



TRUFY

Smart Contract Audit Report
for
OmniFarming Vault V2
Final Report

August, 2025

Contents

- 1 Introduction** **2**
- 1.1 About Thorn’s Vault 2
- 1.2 Vulnerability Summary 2

- 2 Findings** **3**
- 2.1 ID-01: Unsafe Approve Usage 4

- 3 Appendix** **5**
- 3.1 Severity Definitions 5
- 3.2 Finding Categories 5

1 Introduction

OmniFarming V2 is a yield optimization protocol that extends the Yearn V3 vault architecture. It allows users to deposit assets into a vault, which are then allocated to various strategies to maximize returns. Key features include automated fund allocation, performance-based fees, and mechanisms to handle unrealized losses.

1.1 About Thorn's Vault

1.1.1 Project Summary

- Project Name: OmniFarming V2
- Language: Solidity
- Codebase: <https://github.com/Thorn-Protocol/omni-v2-core-contracts>
- Commit: 7a643bf80a57cf4c3a51d18ba61fb73abdffa4bd
- Audit methods: Static Analysis, Manual Review
- Scope:
 - ◊ contracts/protocol/Vault.sol
 - ◊ contracts/protocol/libraries/logic/DebtLogic.sol

1.2 Vulnerability Summary

Severity	# of Findings
Critical	0
Medium	1
Low	0
Info	0

2 Findings

ID	Title	Type	Severity	Status
ID-01	Unsafe Approve Usage	Security Issue	Medium	Checked

2.1 ID-01: Unsafe Approve Usage

Type	Severity	Location	Status
Security Issue	Medium	DebtLogic.sol line 285	Checked

2.1.1 Description

The `ExecuteUpdateDebt` function in `DebtLogic.sol` uses the `unsafe` method from the ERC20 standard to set an allowance for the caller. This approach can lead to potential issues with certain ERC20 token implementations that do not handle allowance changes safely, such as those that require setting the allowance to zero before changing it to a new value.

2.1.2 Recommendations

Replace the `unsafe` call with `ForceApprove` from the `SafeERC20` library to ensure compatibility with all ERC20 tokens and to mitigate risks associated with allowance manipulation.

```
283 if (assetsToDeposit > 0) {
284     address _asset = vault.asset();
285     IERC20 token = IERC20(_asset);
286
287     IERC20(_asset).forceApprove(strategy, 0);
288     IERC20(_asset).forceApprove(strategy, assetsToDeposit);
289
290     uint256 preBalance = IERC20(_asset).balanceOf(address(this)
291         );
292     IStrategy(strategy).deposit(assetsToDeposit, address(this))
293         ;
294     uint256 postBalance = IERC20(_asset).balanceOf(address(this
295         ));
296
297     IERC20(_asset).forceApprove(strategy, 0);
298
299     assetsToDeposit = preBalance - postBalance;
300     vault.totalIdle -= assetsToDeposit;
301     vault.totalDebt += assetsToDeposit;
302 }
```

3 Appendix

3.1 Severity Definitions

Critical

This level vulnerabilities could be exploited easily and can lead to asset loss, data loss, asset, or data manipulation. They should be fixed right away.

Medium

This level vulnerabilities are hard to exploit but very important to fix, they carry an elevated risk of smart contract manipulation, which can lead to critical-risk severity.

Low

This level vulnerabilities should be fixed, as they carry an inherent risk of future exploits, and hacks which may or may not impact the smart contract execution.

Info

This level vulnerabilities can be ignored. They are code style violations and informational statements in the code. They may not affect the smart contract execution.

3.2 Finding Categories

Gas Optimization

Gas Optimization findings refer to exhibits that do not affect the functionality of the code but generate different, more optimal EVM opcodes resulting in a reduction on the total gas cost of a transaction.

Logical Issue

Logical Issue findings are exhibits that detail a fault in the logic of the linked code, such as an incorrect notion on how `block.timestamp` works.

Inconsistency

Inconsistency findings refer to functions that should seemingly behave similarly yet contain different code, such as a constructor assignment imposing different require statements on the input variables than a setter function.

Coding Style

Coding Style findings usually do not affect the generated byte-code and comment on how to make the codebase more legible and as a result easily maintainable.

Mathematical Operations

Mathematical Operation exhibits entail findings that relate to mishandling of math formulas, such as overflows, incorrect operations etc.

Dead Code

Code that otherwise does not affect the functionality of the codebase and can be safely omitted.

Language Specific

Language Specific findings are issues that would only arise within Solidity, i.e. incorrect usage of **private** or **delete**.