

# SHERLOCK SECURITY REVIEW FOR



**Prepared For:** Flux Protocol

Prepared By: Sherlock

Security Researchers: Pauliax, hickupHH3

Dates Reviewed: June 10th - June 16th, 2022

**Report Delivered:** June 18th, 2022

# Introduction

"Flux is the trustless data layer for web3. Flux is a cross-chain oracle that provides smart contracts with access to economically secure data feeds on anything."

# Scope

**Branch:** p2p-audit-fixes-admin

(https://github.com/fluxprotocol/fpo-evm/tree/p2p-audit-fixes-admin)

Commit: a0063173a4607dc8da517cde8cf62de6b287202d

(https://github.com/fluxprotocol/fpo-evm/tree/a0063173a4607dc8da517cde8cf62de6

b287202d) Contracts:

• ExamplePriceFeedConsumer.sol

FluxP2PFactory.sol

FluxPriceFeed.sol

# **Summary**

The FluxP2P contracts allow the easy and simple deployment of first-party price feeds on EVM chains. The codebase size isn't too large and complex as it consists of 2 contracts, with the third (ExamplePriceFeedConsumer) being an example of how to utilise the price feed. The core contract is the EIP-2362 compatible FluxP2PFactory contract that handles the deployment and indexing of individual price feeds which are compatible with Chainlink's V2 and V3 aggregator interface.

This audit is a review of a previous audit performed. A number of changes have been made since then, such as the removal of admin permissions from FluxP2PFactory that makes oracle deployment and signer modification more permissionless, and fixes for issues raised previously.

We looked at functional correctness for the changes made. While a couple of minor issues and gas optimizations have been found, no notable flaws were uncovered.

**Note:** Sherlock has not viewed the fixes for this audit, as Flux has decided not to bring this product to market yet.

# **Test Suite**

Test coverage: Good

**Quality of tests:** The quality of tests were high, with adequate coverage on the FluxP2PFactory contract. Given the relatively small size of the contracts, it is recommended to add more tests to achieve 100% coverage, at least for the factory and price feed contracts.



Note that the first test fails from the new changes, where a revert happens due to 'Future timestamp'

# **Findings**

Each issue has an assigned severity:

- Informational issues are subjective in nature. They are typically suggestions around best practices or readability. Code maintainers should use their own judgement as to whether to address such issues.
- Low issues are objective in nature but are not security vulnerabilities. These should be addressed unless there is a clear reason not to.
- Medium issues are security vulnerabilities that may not be directly exploitable or may require certain conditions in order to be exploited. All major issues should be addressed.
- High issues are directly exploitable security vulnerabilities that need to be fixed.

# **Total Issues**

Informational	Low	Medium	High
10	3	0	0



# Issue L-01

Same formula of roundID generation prevents multiple signer modifications in a round

#### **Summary**

Dependency of modifySigners() on the price feed's roundID prevents multiple signer modifications in between rounds.

### **Severity**

Low

#### **Vulnerability Detail**

The same formula of roundID generation is used for both transmit() and modifySigners(), which is reliant on the price feed's latestRound.

uint256 round = FluxPriceFeed(fluxPriceFeeds[\_id].priceFeed).latestRound() + 1;

There is therefore an indirect dependency of modifySigners() on transmit(), where only a single modification can be made (ie. only do addition or removal of a signer, but not chained or multiple modifications) until a new price feed transmission is made.

While this seems to be intended, where the message to sign "comes with an acknowledgment that a new round must occur to modify signers again", there are potentially scenarios where multiple signers need to be changed in between rounds, such as replacing a signer (adding signer A, removing signer B).

Hence, to accommodate this use case, we recommend using a separate counter.

#### **Impact**

Only 1 modification can be made after each price feed transmission.

#### **Code Snippet**

https://github.com/fluxprotocol/fpo-evm/blob/a0063173a4607dc8da517cde8cf62de6b287202d/contracts/FluxP2PFactory.sol#L205-L206

#### Tool used

Manual Review

#### Recommendation

Have a separate counter for signer modifications.

#### **Flux Protocol Comment**



Implemented the recommended change.

# **Sherlock Comment**



# Issue L-02

#### Incorrect revert reason

### **Summary**

Minimum number of signers is 2, but the revert string gives the impression that it is 3.

# **Severity**

Low

## **Vulnerability Detail**

The minimum signers allowed is 2, so prior to the removal, the requirement would be a minimum of 3 signers. While the check is correct, the revert reason isn't. It should be changed from >2 to >1.

#### **Impact**

Confusion over minimum number of signers required

## **Code Snippet**

https://github.com/fluxprotocol/fpo-evm/blob/a0063173a4607dc8da517cde8cf62de6b287202d/contracts/FluxP2PFactory.sol#L221-L222

#### **Tool used**

Manual review

#### Recommendation

```
require(fluxPriceFeeds[_id].signers.length() > 2, "Need >1 signers");
```

### **Flux Protocol Comment**

Implemented the recommended change.

#### **Sherlock Comment**



# Issue L-03

Modifying signers list does not check return values

#### **Summary**

When adding or removing signers, it does not check if the operation was successful.

## Severity

Low

## **Vulnerability Detail**

EnumerableSet operations return a boolean value indicating if it succeeded or not, e.g. when adding an element:

\* Returns true if the value was added to the set, that is if it was not already present.

While in most cases this does not cause any serious issues, it makes it possible to deploy an oracle with duplicate signers bypassing min signers check. If you invoke deployOracle with 2 duplicate signers, it will add only 1 signer but set minSigners to 2 leaving it impossible to perform any action on this price feed later.

#### **Impact**

This is not a big problem, because the hash of the price feed is derived from the address of msg.sender, thus it does not have a serious impact.

#### **Code Snippet**

https://github.com/fluxprotocol/fpo-evm/blob/a0063173a4607dc8da517cde8cf62de6 b287202d/contracts/FluxP2PFactory.sol#L94-L109

<u>https://github.com/OpenZeppelin/openzeppelin-contracts/blob/master/contracts/utils/ structs/EnumerableSet.sol#L229</u>

https://github.com/OpenZeppelin/openzeppelin-contracts/blob/master/contracts/utils/structs/EnumerableSet.sol#L239

#### Tool used

Manual review

# Recommendation

Require that add/remove operations succeed.

## **Flux Protocol Comment**

Implemented the recommended change.



# **Sherlock Comment**



Same hash produced regardless of msg.sender casing

# **Summary**

Unnecessary requirement of <u>creator</u> to be in lowercase

# **Severity**

Informational

## **Vulnerability Detail**

Regardless of whether the address has been checksummed, or in lower case, the hash result will be the same. Hence, the description of the <u>creator</u> parameter can simply be msg.sender of deploy0racle().

## **Impact**

Redundancy

# **Code Snippet**

https://github.com/fluxprotocol/fpo-evm/blob/a0063173a4607dc8da517cde8cf62de6b287202d/contracts/FluxP2PFactory.sol#L46

#### **Tool used**

Manual review

#### Recommendation

/// @param \_creator msg.sender of `deployOracle()`

## **Flux Protocol Comment**

Implemented the recommended change.

#### **Sherlock Comment**



Redundant address casting of msg.sender

# **Summary**

Redundant address casting

# **Severity**

Informational

## **Vulnerability Detail**

msg.sender is already of address type; the explicit casting has no effect and is therefore unnecessary.

#### **Impact**

Redundancy.

# **Code Snippet**

https://github.com/fluxprotocol/fpo-evm/blob/a0063173a4607dc8da517cde8cf62de6b287202d/contracts/FluxP2PFactory.sol#L97

#### Tool used

Manual review

## Recommendation

```
bytes32 id = hashFeedId(_pricePair, _decimals, msg.sender);
```

#### **Flux Protocol Comment**

Implemented the recommended change.

#### **Sherlock Comment**



Declare and use timestamp earlier to cache \_timestamps[i]

# **Summary**

Cache \_timestamps[i] in the timestamp variable as a gas optimization.

## Severity

Informational

## **Vulnerability Detail**

A gas optimization would be to declare and save <u>\_timestamps[i]</u> into the <u>timestamp</u> variable.

# **Impact**

Higher gas costs

# **Code Snippet**

https://github.com/fluxprotocol/fpo-evm/blob/a0063173a4607dc8da517cde8cf62de6b287202d/contracts/FluxP2PFactory.sol#L151-L152

#### **Tool used**

Manual review

#### Recommendation

```
uint64 timestamp;
for (uint256 i = 0; i < len; ++i) {
    ...
    timestamp = _timestamps[i];
    require(timestamp > lastRoundTimestamp, "Stale timestamp");
    require(timestamp < block.timestamp + 5, "Future timestamp");
    ...
}</pre>
```

#### **Flux Protocol Comment**

Implemented the recommended change.

#### **Sherlock Comment**



Declare and save len / 2 in variable

### **Summary**

Repeated calculation of len / 2 is gas inefficient.

# **Severity**

Informational

## **Vulnerability Detail**

len / 2 is calculated numerous times. It would be more gas efficient to save the result in a local variable.

# **Impact**

Higher gas costs.

# **Code Snippet**

https://github.com/fluxprotocol/fpo-evm/blob/a0063173a4607dc8da517cde8cf62de6b287202d/contracts/FluxP2PFactory.sol#L167-L173

## **Tool used**

Manual review

#### Recommendation

```
// a further gas optimization would be to utilise bitshift
// because the DIV opcode uses 5 gas while the SHR opcode only uses 3
gas.
// medianIndex = len >> 1;
uint256 medianIndex = len / 2;
if (len % 2 == 0) {
   answer = ((_answers[medianIndex - 1] + _answers[medianIndex]) / 2);
   timestamp = ((_timestamps[medianIndex - 1] + _timestamps[medianIndex)
/ 2);
} else {
   answer = _answers[medianIndex];
   timestamp = _timestamps[medianIndex];
}
```



# **Flux Protocol Comment**

Implemented the recommended change.

# **Sherlock Comment**



# **Spelling Error**

# Summary

Initial is spelt wrong.

# **Severity**

Informational

# **Impact**

Readability.

# **Code Snippet**

 $\frac{https://github.com/fluxprotocol/fpo-evm/blob/a0063173a4607dc8da517cde8cf62de6}{b287202d/contracts/FluxP2PFactory.sol\#L30}$ 

## **Tool used**

Manual review

## Recommendation

intitial → initial

## **Flux Protocol Comment**

Implemented the recommended change.

## **Sherlock Comment**



## Emit events with relevant data

# **Summary**

After updating the contracts, do not forget to also update the events. For example, event NewTransmission could emit a new parameter of \_timestamp.

# **Severity**

Informational

# **Impact**

Consistency.

# **Code Snippet**

https://github.com/fluxprotocol/fpo-evm/blob/a0063173a4607dc8da517cde8cf62de6b287202d/contracts/FluxPriceFeed.sol#L78

## **Tool used**

Manual review

#### Recommendation

Revisit events and make sure that they contain the relevant data.

# **Flux Protocol Comment**

Implemented the recommended change.

#### **Sherlock Comment**



# Inconsistent logging of errors

### **Summary**

Based on description the event Log should log all errors:

```
/// @notice logs error messages
/// @param message the error message
event Log(string message);
```

However, it does not log when \_verifySignature fails.

# **Severity**

Informational

# **Impact**

Consistency.

# **Code Snippet**

https://github.com/fluxprotocol/fpo-evm/blob/a0063173a4607dc8da517cde8cf62de6b287202d/contracts/FluxP2PFactory.sol#L41

https://github.com/fluxprotocol/fpo-evm/blob/a0063173a4607dc8da517cde8cf62de6b287202d/contracts/FluxP2PFactory.sol#L81

#### Tool used

Manual review

#### Recommendation

Consider either emitting this event on other failures or renaming it to something like LogTransmitError.

#### **Flux Protocol Comment**

Implemented the recommended change.

# **Sherlock Comment**



# Cancel signatures

# **Summary**

Signers cannot cancel their signatures if they change their mind.

# **Severity**

Informational

## **Impact**

Signers need to be extra careful when signing messages.

## **Tool used**

Manual review

#### Recommendation

Consider adding a function where each signer can cancel their signatures on chain, like updating lastRoundModifySigners/lastRoundTransmit or incrementing a nonce, or something like that.

## **Flux Protocol Comment**

Implemented the recommended change.

# **Sherlock Comment**



# Signature replayability

# **Summary**

toEthSignedMessageHash does not include the domain separator meaning the signatures can be replayed on different chains.

## **Severity**

Informational

#### **Impact**

When identical price feeds are deployed across different chains, it will be possible to replay signature actions. However, this might be the intended behavior, sign once, sync everywhere.

# **Code Snippet**

https://github.com/OpenZeppelin/openzeppelin-contracts/blob/master/contracts/utils/cryptography/ECDSA.sol#L202-L206

#### Tool used

Manual review

#### Recommendation

If the FluxP2PFactory is intended to be deployed on several chains, consider including a domain separator when calculating the signature hash, e.g. toTypedDataHash includes domainSeparator.

#### **Flux Protocol Comment**

Implemented the recommended change.

#### **Sherlock Comment**



Repeated storage access should be cached

### **Summary**

Cache storage variables as a gas optimization.

# Severity

Informational

## **Vulnerability Detail**

There are many inefficiencies when accessing the same storage slot several times, for example, FluxPriceFeed(fluxPriceFeeds[\_id].priceFeed) is accessed twice here: uint256 round = FluxPriceFeed(fluxPriceFeeds[\_id].priceFeed).latestRound() + 1; uint256 lastRoundTimestamp =

FluxPriceFeed(fluxPriceFeeds[\_id].priceFeed).latestTimestamp();

#### **Impact**

Higher gas costs

# **Code Snippet**

https://github.com/fluxprotocol/fpo-evm/blob/a0063173a4607dc8da517cde8cf62de6b287202d/contracts/FluxP2PFactory.sol#L137-L138

#### Tool used

Manual review

#### Recommendation

```
FluxPriceFeed fluxPriceFeed =
FluxPriceFeed(fluxPriceFeeds[_id].priceFeed);
uint256 round = fluxPriceFeed.latestRound() + 1;
uint256 lastRoundTimestamp = fluxPriceFeed.latestTimestamp();
```

#### **Flux Protocol Comment**

Implemented the recommended change.

#### **Sherlock Comment**

