

EPNS Smart Contracts Review

By ChainSafe Systems





EPNS Smart Contracts Review

Auditor: Oleksii Matiiasevych

Warranty

This Code Review is provided on an "as is" basis, without warranty of any kind, express or implied. It is not intended to provide legal advice, and any information, assessments, summaries, or recommendations are provided only for convenience (each, and collectively a "recommendation"). Recommendations are not intended to be comprehensive or applicable in all situations. ChainSafe Systems does not guarantee that the Code Review will identify all instances of security vulnerabilities or other related issues.

Executive Summary

There were 0 critical, 1 major, 2 minor, 53 informational/optimizational issues identified in this version of the contracts. There are **no** known compiler bugs, for the specified compiler version (0.6.11), that might affect the contracts' logic.

Considerable space is available for gas efficiency improvements. In particular, Staking implementation could borrow ideas from the StakingRewards contract by Synthetix. Solidity compiler's optimizer settings could be adjusted to account for expected number of contract executions (runs parameter) instead of using a default number 200. I enjoyed working with the EPNS team, especially due to their responsiveness for any inquiries during the whole engagement.

Update Verification Summary

There were 0 critical, 0 major, 0 minor, 20 informational/optimizational findings were acknowledged and left unchanged in the updated version of the contracts. There are **no** known compiler bugs, for the specified compiler version (0.6.11), that might affect the contracts' logic. All the significant issues were addressed in this update, and 0 new issues were found.

1. Introduction

EPNS requested ChainSafe Systems to perform a review of the PUSH Tokens, Staking and Time Vesting smart contracts. The contracts in question can be identified by the following git commit hash:

80b7acaf8ef660cb2851ded9bc93bf41250bbc6e

There are 10 contracts/libraries/interfaces in scope.

2. Disclaimer

The review makes no statements or warranties about utility of the code, safety of the code, suitability of the business model, regulatory regime for the business model, or any other statements about fitness of the contracts for any specific purpose, or their bug free status.

3. Executive Summary

There were 0 critical, 1 major, 2 minor, 53 informational/optimizational issues identified in this version of the contracts. There are **no** known compiler bugs, for the specified compiler version (0.6.11), that might affect the contracts' logic.

Considerable space is available for gas efficiency improvements. In particular, Staking implementation could borrow ideas from the StakingRewards contract by Synthetix. Solidity compiler's optimizer settings could be adjusted to account for expected number of contract executions (runs parameter) instead of using a default number 200. I enjoyed working with the EPNS team, especially due to their responsiveness for any inquiries during the whole engagement.

4. Critical Bugs and Vulnerabilities

No critical issues were identified during the course of review.

5. Line By Line Review

- 5.1. EPNS, line 112. Note, it could be useful to modify rawAmount == uint(-1) check in favor of rawAmount >= uint(uint96(-1)) in order to consider anything above uint96(-1) to be infinite.
- 5.2. EPNS, line 142. Optimization, domainSeparator should be set in the constructor and be immutable.
- 5.3. EPNS, line 204. Style, line indentation is different here and in a number of other functions.
- 5.4. EPNS, line 204. **Major**, mul256(balances[msg.sender], holderWeight[msg.sender]) formula is incorrect and should be replaced with the following: mul256(balances[msg.sender], sub256(block.number, holderWeight[msg.sender])).
- 5.5 EPNS, line 228. Minor, HolderWeightChanged event is emitted with wrong parameters. It should report information about the holder instead of msg.sender.
- 5.6. EPNS, line 235. Note, tokens burnt but the delegated votes remain unaffected. It is not clear if this behavior is correct or not because there are no contracts in scope that rely on the votes from EPNS.
- 5.7. EPNS, line 237. Optimization, msg.sender can never be 0x0 address, so require(account != address(0)) assertion can be removed.
- 5.8. EPNS, line 264. Note, delegateBySig() function params design differs from those of permit() function. In order to have a unified style, consider passing the owner address instead of nonce.
- 5.9. EPNS, line 265. Optimization, domainSeparator should be set in the constructor and be immutable.
- 5.10. EPNS, line 302. Optimization, checkpoints [account] [nCheckpoints 1] read twice from the storage, first to fetch fromBlock then for votes. As those two values share a storage slot, it will be cheaper to read them into memory once, then fetch.
- 5.11. EPNS, line 357. Optimization, balances [dst] read from storage multiple times. Consider assigning it to a local variable once instead.
- 5.12. EPNS, line 363. Note, div256(totalAmount, 2) cannot fail so there is no point in having an error message.
- 5.13. EPNS, line 389. Note, this will freeze transfers on blockchains with a sub-second block time. Not a problem for Ethereum Mainnet.
- 5.14. Rockstar, line 25. Note, hashCheck could map metadata to a tokenId instead of 1 to serve the same purpose and also give the ability to find tokens by metadata.

- 5.15. CommunityVault, line 9. Optimization, push can be made immutable.
- 5.16. YieldFarm, line 15. Optimization, TOTAL_DISTRIBUTED_AMOUNT can be made immutable.
- 5.17. YieldFarm, line 16. Optimization, NR OF EPOCHS can be made immutable.
- 5.18. YieldFarm, line 21. Optimization, token can be made immutable.
- 5.19. YieldFarm, line 22. Optimization, communityVault can be made immutable.
- 5.20. YieldFarm, line 24. Optimization, push can be made immutable.
- 5.21. YieldFarm, line 25. Optimization, staking can be made immutable.
- 5.22. YieldFarm, line 29. Optimization, genesisEpochAmount can be made immutable.
- 5.23. YieldFarm, line 32. Note, it will be easier to integrate UI if lastEpochIdHarvested is made public. It is common to fetch data from a contract like YieldFarm.methods.lastEpochIdHarvested(userAddress).call() versus YieldFarm.methods.userLastEpochIdHarvested().call({from: userAddress}).
- 5.24. YieldFarm, line 33. Optimization, epochDuration can be made immutable.
- 5.25. YieldFarm, line 34. Optimization, epochStart can be made immutable.
- 5.26. YieldFarm, line 68. Style, lastEpochIdHarvested[msg.sender] + 1 does not utilize SafeMath.add() which is used in other places for the same action.
- 5.27. YieldFarm, line 74. Minor, MassHarvest will always report epochsHarvested as 0. lastEpochIdHarvested needs to be saved in the beginning of the function to correctly calculate epochsHarvested.
- 5.28. YieldFarm, line 85. Note, "Maximum number of epochs is 100" is a misleading revert reason. Number of epochs is set in the constructor and can vary.
- 5.29. YieldFarm, line 130. Optimization, lastEpochIdHarvested can be moved to an upper layer as well as transfer in order not to update it multiple times during massHarvest().
- 5.30. Staking, line 8. Note, Staking contract should inherit from IStaking to guarantee interface compatibility.
- 5.31. Staking, line 15. Optimization, epoch1Start can be made immutable.
- 5.32. Staking, line 18. Optimization, epochDuration can be made immutable.
- 5.33. Staking, line 21. Optimization, balances [user] [token] can be removed in favor of balanceCheckpoints [user] [token] [last].startBalance as they are always equal.

- 5.34. Staking, line 24. Optimization, the size variable could utilize a smaller data type, like uint248, to squeeze the set variable in the same storage slot to make reads cheaper.
- 5.35. Staking, line 62. Optimization, allowance check is excessive because it will happen in the token itself.
- 5.36. Staking, line 64. Optimization, balances [msg.sender] [tokenAddress] is read from storage multiple times.
- 5.37. Staking, line 66. Note, token.transferFrom() will not work for any token. It is recommended to utilize safeTransferFrom instead to assure support of all tokens. As long as it is used only for fully ERC20 compliant tokens, like Uniswap V2 LP, it will work correctly.
- 5.38. Staking, line 102. Optimization, for the last checkpoint, newDeposits are always 0. It is cheaper to read just the startBalance.
- 5.39. Staking, line 107. Optimization, getCheckpointBalance(checkpoints[last]) executed multiple times resulting in excessive storage reads.
- 5.40. Staking, line 124. Optimization, last >= 1 && checkpoints[last 1].epochId == currentEpoch condition is always true, at this point, and can be removed.
- 5.41. Staking, line 175. Note, provided commentary is partially misleading. It is true that withdrawal with no checkpoints will revert but not necessarily because of the 0 balance. Withdrawal of 0 amount will revert because checkpoints [last] will be out of bound.
- 5.42. Staking, line 186. Optimization, checkpoints[last].newDeposits is already 0 and does not require an update.
- 5.43. FundsDistributor, line 9. Optimization, identifier can be made immutable.
- 5.44. VestedReserves, line 10. Optimization, identifier can be made immutable.
- 5.45. Reserves, line 13. Optimization, pushToken can be made immutable.
- 5.46. Reserves, line 16. Optimization, identifier can be made immutable.
- 5.47. Reserves, line 37. Optimization, balance check is excessive because it will happen in the token itself.
- 5.48. FundsDistributorFactory, line 16. Optimization, pushToken can be made immutable.
- 5.49. FundsDistributorFactory, line 19. Optimization, identifier can be made immutable.
- 5.50. FundsDistributorFactory, line 22. Optimization, cliff can be made immutable.
- 5.51. FundsDistributorFactory, line 83. Optimization, balance check is excessive because it will happen in the token itself.

- 5.52. FundsDistributorFactory, line 84. Optimization, using msg.sender instead of owner() is cheaper.
- 5.53. TokenVesting, line 33. Optimization, _cliff can be made immutable.
- 5.54. TokenVesting, line 34. Optimization, start can be made immutable.
- 5.55. TokenVesting, line 35. Optimization, duration can be made immutable.
- 5.56. TokenVesting, line 37. Optimization, revocable can be made immutable.

Oleksii Matiiasevych

Mann

EPNS Smart Contracts Update Verification

Auditor: Oleksii Matiiasevych

1. Executive Summary

There were 0 critical, 0 major, 0 minor, 20 informational/optimizational findings were acknowledged and left unchanged in the updated version of the contracts. There are **no** known compiler bugs, for the specified compiler version (0.6.11), that might affect the contracts' logic. All the significant issues were addressed in this update, and 0 new issues were found.

2. Remaining Findings

- 2.1. EPNS, line 142. Optimization, domainSeparator should be set in the constructor and be immutable.
- 2.2. EPNS, line 235. Note, tokens burnt but the delegated votes remain unaffected. It is not clear if this behavior is correct or not because there are no contracts in scope that rely on the votes from EPNS.
- 2.3. EPNS, line 263. Note, delegateBySig() function params design differs from those of permit() function. In order to have a unified style, consider passing the owner address instead of nonce.
- 2.4. EPNS, line 264. Optimization, domainSeparator should be set in the constructor and be immutable.
- 2.5. EPNS, line 391. Note, this will freeze transfers on blockchains with a sub-second block time. Not a problem for Ethereum Mainnet.
- 2.6. Rockstar, line 25. Note, hashCheck could map metadata to a tokenId instead of 1 to serve the same purpose and also give the ability to find tokens by metadata.
- 2.7. YieldFarm, line 25. Optimization, _staking can be made immutable.
- 2.8. YieldFarm, line 33. Optimization, epochDuration can be made immutable.
- 2.9. YieldFarm, line 34. Optimization, epochStart can be made immutable.
- 2.10. YieldFarm, line 70. Style, lastEpochIdHarvested[msg.sender] + 1 does not utilize SafeMath.add() which is used in other places for the same action.

- 2.11. YieldFarm, line 132. Optimization, lastEpochIdHarvested can be moved to an upper layer as well as transfer in order not to update it multiple times during massHarvest().
- 2.12. Staking, line 8. Note, Staking contract should inherit from IStaking to guarantee interface compatibility.
- 2.13. Staking, line 21. Optimization, balances [user] [token] can be removed in favor of balanceCheckpoints [user] [token] [last]. startBalance as they are always equal.
- 2.14. Staking, line 24. Optimization, the size variable could utilize a smaller data type, like uint248, to squeeze the set variable in the same storage slot to make reads cheaper.
- 2.15. Staking, line 62. Optimization, balances [msg.sender] [tokenAddress] is read from storage twice. First here, then on the line 69.
- 2.16. Staking, line 64. Note, token.transferFrom() will not work for any token. It is recommended to utilize safeTransferFrom instead to assure support of all tokens. As long as it is used only for fully ERC20 compliant tokens, like Uniswap V2 LP, it will work correctly.
- 2.17. Staking, line 101. Optimization, for the last checkpoint, newDeposits are always 0. It is cheaper to read just the startBalance.
- 2.18. Staking, line 106. Optimization, getCheckpointBalance(checkpoints[last]) executed multiple times resulting in excessive storage reads.
- 2.19. Staking, line 123. Optimization, last >= 1 && checkpoints[last 1].epochId == currentEpoch condition is always true, at this point, and can be removed.
- 2.20. Staking, line 185. Optimization, checkpoints[last].newDeposits is already 0 and does not require an update.