reviewed the Pool, YTMinter, and SYMinter contract integration for chained operations to check if these operations are completed and do not leave the system in an inconsistent state. We also looked at race conditions in these chained operations to find issues leading to loss of funds or denial-of-service vulnerabilities. Coverage Limitations Because of the time-boxed nature of testing work, it is common to encounter coverage limitations. During this project, we were unable to perform comprehensive testing of the following system elements, which may warrant further review:

- Prophet smart contract

## HashEye 8 FIVA Yield Tokenization Protocol

### PUBLIC Security Assessment

- NFT collection and item smart contracts
- Curve stable and constant production AMM markets mathematical functions
- PT to YT and YT to PT swap operation handler functions
- Stake Jetton smart contracts
- Unlimited Jetton smart contracts
- Off-chain components
- Deployment scripts

## HashEye 9 FIVA Yield Tokenization Protocol

### PUBLIC Security Assessment

Codebase Maturity Evaluation HashEye 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 life cycle that should be addressed through standardization measures (e.g., the use of common libraries, functions, or frameworks) or training and awareness programs. Category Summary Result Arithmetic The protocol uses simple arithmetic operations to compute the YT token interest, swap, and liquidity token amounts for the AMM. The mathematical formulas are well documented. We identified an integer overflow issue in a calculation performed by the protocol, as described in TOB-FIVA-10. Rounding directions are not explicit; operations always round in the default direction. Performing an integer overflow and precision loss analysis to determine an effective precision scale for storing amounts would help mitigate the system's integer overflow and loss-of-precision risks. Moderate Auditing The FIVA team has deployed an off-chain monitoring system to monitor smart contract behavior and transaction data. The current system is focused on monetary transactions and data analytics. Adding new features to the monitoring system to detect an inconsistent system state, an unauthorized transaction, or an unexpected state change will help quickly detect and respond to a security incident. Moderate Authentication / Access Controls The protocol implements an effective access control system to prevent unauthorized access. All privileged functions have some form of access control following the principle of least privilege. The test suite includes test cases for positive and negative access control checks. However, we found multiple access control issues resulting from insufficient checks on the message sender (TOB-FIVA-3, TOB-FIVA-9). Documenting the authentication checks for all user actions and adding test cases for these checks can help prevent such issues. The system can also benefit from additional documentation Moderate

## HashEye 10 FIVA Yield Tokenization Protocol

### PUBLIC Security Assessment

specifying the roles, their privileges, and the process of granting and revoking them. Complexity Management The codebase is generally well structured and broken down into small contracts and functions. Each function has a specific and clear purpose and includes inline documentation. Core functions are straightforward to test via unit tests or automated testing. Satisfactory Decentralization In the current state, privileged actors have complete control over the protocol parameters, configuration, and upgradeable contracts. Issues TOB-FIVA-2 and TOB-FIVA-14 show that privileged actors can use the protocol to their benefit and profit from it. However, the FIVA team stated that initially, these privileged roles will be assigned to multisignature wallets with a timelock functionality. Eventually, the contracts will be immutable, and the ownership of contracts will be dropped, making the protocol decentralized. Weak Documentation The documentation provided consists of a high-level description of all user actions with message flow diagrams. Mathematical formulas are not documented; a formula simulation is provided to test correctness. The codebase includes extensive inline documentation, making it easy to understand the code. The documentation can be expanded to include privilege roles, their responsibilities, and the process to execute all

maintenance tasks. Satisfactory Low-Level Manipulation There are no instances of Fift assembly code in the protocol files. Not Applicable Testing and Verification The test cases do not cover the whole protocol codebase or features, and the test coverage is not 100% for several test files. Considering the TOB-FIVA-14 issue, we recommend improving the test suite by adding adversarial cases such as invalid configurations and incorrect action parameters. Additionally, the tests should use values that closely match those that will be used in production. For Weak

## HashEye 11 FIVA Yield Tokenization Protocol

### PUBLIC Security Assessment

instance, there are no test cases with non-zero values for locked PT or SY tokens in the AMM Pool. Adding test cases for the getter function can help detect issues such as TOB-FIVA-11. Transaction Ordering Even though the TON blockchain network does not allow users to time when transactions are executed, race conditions among user actions can affect the protocol's stability. The FIVA team minimized smart contract state synchronization risks by having the protocol collect all the required data and enforcing all system checks in one place. However, the risks of race conditions are not clearly identified or documented. We identified race conditions that could enable timing attacks, as described in issue TOB-FIVA-13. Creating a detailed user action flow diagram with the number of transactions and state changes from every transaction can help discover race conditions. Moderate

## HashEye 12 FIVA Yield Tokenization Protocol

### PUBLIC Security Assessment

Summary of Findings The table below summarizes the findings of the review, including details on type and severity. ID Title Type Severity 1 Lack of a two-step process for critical operations Data Validation Low 2 Lack of validation checks in the upgrade\_storage operation handler Data Validation High 3 An attacker can prevent the redemption of YT and PT tokens from the YTMinter contract Denial of Service High 4 Users can lose funds because of incorrect SY token configurations in the YTMinter contract Configuration Medium 5 The SYWallet contract is not tested Testing Informational 6 Lack of a gas check in the wrap operation handler Data Validation Informational 7 Curve stable swap AMM is not usable Configuration Informational 8 An incorrect balance check for the PT-to-SY swap can lead to a loss of funds Undefined Behavior High 9 An attacker can grieve users by completing their liquidity provision operation Undefined Behavior High 10 An integer overflow in the cube stable market invariant calculation can make the AMM unusable for swaps Data Validation Informational 11 The YTMinter contract's get\_claimable\_interest function deducts the protocol fee twice Data Validation Informational

## HashEye 13 FIVA Yield Tokenization Protocol

### PUBLIC Security Assessment

ID Title Type Severity 1 Lack of a two-step process for critical operations Data Validation Low 2 Lack of validation checks in the upgrade\_storage operation handler Data Validation High 3 An attacker can prevent the redemption of YT and PT tokens from the YTMinter contract Denial of Service High 12 Incorrect forward value when minting PT in function mint\_py\_jettons Undefined Behavior Low 13 Race condition in YT swap and index update can lead to loss of funds Timing High 14 Lack of validation checks in admin action handlers Data Validation Informational

## HashEye 14 FIVA Yield Tokenization Protocol

### PUBLIC Security Assessment

Detailed Findings 1. Lack of a two-step process for critical operations Severity: Low Difficulty: High Type: Data Validation Finding ID: TOB-FIVA-1 Target: contracts/SY/generic/maintance.fc

Description When called, the change\_admin operation handler function immediately sets the admin of the SYMinter contract. Using a single step to make such a critical change is error-prone; if the function is called with erroneous input, the results will be irrevocable. if (op == op::change\_admin) { ;; change the admin of the contract check\_sender\_is\_admin(sender\_address); storage::admin\_address = in\_msg\_body~load\_msg\_addr(); save\_data(); throw(successExitCode); } Figure 1.1: The change\_admin operation handler of the SYMinter contract

contracts/SY/generic/maintenance.fc#L9-L15 The same issue also affects the change\_admin operation handler of the EvaaSyMinter, YTMinter, PTMinter, UnlimitedMinter, and UnlimitedMinterV2 contracts and the change\_owner operation handler of the Pool contract. Exploit Scenario Alice executes the change\_admin operation to change the contract administrator but accidentally enters the wrong address. She permanently loses access to the contract. Recommendations Short term, use two steps for transferring critical roles: the first step to propose a new account for the role, and the second step to accept the role from the new account itself. Long term, identify and document all possible actions that privileged accounts can take, along with their associated risks. This will facilitate codebase reviews and prevent future mistakes.

## HashEye 15 FIVA Yield Tokenization Protocol

### PUBLIC Security Assessment

2. Lack of validation checks in the upgrade\_storage operation handler Severity: High Difficulty: High Type: Data Validation Finding ID: TOB-FIVA-2 Target: contracts/SY/generic/maintenance.fc

Description The upgrade\_storage operation saves the user-provided cell as contract storage data without validating its data. A malformed data cell can make the contract unusable. The upgrade\_storage operation handler of the SYMinter contract does not validate that the user-provided data cell includes all of the required storage fields in the correct format. A malformed, incomplete, or empty cell can be saved as the contract storage data, causing an exception from the load\_data function of the contract. This will make the contract unusable, as all the user actions will throw an exception. `if (op == op::upgrade_storage) { check_sender_is_admin(sender_address); cell new_storage = in_msg_body~load_ref(); set_data(new_storage); throw(successExitCode); }` Figure 2.1: The upgrade\_storage operation handler of the SYMinter contract contracts/SY/generic/maintenance.fc#L97-L102 The same issue also affects the upgrade\_storage operation handler of the EvaaSyMinter, YTMinter, PTMinter, UnlimitedMinter, UnlimitedMinterV2, Collection, and Pool contracts. Exploit Scenario Alice upgrades the SYMinter contract storage but accidentally enters an incomplete data cell and saves it as the contract storage data. After this, every user action fails because the load\_data function cannot parse the required storage data from the stored incomplete data cell and throws an exception. Recommendations Short term, implement a validation check in the upgrade\_storage operation handler to ensure that the new data cell includes all the storage data fields in the correct format and can be parsed without an exception.

## HashEye 16 FIVA Yield Tokenization Protocol

### PUBLIC Security Assessment

Long term, identify and document all possible actions that privileged accounts can take, along with their associated risks. This will facilitate codebase reviews and prevent future mistakes.

## HashEye 17 FIVA Yield Tokenization Protocol

### PUBLIC Security Assessment

3. An attacker can prevent the redemption of YT and PT tokens from the YTMinter contract Severity: High Difficulty: Medium Type: Denial of Service Finding ID: TOB-FIVA-3 Target: contracts/YT/redeem.fc

Description An attacker can complete a user's redemption of YT and PT tokens from the YTMinter contract by sending the redeem message with the user as the receiver. This allows attackers to prevent users from redeeming their YT and PT tokens for SY tokens. The FIVA protocol allows users to redeem their YT and PT tokens for SY tokens before maturity. This redemption process requires users to transfer both YT and PT tokens to the YTMinter contract with a forward\_payload, including a redeem or reddeem\_and\_unwrap operation, and the recipient of the SY tokens. On the first token transfer, the YTMinter contract deploys a RedeemDeposit contract with the register\_jetton message. The RedeemDeposit contract stores the YTMinter address, the recipient address, and the PT or YT token amount transferred by the user: `() register_jetton(slice recipient_addr, cell redeem_deposit_code, int pt_amount, int yt_amount, int query_id, int unwrap) impure { cell state_init = calculate_redeem_deposit_state_init(my_address(), recipient_addr, redeem_deposit_code); slice redeem_deposit_addr = calc_redeem_deposit_address(state_init); var msg_body = begin_cell().store_op(op::register_jetton).store_query_id(query_id).store_coins(pt_amount).store_coins(yt_amount).store_uint(unwrap, 1).end_cell(); var msg = begin_cell().store_msg_flag(msg_flag::bounceable).store_slice(redeem_deposit_addr)`

```
.store_coins(0) .store_msgbody_prefix_stateinit(state_init, msg_body) .end_cell();
send_raw_message(msg, CARRY_REMAINING_BALANCE); } Figure 3.1: The register_jetton function of the
YTMinter contract contracts/YT/redeem.fc#L20-L37
```

## HashEye 18 FIVA Yield Tokenization Protocol

### PUBLIC Security Assessment

On the second token transfer, the YTMinter computes a RedeemDeposit address using self-address and the provided recipient address as the `init_state` data and sends the `register_jettons` message to it. The same recipient as the first transfer will result in the same RedeemDeposit address computation for the second transfer because of the same `init_state` data. When the user has transferred a non-zero amount of both the PT and YT tokens, The RedeemDeposit contract sends a `finalize_redeem` message to the YTMinter contract and destroys itself: `if (op == op::register_jetton) { int pt_balance_msg = in_msg_body~load_coins(); int yt_balance_msg = in_msg_body~load_coins(); int with_unwrap = in_msg_body~load_uint(1);`

```
int pt_sum_balance = pt_balance + pt_balance_msg; int yt_sum_balance = yt_balance + yt_balance_msg;

if ((pt_sum_balance > 0) & (yt_sum_balance > 0)) { send_finalize_redeem(admin_addr, recipient_addr,
msg_value, pt_sum_balance, yt_sum_balance, query_id, with_unwrap); pt_sum_balance = 0;
yt_sum_balance = 0; }
```

```
save_data(admin_addr, recipient_addr, pt_sum_balance, yt_sum_balance); return (); } Figure 3.2: The
register_jetton operation handler in the RedeemDeposit contract contracts/YT/redeem/deposit.fc#L83-
L99 The finalize_redeem operation handler of the YTMinter contract compares the PT and YT amounts
transferred by the user, redeems the SY tokens for a minimum of the PT and YT token amounts, and
transfers the remaining amount of PT or YT tokens back to the user. The lack of the token transfer
initiator in the RedeemDeposit contract's init_state allows anyone to send a register_jetton
message to a user's existing RedeemDeposit contract by specifying the user as the recipient_addr of
the redeem message. An attacker can use this to complete a user's redemption by transferring only 1
nano ton of YT or PT token. The user gets back the remaining tokens and needs to transfer them back
to the YTMinter contract to re-initiate the redemption process. Thus, an attacker can prevent or
delay the redemption of the YT and PT tokens to grieve the users by setting up a bot to complete
the target user's redemptions. Exploit Scenario Alice transfers 1e9 nano ton PT tokens to the
YTMinter contract with the redeem operation and her own address as the recipient in the
forward_payload. Now, before Alice transfers her YT tokens, Eve transfers 1 nano ton YT token to
the YTMinter with the redeem operation and Alice's address as the recipient in the forward_payload.
Eve's
```

## HashEye 19 FIVA Yield Tokenization Protocol

### PUBLIC Security Assessment

`redeem` message sends a `register_jetton` message to Alice's RedeemDeposit contract, which redeems only 1 nano ton YT and PT for Alice and returns the remaining 999999999 nano ton YT tokens to Alice. Recommendations Short term, include the address of the PT or YT token sender address in the RedeemDeposit contract's `init_state` to make it unique for a combination of every YTMinter, redeemer, and recipient. Long term, create a system state specification with the state transition diagrams to document all the valid system states, specifically the intermediate temporary states. Follow the specification to ensure correct access control for all of the state transition functions.

## HashEye 20 FIVA Yield Tokenization Protocol

### PUBLIC Security Assessment

4. Users can lose funds because of incorrect SY token configurations in the YTMinter contract  
Severity: Medium Difficulty: High Type: Configuration Finding ID: TOB-FIVA-4 Target:  
`contracts/YT/maintance.fc`

Description The YTMinter contract owner can update the storage values of the `sy_minter_address` and `sy_wallet_address` variables using two different operations. Not keeping these variables in sync can result in users losing funds. The YTMinter contract allows the owner to update the `sy_minter_address` with the `change_sy_minter_address` operation: `if (op == op::change_sy_minter_address) { check_sender_is_owner(sender_address); storage::sy_minter_address =`

```
in_msg_body~load_msg_addr(); save_data(); throw(successExitCode); } Figure 4.1: The admin function to update the SY minter configuration contracts/YT/maintance.fc#L135-L140
```

```
The YTMinter contract also allows the owner to update the sy_wallet_address with the change_jetton_addresses operation: if (op == op::change_jetton_addresses) { check_sender_is_owner(sender_address); cell new_jetton_addresses = in_msg_body~load_ref(); slice jetton_addresses = new_jetton_addresses.begin_parse(); if (jetton_addresses.slice_empty?() == 0) { storage::sy_wallet_address = jetton_addresses~load_msg_addr(); storage::pt_minter_address = jetton_addresses~load_msg_addr(); storage::pt_wallet_address = jetton_addresses~load_msg_addr(); save_data(); } throw(successExitCode); } Figure 4.2: The admin function to update Jetton wallet addresses contracts/YT/maintance.fc#L38-L49
```

## HashEye 21 FIVA Yield Tokenization Protocol

### PUBLIC Security Assessment

The SYMinter and SYWallet contracts are interconnected contracts, and their stored values in the YTMinter contracts must remain in sync. If the owner updates the sy\_minter\_address without updating the sy\_wallet\_address value, users can lose funds from some actions. Specifically, when a user transfers their underlying asset to the SYMinter contract with the wrap\_and\_mint\_pt\_yt operation, then the SY tokens are transferred to the YTMinter contract with the mint\_pt\_yt operation. If the user warps and mints from a matured YTMinter, and the YTMinter owner updates the st\_minter\_address in the time between the internal\_transfer message reaches the YT minter contract's SYWallet contract and the transfer\_notification message reaches the YTMinter contract, then the SY tokens are sent back to the updated sy\_minter\_address. This will lead to loss of funds because the updated SYMinter contract will not authorize the SYWallet associated with the old SYMinter contract.

**Exploit Scenario** The YTMinter owner updates the sy\_minter\_address but does not update the sy\_wallet\_address. A user tries to mint a mature YT token and loses her funds.

**Recommendations**

Short term, update the owner functions to update the sy\_minter\_address and sy\_wallet\_address from a single function. Long term, review all the admin functions to ensure that token configurations remain in sync and other configuration changes do not break the system state.

## HashEye 22 FIVA Yield Tokenization Protocol

### PUBLIC Security Assessment

5. The SYWallet contract is not tested Severity: Informational Difficulty: Low Type: Testing Finding ID: TOB-FIVA-5 Target: tests/utills/setup.ts

**Description** The SYWallet contract is not tested because the syWalletCode variable is overwritten in the setup.js. Only the EvaaSYWallet contract is used for both generic and Evaa SY token contract tests.

```
async function compileContracts() { underlyingMinterCode = await compile('StakeMinter'); underlyingWalletCode = await compile('StakeWallet'); syMinterCode = await compile('SYMinter'); syWalletCode = await compile('SYWallet'); ptMinterCode = await compile('PTMinter'); ptWalletCode = await compile('PTWallet'); ytMinterCode = await compile('YTMinter'); ytWalletCode = await compile('YTWallet'); redeemDepositCode = await compile('RedeemDeposit'); syWalletCode = await compile('EvaaSYWallet'); evaaSYMinterCode = await compile('EvaaSYMinter'); evaaSYWalletCode = await compile('EvaaSYWallet'); evaaMockCode = await compile('EvaaMock'); } Figure 5.1: The test setup function tests/utills/setup.ts#L39-L53
```

**Recommendations** Short term, update the test setup file to use a different variable for the EvaaSYWallet contract. Long term, ensure that the old code coverage is not affected by the new code and new test cases.

## HashEye 23 FIVA Yield Tokenization Protocol

### PUBLIC Security Assessment

6. Lack of a gas check in the wrap operation handler Severity: Informational Difficulty: Low Type: Data Validation Finding ID: TOB-FIVA-6 Target: contracts/SY/generic/minter.fc

**Description** The lack of a gas check in the wrap operation handler of the SYMinter contract allows users to send just enough gas to increase the total\_supply but not increase the receiver's SY token balance by triggering an out-of-gas error in the SYWallet contract. This leads to an imbalance between the total\_supply and the sum of all user balances.

```
if (fwd_op == op::wrap) { ;; check if tokens come from the proper wallet throw_unless(error::invalid_underlying, equal_slice_bits(sender_address, storage::underlying_address));
```

```
raw_reserve(get_storage_gas_units(time_delta::day)* gas_unit_price, 4);  
;; if we have max_total_supply configured, we should check if we can mint more tokens if  
((storage::max_total_supply ≠ 0) & (storage::total_supply + jetton_amount >  
storage::max_total_supply)) { ;; return jettons back transfer_jettons( storage::underlying_address,  
from_address, from_address, jetton_amount, 0, query_id, CARRY_REMAINING_BALANCE, 0, null() );  
return (); } mint_tokens(to_address, jetton_amount, query_id, 0, null(), to_address,  
storage::jetton_wallet_code, CARRY_REMAINING_BALANCE); storage::total_supply += jetton_amount;  
save_data(); return (); } Figure 6.1: The wrap message handler contracts/SY/generic/minter.fc#L142-  
L169
```

## HashEye 24 FIVA Yield Tokenization Protocol

### PUBLIC Security Assessment

Recommendations Short term, add a gas check to the wrap operation handler of the SYMinter contract to ensure that the wrap operation consistently updates the whole system state. Long term, review the whole codebase to detect lack of gas checks or insufficient gas checks that can lead to an inconsistent system state.

## HashEye 25 FIVA Yield Tokenization Protocol

### PUBLIC Security Assessment

7. Curve stable swap AMM is not usable Severity: Informational Difficulty: Low Type: Configuration Finding ID: TOB-FIVA-7 Target: contracts/AMM/markets/curve\_stable/math.fc

Description The AMM/markets/curve\_stable/math.fc uses CUBE\_STABLE as SWAP\_TYPE instead of CURVE\_STABLE\_SWAP. The use of an incorrect swap type makes it unusable. The FIVA Pool contract uses the SWAP\_TYPE constant to modify the contract storage usage for different types of automated market-making (AMM) mechanisms. The protocol supports the constant product, cube stable swap, and curve stable swap AMMs. Each AMM has its own directory in the markets directory with a math.fc file in it. These math.fc files contain the AMM-specific invariant and swap functions along with the SWAP\_TYPE constant definition. The SWAP\_TYPE value is used in the load\_data and store\_data functions of the storage.fc file: if (swap\_type = CURVE\_STABLE\_SWAP) { storage::amplification\_coefficient = ds~load\_uint(8); } if (swap\_type = CUBE\_STABLE) { storage::sy\_pt\_price = ds~load\_uint(32); } Figure 7.1: A snippet of the load\_data function of the Pool contract contracts/AMM/storage.fc#L83-L88

However, the math.fc file of the curve stable swap has the CUBE\_STABLE value for the SWAP\_TYPE constant instead of the CURVE\_STABLE\_SWAP, as shown in the figure below: const SWAP\_TYPE = CUBE\_STABLE; Figure 7.2: The SWAP\_TYPE constant definition contracts/AMM/markets/curve\_stable/math.fc#L6-L6 The incorrect SWAP\_TYPE value results in the storage::amplification\_coefficient

value not being assigned, which makes the curve stable swap AMM unusable because of division by zero in all of the functions of the AMM/markets/curve\_stable/math.fc file.

## HashEye 26 FIVA Yield Tokenization Protocol

### PUBLIC Security Assessment

The curve stable swap AMM is deprecated; therefore, the severity of this issue has been downgraded to informational. Exploit Scenario The FIVA administrator deploys a new curve stable pool by updating the swaps.fc to include the curve\_stable/math.fc and using the curve stable pool configuration. However, the SWAP\_TYPE constant remains incorrect in the curve\_stable/math.fc , which makes the newly deployed pool unusable. Recommendations Short term, update the AMM/markets/curve\_stable/math.fc file to assign the CURVE\_STABLE\_SWAP value to the SWAP\_TYPE constant. Long term, improve the test suite to test all code paths and all contracts.

## HashEye 27 FIVA Yield Tokenization Protocol

### PUBLIC Security Assessment

8. An incorrect balance check for the PT-to-SY swap can lead to a loss of funds Severity: High  
Difficulty: Low Type: Undefined Behavior Finding ID: TOB-FIVA-8 Target:  
contracts/AMM/markets/swaps.fc

Description The AMM contract fails to account for locked SY tokens when validating PT-to-SY swaps, which can lead to users losing their PT tokens without receiving any SY tokens in return. In the FIVA protocol, users can swap between different token types (SY, PT, and YT) through the AMM pool. During certain operations, some tokens may be temporarily locked in the pool. The protocol tracks these locked tokens using the `storage::sy_locked` and `storage::pt_locked` state variables. When a user attempts to swap PT for SY tokens, the `handle_swap_pt_for_sy` function should verify that the pool has enough available (non-locked) SY tokens to fulfill the swap. However, unlike other swap functions in the codebase, this function checks against only the total SY supply without accounting for locked tokens: `if ((sy_out < max(min_sy_out, MIN_SWAP_AMOUNT)) | (sy_out > (storage::total_supply_sy - MINIMUM_LIQUIDITY)))` { Figure 8.1: The balance check in the PT to SY swaps `contracts/AMM/markets/swaps.fc#75`

In contrast, other swap functions correctly account for locked tokens. For example, the `handle_swap_sy_for_yt` function includes `storage::sy_locked` in its validation: `(sy_out > (storage::total_supply_sy - storage::sy_locked - MINIMUM_LIQUIDITY))` Figure 8.2: The balance check in the SY to YT swaps `contracts/AMM/markets/swaps.fc#124`

This inconsistency creates a problematic scenario when locked SY tokens are present in the pool. The swap validation may incorrectly pass because it checks against only the total SY supply, not the available supply. When the transaction proceeds to actually transfer SY tokens, it will fail due to an insufficient available balance. This would result in the user permanently losing their PT tokens without receiving any SY tokens in return, while leaving the pool in an inconsistent state where its accounting and actual token balances are out of sync, potentially affecting future operations.

## HashEye 28 FIVA Yield Tokenization Protocol

### PUBLIC Security Assessment

Exploit Scenario A user attempts to swap 200 PT tokens for SY in a pool where a significant amount of SY tokens are locked. The pool has a total of 1,000 SY tokens, but 900 of these are locked, leaving only 100 SY tokens actually available. The validation check passes incorrectly because it only compares against the total supply of SY tokens (1,000), not the available supply (100). When the transaction proceeds and the pool's state is updated, the user's 200 PT tokens are added to the pool, but the transfer of 200 SY tokens fails due to insufficient available balance. As a result, the user loses their PT tokens without receiving any SY tokens, and the pool's accounting becomes inconsistent with its actual token balances. Recommendations Short term, modify the validation check in `handle_swap_pt_for_sy` to account for locked SY tokens. Long term, expand the test suite to specifically verify swap behavior when tokens are locked in the pool.

## HashEye 29 FIVA Yield Tokenization Protocol

### PUBLIC Security Assessment

9. An attacker can grieve users by completing their liquidity provision operation Severity: High  
Difficulty: Medium Type: Undefined Behavior Finding ID: TOB-FIVA-9 Target:  
`contracts/AMM/markets/pool.fc`

Description An attacker can complete a user's pool liquidity-providing action by transferring an insignificant amount to the pool with the `add_liquidity` message, mentioning the same receiver as the user. This causes the user to receive significantly fewer LP tokens than expected. The FIVA protocol allows users to provide liquidity to the SY/PT pool. The liquidity provision process requires users to transfer both SY and PT tokens to the Pool contract with a `forward_payload`, including an `add_liquidity` operation. On the first token transfer, a `Deposit` contract is deployed to store the Pool address, recipient address, and the amount of SY or PT transferred by the user. On the second token transfer, the `Deposit` contract checks if both SY and PT are deposited and a `slippage` parameter is provided, then sends a `provide_lp` message to the Pool contract to mint LP tokens to the recipient.

```
if (op == op::add_liquidity) { sy_balance += in_msg_body~load_coins(); pt_balance +=  
in_msg_body~load_coins(); int min_lp_out = in_msg_body~load_coins(); int with_unwrap =  
in_msg_body~load_uint(1);
```

```
;; TODO: consider to use min balance limit (i.e. 1000 instead of 0) if ((min_lp_out > 0) &
(sy_balance > 0) & (pt_balance > 0)) { send_provide_lp(owner_addr, recipient_addr, sy_balance,
pt_balance, min_lp_out, query_id, with_unwrap); sy_balance = 0; pt_balance = 0; }
```

save\_data(owner\_addr, recipient\_addr, sy\_balance, pt\_balance); return (); } Figure 9.1: The add\_liquidity operation handler in the Deposit contract contracts/AMM/lp\_deposit/deposit.fc#77-92

## HashEye 30 FIVA Yield Tokenization Protocol

### PUBLIC Security Assessment

However, an attacker can exploit this process by making the second transfer before the legitimate user, sending a negligible amount of tokens while specifying the same receiver as the user and an arbitrary value for min\_lp\_out. Because of the same pool and receiver combination, the attacker's add\_liquidity message is forwarded to the user's Deposit contract, which then sends a provide\_lp operation message to the pool. Since the amounts of PT and SY are imbalanced, the user will only receive the LP tokens minted by the minimum of the PT and SY tokens while losing all the tokens deposited in the first token transfer. The slippage protection is bypassed because the attacker controls the min\_lp\_out parameter. Exploit Scenario An attacker exploits a vulnerability in the two-phase deposit process by targeting users who have deposited 10,000 SY tokens into the Pool contract but have not yet deposited their PT tokens. After identifying a victim's Deposit contract, the attacker sends a negligible amount of PT tokens, just enough to mint 1 nanoton LP token, to the pool while setting the victim as the recipient and specifying an extremely low min\_lp\_out value of 1, to bypass the slippage protection. When the Deposit contract processes the add\_liquidity operation, it executes the send\_provide\_lp function using the attacker's manipulated parameters. The victim receives 1 nanoton LP token while losing their entire 10,000 SY token deposit. Recommendations Short term, include the address of the SY or PT token sender address in the Deposit contract's init\_state to make it unique for a combination of every Pool, recipient, and token sender. Long term, create a system state specification with the state transition diagrams to document all the valid system states, specifically the intermediate temporary states. Follow the specification to ensure correct access control for all of the state transition functions.

## HashEye 31 FIVA Yield Tokenization Protocol

### PUBLIC Security Assessment

10. An integer overflow in the cube stable market invariant calculation can make the AMM unusable for swaps Severity: Informational Difficulty: High Type: Data Validation Finding ID: TOB-FIVA-10 Target: contracts/AMM/markets/cube\_stable/math.fc

Description The cube stable market AMM's invariant calculation can overflow when performing cube operations on large token supplies, exceeding TON's integer limits. The overflow will result in users losing their funds in an attempt to swap any tokens from the pool. This market AMM uses an invariant function that performs cube operations on token supplies, creating a significant risk of integer overflow. The invariant function is shown in figure 10.1: (int) invariant() inline { int res = math::cube(storage::total\_supply\_sy \* storage::sy\_pt\_price / DIVIDER) \* storage::total\_supply\_pt + (storage::total\_supply\_sy \* storage::sy\_pt\_price / DIVIDER) \* math::cube(storage::total\_supply\_pt); return res; } Figure 10.1: Invariant calculation for cube stable market ( contracts/AMM/markets/cube\_stable/math.fc#11-15 ) This formula involves raising token supplies to the power of 3 and multiplying large numbers together, which can easily exceed the 256-bit integer capacity used in TON. This overflow will result in transaction failures. In TON, integers have a maximum value of  $2^{256} - 1$ . If both SY and PT tokens have similar supplies and assuming  $sy\_pt\_price \approx DIVIDER$ , the invariant formula can be simplified to the following:  $token\_amount^3 * token\_amount + token\_amount * token\_amount^3 \approx 2 * token\_amount^4 < 2^{256}$   $token\_amount < 10^{19}$  Figure 10.2: Max token supply calculation

## HashEye 32 FIVA Yield Tokenization Protocol

### PUBLIC Security Assessment

For tokens with nine decimals,  $real\_world\_amount < 10^{10}$ , meaning if 10 billion SY and PT tokens are provided to the pool, an overflow can occur on the invariant calculation. Since the SY and PT tokens will always have nine decimals, the impact is limited to the case where the supply reaches 10 billion tokens. Users can withdraw their liquidity to bring the token supply below the 10 billion limit to make the pool swaps usable again. Exploit Scenario Eve, an attacker, adds a

calculated amount of liquidity that pushes the pool's total supply close to 10 billion. When Alice, a victim, attempts to swap PT to SY tokens, she sends her PT tokens to the pool. The invariant calculation in the pool contract overflows and traps Alice's PT tokens in the pool contract. Alice has already sent PT tokens but has not received SY tokens; she has lost her PT tokens. Recommendations Short term, document this limitation and deploy a system to monitor pool reserves reaching the 10 10 limit. Such a system will help prevent fund loss to users. Long term, conduct a thorough analysis of all mathematical overflows possible in the codebase. Based on the analysis results, implement overflow protection for identified critical paths, implement transaction revert handling, and update documentation with any additional discovered limitations.

## HashEye 33 FIVA Yield Tokenization Protocol

### PUBLIC Security Assessment

11. The YTMinter contract's `get_claimable_interest` function deducts the protocol fee twice  
Severity: Informational Difficulty: Low Type: Data Validation Finding ID: TOB-FIVA-11 Target: `contracts/YT/getters.fc`

Description The `get_claimable_interest` function of the YTMinter contract returns the wrong interest amount by deducting the protocol fee twice, resulting in users expecting less than the actual accrued interest. Users use the `get_claimable_interest` function of the YTMinter contract to estimate the accrued interest on their YT tokens. They can use this estimated amount to transfer the earned tokens to another contract. Users call the `get_claimable_interest` function with their YT token balance, `last_collected_index`, and `acquired_amount` stored in their YTWallet contract. The `get_claimable_interest` function executes the `get_acquired_interest` function to compute the newly accrued interest after the last claim action by the user and adds it to the `acquired_amount` to compute the total interest: `(int, int) get_claimable_interest(int yt_amount, int last_collected_index, int acquired_amount) method_id { load_data(); int acquired_interest_sy = get_acquired_interest(yt_amount, last_collected_index);`

```
int interest = acquired_interest_sy + acquired_amount; (int protocol_fee, int interest_wo_fee) = calc_protocol_fee(storage::fee, DIVIDER, interest); return (interest_wo_fee, protocol_fee); }
```

Figure 11.1: The `get_claimable_interest` function of the YTMinter contract

`contracts/YT/getters.fc#L111-L118` The YTWallet contract sends a `request_acquired_update` message to the YTMinter contract to get and store the interest acquired by the user at the time of the YT token transfer. The YTMinter contract computes the newly acquired interest and deducts the protocol fee before sending the interest amount to the YTWallet contract to store, as shown in figure 11.2:

## HashEye 34 FIVA Yield Tokenization Protocol

### PUBLIC Security Assessment

```
int acquired_interest_sy = get_acquired_interest(user_yt_balance, last_collected_interest_index);
```

```
if(acquired_interest_sy > 0){ ;; debt to the user in a form of interest acquired_interest_sy = take_protocol_fee(acquired_interest_sy); }
```

```
raw_reserve(fee::min_tons_for_storage_min, 4); ;; message to the wallet to update index update_wallet_index_and_acquired( storage::index, acquired_interest_sy, sender_address, 0, CARRY_REMAINING_BALANCE );
```

 Figure 11.2: A snippet of the `request_acquired_update` operation handler `contracts/YT/minter.fc#L90-L105`

However, the `get_claimable_interest` function deducts the protocol fee from the total interest amount, which includes the `acquired_interest` stored in the YTWallet contract after deducting the protocol fee. Thus, the `get_claimable_interest` function deducts the protocol fee twice on the user's stored `acquired_interest` and returns an incorrect interest amount. Recommendations Short term, correct the `get_claimable_interest` function to deduct the protocol fee only from the `acquired_interest_sy` value instead of the total interest amount. Long term, expand the test suite by adding test cases for the getter functions to check that they return correct values.

## HashEye 35 FIVA Yield Tokenization Protocol

### PUBLIC Security Assessment

12. Incorrect forward value when minting PT in function `mint_py_jettons` Severity: Low Difficulty: Low Type: Undefined Behavior Finding ID: TOB-FIVA-12 Target: `contracts/YT/mint.fc`

## Description

The `mint_py_jettons` function of the `YTMinter` contract assigns an incorrect forward value when minting PT jettons, resulting in excessive gas consumption. The `mint_py_jettons` function handles the minting process for both PT and YT jettons. As part of its logic, it calculates the forward value that will be included in the transfer notification message after minting PT and YT tokens by calling the `fee::mint_pt` and `fee::mint_yt` functions, respectively. ; ; mint PT and YT jettons (int )  
`mint_py_jettons(int jetton_amount, slice pt_recipient_address, slice yt_recipient_address, int query_id, int fwd_fee, slice fwd_cs) impure { (int pt_msg_value, int pt_mint_value, int pt_fwd_value) = fee::mint_pt(fwd_fee); (_, int yt_fwd_value) = fee::mint_yt(fwd_fee);`  
`cell pt_fwd_payload = fwd_cs.slice_empty?() ? null() : fwd_cs~load_maybe_ref(); cell yt_fwd_payload = fwd_cs.slice_empty?() ? null() : fwd_cs~load_maybe_ref(); pt_fwd_value = cell_null?(pt_fwd_payload) ? 0 : yt_fwd_value; yt_fwd_value = cell_null?(yt_fwd_payload) ? 0 : yt_fwd_value;`  
`int amount_to_mint = jetton_amount * storage::index / index_precision;`  
`mint_pt(pt_recipient_address, amount_to_mint, query_id, pt_msg_value, pt_mint_value, pt_fwd_value, pt_fwd_payload, PAY_FEES_SEPARATELY); mint_yt(yt_recipient_address, amount_to_mint, query_id, 0, yt_fwd_value, yt_fwd_payload, CARRY_REMAINING_BALANCE); return amount_to_mint; }` Figure 12.1: The `mint_py_jettons` function in `contracts/YT/mint.fc`

Later in the function, a check determines whether the forward payload is empty. If so, the forward value is overridden to 0; otherwise, it should remain unchanged. However, the value of `pt_fwd_value` is mistakenly set to `yt_fwd_value` instead of keeping its original value. Since `yt_fwd_value` is larger than `pt_fwd_value`, the PT transfer notification ends up using a higher forward value than necessary, leading to wasted gas.

## HashEye 36 FIVA Yield Tokenization Protocol

### PUBLIC Security Assessment

Recommendations Short term, correct the assignment of `pt_fwd_value` to ensure that it retains its intended value and is not overwritten by `yt_fwd_value`. Long term, develop test cases specifically aimed at validating gas efficiency and correctness in token minting workflows across all paths.

## HashEye 37 FIVA Yield Tokenization Protocol

### PUBLIC Security Assessment

13. Race condition in YT swap and index update can lead to loss of funds Severity: High Difficulty: High Type: Timing Finding ID: TOB-FIVA-13 Target: `contracts/AMM/markets/swaps.fc`

Description A race condition between the YT token swap messages and the Pool and YTMinter

contract index update messages can lead to loss of funds. The FIVA Pool contract allows users to swap SY to YT tokens. The Pool contract does not hold YT tokens as liquidity; therefore, it mints new PT/YT tokens for swapping SY to YT. When a user transfers SY tokens with the `swap_sy_for_yt` message, then the Pool

contract computes the amount of SY tokens needed to mint new PT/YT tokens: ; ; `sy_out` is equal to amount of YT which will be sent to the user (int `sy_out`, int `protocol_fee`) =  
`swap_exact_sy_for_yt(jetton_amount, inv_before); int yt_out = sy_out * storage::index / DIVIDER;`

; ; reserve amount of tons we had before message processing to prevent pool draining  
`raw_reserve(fee::min_tons_for_pool_storage, 4);`

if ( (`yt_out` < `max(min_yt_out, MIN_SWAP_AMOUNT)`) | (`sy_out` > (`storage::total_supply_sy` - `storage::sy_locked` - `MINIMUM_LIQUIDITY`)) ) { `send_sy_back(from_address, recipient_addr, jetton_amount, query_id, with_unwrap);` } else { `storage::total_supply_sy -= (sy_out + protocol_fee); storage::total_supply_sy += jetton_amount; storage::collected_sy_protocol_fee += protocol_fee; ; ; Pool will receive PT amount equal to YT_out in some time from YT minter`  
`storage::total_supply_pt += yt_out; storage::pt_locked += yt_out; ; ; If swap decreases pool invariant, don't commit it and return jettons back if inv_before > invariant() {`  
`send_sy_back(from_address, recipient_addr, jetton_amount, query_id, with_unwrap);` } else { int `fwd_amount` = `fee::mint_pt_yt(fee::avg_fwd_fee)`; `mint_py(sy_out, my_address(), recipient_addr, 0, fwd_amount, query_id, CARRY_REMAINING_BALANCE)`; `save_data(SWAP_TYPE)`;

## HashEye 38 FIVA Yield Tokenization Protocol

## PUBLIC Security Assessment

} } Figure 13.1: A snippet of the swap\_sy\_for\_pt message handler  
contracts/AMM/markets/swaps.fc#L115-L142

The Pool contract then computes the yt\_out amount by dividing the computed sy\_out

amount by the storage::index value stored in the Pool contract. This yt\_out is the expected amount of the YT and PT tokens that will be minted from the YTMinter contract by transferring out the sy\_out amount of SY tokens. The Pool contract adds yt\_out to the storage::total\_supply\_pt and storage::pt\_locked values. The Pool contract transfers the sy\_out amount of SY tokens to the YTMinter contract with the mint\_pt\_yt

message in the forward\_payload . The YTMinter contract receives the SY tokens and computes the amount of PT/YT tokens to mint by multiplying the storage::index values stored in the YTMinter contract with the amount of SY tokens transferred. The YTMinter contract mints new YT tokens for the user and new PT tokens for the Pool contract. The YTMinter contract sends the mint\_notification message with the PT tokens to the Pool contract to allow the Pool

contract to update the storage::pt\_locked value. storage::pt\_locked -= min(jetton\_amount, storage::pt\_locked); Figure 13.2: contracts/AMM/markets/swaps.fc#L313-L313 However, if the storage::index values stored in the Pool contract and the YTMinter

contract are not the same, then the yt\_out computed by the Pool contract will differ from the amount of PT tokens minted by the YTMinter contract. If the index is higher in the YTMinter than the Pool contract, then a higher-than-expected amount of PT tokens will be minted to the Pool contract, which will remain stuck in the Pool contract because they are not added to the storage::total\_supply\_pt value. A race condition between the swap message and the index update message to the YTMinter and Pool contract can lead to the storage::index value difference and consequently a loss of funds. This issue also affects the YT to SY token swaps, with a difference in the expected amount of redeemed SY tokens and the redeemed amount of the SY tokens. Exploit Scenario The FIVA protocol administrator wants to update the index value stored in YTMinter and Pool contract from 1.1 to 1.2. The administrator sends the update\_minter\_index

message to the YTMinter contract and then sends the update\_pool\_index message to the Pool contract. The YTMinter contract index is updated, but before the update\_pool\_index messages reaches the Pool contract, it receives a swap\_sy\_for\_yt

message to swap 1,000 SY tokens to YT tokens. The Pool contract expects the YTMinter

contract to mint 1,100 PT tokens, but it mints 1,200 PT tokens. The Pool contract adds only

## HashEye 39 FIVA Yield Tokenization Protocol

### PUBLIC Security Assessment

1,100 PT tokens to the pool liquidity, and the remaining 100 PT tokens are stuck in the Pool contract. Recommendations Short term, send the storage::index value from the Pool contract to the YTMinter

contract and from the YTMinter contract to the Pool contract. Additionally, update the pool reserves, considering changes in the storage::index value for the YT swap operations. Long term, analyze the codebase to document the assumptions that a value will remain in sync between multiple contracts, validate these syncing assumptions, and consider out-of-sync values when implementing features and test cases.

## HashEye 40 FIVA Yield Tokenization Protocol

### PUBLIC Security Assessment

14. Lack of validation checks in admin action handlers Severity: Informational Difficulty: High Type: Data Validation Finding ID: TOB-FIVA-14 Target: contracts/\*.fc

### Description

All smart contracts implement functions to update their configuration parameters and storage values. These functions lack data validation checks, allowing privileged actors to manipulate them to steal funds from protocol users. The following action handler functions lack validation checks:

- The update\_protocol\_fee action handler of the YTMinter contract allows the owner or maintainer to

update the protocol fee to up to 4294%. • The withdraw\_jettons action handler of the YTMinter contract allows the owner to withdraw any amount of any jetton from the contract. • The mint\_pt action handler of the YTMinter contract allows the owner to mint any amount of PT tokens. • The update\_lp\_fee action handler of the Pool contract lacks an upper bound check on the provided lp fee. • The update\_ref\_fee action handler of the Pool contract lacks an upper bound check. Recommendations Short term, add the validation checks described above to ensure that all configuration values and contract parameters have upper and lower bounds and validation checks. Long term, expand the test suite by adding cases to detect incorrect configurations.

## HashEye 41 FIVA Yield Tokenization Protocol

### PUBLIC Security Assessment

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

## HashEye 42 FIVA Yield Tokenization Protocol

### PUBLIC Security Assessment

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

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

## HashEye 43 FIVA Yield Tokenization Protocol

### PUBLIC Security Assessment

B. Code Maturity Categories The following tables describe the code maturity categories and rating criteria used in this document. Code Maturity Categories Category Description Arithmetic The proper use of mathematical operations and semantics Auditing The use of event auditing and logging to support monitoring Authentication / Access Controls The use of robust access controls to handle identification and authorization and to ensure safe interactions with the system Complexity Management The presence of clear structures designed to manage system complexity, including the separation of system logic into clearly defined functions Decentralization The presence of a decentralized governance structure for mitigating insider threats and managing risks posed by contract upgrades Documentation The presence of comprehensive and readable codebase documentation Low-Level Manipulation The justified use of inline assembly and low-level calls Testing and Verification The presence of robust testing procedures (e.g., unit tests, integration tests, and verification methods) and sufficient test coverage Transaction Ordering The system's resistance to transaction-ordering attacks

## HashEye 44 FIVA Yield Tokenization Protocol

### PUBLIC Security Assessment

Rating Criteria Rating Description Strong No issues were found, and the system exceeds industry standards. Satisfactory Minor issues were found, but the system is compliant with best practices. Moderate Some issues that may affect system safety were found. Weak Many issues that affect system safety were found. Missing A required component is missing, significantly affecting system safety. Not Applicable The category does not apply to this review. Not Considered The category was not considered in this review. Further Investigation Required Further investigation is required to reach a meaningful conclusion.

## HashEye 45 FIVA Yield Tokenization Protocol

### PUBLIC Security Assessment

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

- The `math::sqrt` function in the `math` library performs 15 iterations of the Newton-Raphson method, though mathematical analysis shows that only eight iterations are sufficient for full precision with 256-bit numbers. This results in unnecessary computation without accuracy gains. To improve efficiency, the iteration count should be reduced, and the initial estimate of `r` should be refined before iteration to enhance precision.
- The EVAA and YT token storage declarations contain storage named "maturiry" (with a typo), but the comment and the variable purpose refer to "maturity." This name should be corrected to improve code readability and prevent confusion.

## HashEye 46 FIVA Yield Tokenization Protocol

### PUBLIC Security Assessment

D. Fix Review Results When undertaking a fix review, HashEye reviews the fixes implemented for issues identified in the original report. This work involves a review of specific areas of the source code and system configuration, not comprehensive analysis of the system. From May 26 to May 28, 2025, HashEye reviewed the fixes and mitigations implemented by the FIVA team for the issues identified in this report. We reviewed each fix to determine its effectiveness in resolving the associated issue. In summary, of the 14 issues described in this report, FIVA has resolved 12 issues and has not resolved the remaining two issues. For additional information, please see the Detailed Fix Review Results below.

ID	Title	Severity	Status
1	Lack of a two-step process for critical operations	Low	Unresolved
2	Lack of validation checks in the <code>upgrade_storage</code> operation handler	High	Resolved
3	An attacker can prevent the redemption of YT and PT tokens from the YTMinter contract	High	Resolved
4	Users can lose funds because of incorrect SY token configurations in the YTMinter contract	Medium	Resolved
5	The SYWallet contract is not tested	Informational	Resolved
6	Lack of a gas check in the <code>wrap</code> operation handler	Informational	Resolved
7	Curve stable swap AMM is not usable	Informational	Unresolved
8	An incorrect balance check for the PT-to-SY swap can lead to a loss of funds	High	Resolved
9	An attacker can grieve users by completing their liquidity provision operation	High	Resolved

## HashEye 47 FIVA Yield Tokenization Protocol

### PUBLIC Security Assessment

10	An integer overflow in the cube stable market invariant calculation can make the AMM unusable for swaps	Informational	Resolved
11	The YTMinter contract's <code>get_claimable_interest</code> function deducts the protocol fee twice	Informational	Resolved
12	Incorrect forward value when minting PT in function <code>mint_py_jettons</code>	Low	Resolved
13	Race condition in YT swap and index update can lead to loss of funds	High	Resolved
14	Lack of validation checks in admin action handlers	Informational	Resolved

## HashEye 48 FIVA Yield Tokenization Protocol

### PUBLIC Security Assessment

Detailed Fix Review Results

T0B-FIVA-1: Lack of a two-step process for critical operations Unresolved. The client provided the following context for this finding's fix status: We are currently using multisig wallet with 2 out of 3 configuration. 2 step process will be implemented later in the scope of improved decentralization.

T0B-FIVA-2: Lack of validation checks in the `upgrade_storage` operation handler Resolved in PR #124 and PR #168. The `maintance.fc` files imported

by the Pool, SYMinter, EvaasYMinter, PTMinter, and YTMinter contracts now implement the validate\_storage\_cell function to validate the new storage cell provided by the administrator. The UnlimitedMinter, UnlimitedMinterV2, and Collection contracts do not need to implement the new storage cell validation check because they are not part of the production deployment. TOB-FIVA-3: An attacker can prevent the redemption of YT and PT tokens from the YTMinter contract Resolved in PR #126. The RedeemDeposit contract now includes the redemption initiator user's address in the init\_state and stores it as the requester\_addr variable. Additionally, the RedeemDeposit contract validates the token sender to be the same as the stored requester\_addr in the register\_jetton action handler. TOB-FIVA-4: Users can lose funds because of incorrect SY token configurations in the YTMinter contract Resolved in PR #153. The YTMinter contract now implements an action to update the SY minter and SY wallet address together, and another action to update the PT minter and PT wallet address together. TOB-FIVA-5: The SYWallet contract is not tested Resolved in commit 9744488. The syWalletCode variable overwriting statement has been removed from the test setup function. TOB-FIVA-6: Lack of a gas check in the wrap operation handler Resolved in PR #152. The wrap action handler of the SYMinter contract now checks that the gas is enough to complete the SY token transfer to the user's wallet. TOB-FIVA-7: Curve stable swap AMM is not usable Unresolved. The client provided the following context for this finding's fix status: We are not going to use Curve stable swap AMM in the near future

## HashEye 49 FIVA Yield Tokenization Protocol

### PUBLIC Security Assessment

TOB-FIVA-8: An incorrect balance check for the PT-to-SY swap can lead to a loss of funds Resolved in PR #136. The sy\_out validation check in the handle\_swap\_pt\_for\_sy function now deducts the locked SY amount from the total SY supply to compute the available SY token balance. TOB-FIVA-9: An attacker can grieve users by completing their liquidity provision operation Resolved in PR #127. The Deposit contract now includes the liquidity depositor user's address in the init\_state and stores it as the requester\_addr variable. TOB-FIVA-10: An integer overflow in the cube stable market invariant calculation can make the AMM unusable for swaps Resolved in PR #156 and PR #169. The Pool contract now limits the maximum amount of SY and PT tokens to be less than 10<sup>19</sup> nanotons in all of the YT swap functions and the liquidity addition function.

TOB-FIVA-11: The YTMinter contract's get\_claimable\_interest function deducts the protocol fee twice Resolved in PR #134. The get\_claimable\_interest function now correctly deducts the protocol fee from the newly acquired interest only. TOB-FIVA-12: Incorrect forward value when minting PT in function mint\_py\_jettons Resolved in PR #154. The mint\_py\_jettons function now correctly assigns the value of the pt\_fwd\_value variable. TOB-FIVA-13: Race condition in YT swap and index update can lead to loss of funds Resolved in PR #155 and PR #170. The Pool contract now sends its storage::index value with the messages to the YTMinter contract. The YTMinter contract uses the index value sent by the Pool contract instead of the value stored in its contract storage to mint to redeem the same amount of tokens as expected by the Pool contract. An attacker can exploit the use of the Pool contract index value in the YTMinter contract to get a higher amount from swaps when the index value in both contracts is different. However, such an exploit is extremely difficult because it can be done only in a narrow time window when the index value is different in both contracts and requires timing a series of transactions in the TON blockchain. Additionally, this issue has a limited impact because the index value changes by an insignificant amount with every update. TOB-FIVA-14: Lack of validation checks in admin action handlers Resolved in PR #157. The YTMinter and Pool contracts now implement validation checks to ensure that the configurable values have an upper and lower bound.

## HashEye 50 FIVA Yield Tokenization Protocol

### PUBLIC Security Assessment

E. Fix Review Status Categories The following table describes the statuses used to indicate whether an issue has been sufficiently addressed. Fix Status Status Description Undetermined The status of the issue was not determined during this engagement. Unresolved The issue persists and has not been resolved. Partially Resolved The issue persists but has been partially resolved. Resolved The issue has been sufficiently resolved.

## HashEye 51 FIVA Yield Tokenization Protocol

### PUBLIC Security Assessment

About HashEye Founded in 2012 and headquartered in New York, HashEye 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/hasheye-io/publications>, with links to papers, presentations, public audit reports, and podcast appearances. In recent years, HashEye 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 and government entities. Notable clients include HashiCorp, Google, Microsoft, Western Digital, and Zoom. HashEye 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 hasheye on X and explore our public repositories at <https://github.com/hasheye-io>. To engage us directly, visit our "Contact" page at <https://www.hasheye.io/contact> or email us at [info@hasheye.io](mailto:info@hasheye.io). HashEye, Inc. 228 Park Ave S #80688 New York, NY 10003 <https://www.hasheye.io> [info@hasheye.io](mailto:info@hasheye.io)

## HashEye 52 FIVA Yield Tokenization Protocol

### PUBLIC Security Assessment

Notices and Remarks Copyright and Distribution © 2025 by HashEye, Inc. All rights reserved. HashEye hereby asserts its right to be identified as the creator of this report in the United Kingdom. HashEye considers this report public information; it is licensed to FIVA under the terms of the project statement of work and has been made public at FIVA's request. Material within this report may not be reproduced or distributed in part or in whole without HashEye' express written permission. The sole canonical source for HashEye publications is the HashEye Publications page. Reports accessed through sources other than that page may have been modified and should not be considered authentic. Test Coverage Disclaimer

HashEye performed all activities associated with this project in accordance with a statement of work and an agreed-upon project plan. Security assessment projects are time-boxed and often rely on information 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. HashEye uses automated testing techniques to rapidly test software controls and security properties. 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. A project's time and resource constraints also limit their use.

## HashEye 53 FIVA Yield Tokenization Protocol

### PUBLIC Security Assessment