



Audius Contracts Audit

AUGUST
25,
2020 | IN
SECURITY
AUDITS |
BY
OPENZEPPELIN
SECURITY

I
N
T
R
O
D
U
C
T
I
O
N

C
R
I
T
I
C
A
L

H
I
G
H

M
E
D
I
U
M

L
O
W

N
O
T
E
S

C

Introduction

The

[Audius](#)

team

asked

us

to

review

and

audit

their

smart

contracts.

We

looked

at

the

code

and

now

publish

our

results.

We

audited

commit

[6f3b31562b9d4c43cef91af0a011986a2580fba2](#)

of

the

[AudiusProject/audius-](#)

[protocol/](#)

[repository.](#)

In

scope

are

all

the

smart

contracts

in

the

eth-

contracts/contracts

directory,

except

for

the

test

contracts.

All

external

code

and

contract

dependencies

were

assumed

to

work

correctly.

Additionally,

we

assumed

that

the

administrators

are

available,

honest,

and

not

compromised

during

this

audit.

Update:

The

Audius

team

made

some

fixes

and

comments

based

on

our

recommendations.

They

fixed

all
the
critical,
high,
and
medium
severity
issues
that
we
reported.
Below
we
address
those
fixes,
which
were
introduced
in
pull
requests
[#564](#)
and
[#657](#).
The
Audius
team
then
merged
these
pull
requests
into
master,
resulting
in
commit
[dac9cb31f0a2df9c25083bd3a833d285a4d947ef](#),
which
now
includes
the
smart
contract
code
we
originally
audited
and

*the
fixes
that
we
reviewed
as
part
of
this
engagement.
Our
analysis
of
the
mitigations
disregards
any
other
changes
to
the
code
base.*

About Audius

Audius
is
a
decentralized
community
of
artists,
developers,
and
listeners
whose
mission
is
to
give
everyone
the
freedom
to
share,
monetize,
and
listen

to
any
audio.

The
system
comprises
service
providers
who
maintain
the
availability
of
the
content,
index
the
content
for
discovery,
handle
authentication,
monitor
activity,
and
cache.

This
system
is
backed
by
these
main
smart
contracts
deployed
in
the
Ethereum
blockchain:

- Registry:
hub
where
all
the
contracts
are
registered.

- **ServiceTypeManager:**
maintains
the
different
types
of
service
providers,
their
versioning,
and
stake
requirements.
- **ServiceProviderFactory:**
manages
the
registration
of
service
endpoints
and
their
delegate
owner
wallet.
- **AudiusToken:**
ERC-
20
token
used
for
staking
on
service
providers
and
rewards.
- **Staking:**
stores
staking
balances
for
service
providers.
- **DelegateManager:**
manages
delegation
of
stake

to
service
providers,
slashing
and
claiming
rewards.

- ClaimFactory:
mints
and
allocates
tokens,
and
manages
claim
rounds.
- Governance:
manages
changes
to
the
protocol
through
staked
voting.

All
the
Audius
contracts
use
the
[OpenZeppelin](#)
[proxy](#)
[pattern](#)
and
can
be
upgraded
through
the
Governance
contract
by
voting
on
proposals
submitted
by
stakers

or
through
administrator
action.

The
system
administrators
manage
the
[registry](#),
which
lists
all
the
target
contracts
that
can
be
proposed
for
Governance
voting.

In
the
Governance
contract
migration,
[the](#)
[registry](#)
[ownership](#)
[is](#)
[transferred](#)
[to](#)
[the](#)
[Governance](#)
[contract](#),
so
all
contracts
added
to
the
registry
are
intended
to
go
through

the
governance
system.

In
this
audit
we
assumed
that
contracts
are
extensively
tested
and
audited
before
being
added
to
the
registry.

The
administrators
also
control
the

`guardianAddress`,

which
can
veto
proposals
made
by
the
stakers,
and
directly
execute
any
protocol
changes
without
voting.

According
to
the
Audius
team,
"These

safeguards
will
be
slowly
removed
over
time
through
contract
upgrades
to
Governance
itself.”
With
[pull](#)
[request](#)
[#616](#),
the
Audius
team
also
allowed
the
`guardianAddress`
to
submit
proposals
without
stake.

Update:

*While
we
were
auditing
this
project,
the
Audius
team
found
the
following
issue:*

The
guardian
can
veto
a
proposal

at
any
time
from
its
creation
until
its
evaluation.

However,
if
the
`guardianAddress`
waits
to
veto
a
proposal
until
the
voting
period
is
almost
over,
by
making
use
of
the
`vetoProposal`
function,
this
transaction
can
be
frontrun
by
any
staker
calling
the
`evaluateProposalOutcome`
function,
which
will
modify
the
proposal's

outcome

and

make

the

vetoProposal

transaction

fail

when

the

requirement

for

an

InProgress

proposal

is

not

met.

Also,

depending

on

the

vote

count,

the

guardian

could

be

tricked

to

not

veto

the

proposal

because

the

proposal

does

not

reach

the

necessary

votes

to

be

executed.

However,

a

malicious

staker

could
vote
near
the
voting
deadline,
changing
the
proposal
from
a
failure
into
a
success,
and
executing
it
while
it
frontruns
the
`vetoProposal`
call.

Consider
adding
a
cooldown
period
after
the
voting
ends
to
allow
the
guardian
to
veto
successful
but
malicious
proposals.

Update:

Fixed.

An

`executionDelay`

is

now

*enforced
on
every
proposal
to
account
for
this
vulnerability.*

READ ALL THE
ISSUES

Security Audits

- If you are interested in smart contract security, you can continue the discussion in our [forum](#), or even better, [join the team](#) 🚀
- If you are building a project of

your
own
and
would
like
to
request
a
security
audit,
please
do
so
[here](#).

RELATED POSTS



Products

Contracts
Defender

Security

Security Audits

Learn

Docs
Forum
Ethernaut

Company

Website
About
Jobs
Logo Kit