

# Yearn Finance

**Smart contract**

**Security Assessment**

Stargate Strategy

May, 2022



# Table Of Contents

<b>Disclaimer</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Overview Page</b>	<b>4</b>
Summary	4
Contracts Assessed	4
Findings Summary	4
Classification of issues	5
<b>Findings</b>	<b>6</b>
Issue #01	6
Issue #02	6
Issue #03	7
<b>Observations</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>8</b>
Recommendation #01	8



# Disclaimer

This report does not provide any security warranty, investment advice, endorsement, or disapproval of any particular project or team. This report does not provide a warranty that the code in scope is completely free of vulnerabilities, bugs, or potential exploits. This report does not assess the financial risk of any asset. No third party should rely on this report to make any decisions to buy or sell any asset or product.

Delivering secured code is a continuous challenge that requires multiple steps. It is strongly recommended to use best code practices, write a full test suite, conduct an internal audit, and launch a bug bounty program as a complement to this report.

It is the sole responsibility of the project team to ensure that the code in scope is functioning as intended and that the recommendations presented in this report are carefully tested before deployment.

# Overview Page

## Summary

Project name	Yearn Finance
URL	<a href="https://yearn.finance/">https://yearn.finance/</a>
Code	<a href="https://github.com/OpenOrg-gg/yearn-stargate">https://github.com/OpenOrg-gg/yearn-stargate</a>
Commit hash	b113405d720a7997aefcb34ee2a5caea8ea3a1a6
Mitigations commit hash	
Language	Solidity

## Contracts Assessed

Contract name	SHA-1
<a href="#">/contracts/Strategy.sol</a>	acdcca85aafc3cca8c9799a75d9432b3a98c41c7

## Findings Summary

Severity	Found	Resolved	Partially resolved	Acknowledged
High	0	0	0	0
Medium	0	0	0	0
Low	0	0	0	0
Informational	0	0	0	0
Total	0	0	0	0



# Classification of issues

Severity	
High	Vulnerabilities that may directly result in loss of funds, and thus require an urgent fix.
Medium	Issues that may not be directly exploitable, or with a limited impact, are still required to be fixed.
Low	Subjective issues with a negligible impact.
Informational	Subjective issues or observations with negligible or no impact.



# Findings

<b>Issue #01</b>	<b><i>Strategy._withdrawFromLP</i> - <i>instantRedeemLocal</i> may not withdraw the entire <i>_lpAmount</i> specified</b>
<b>Severity</b>	<b>Medium</b>
<b>Location</b>	<i>Strategy.sol</i> - <i>_withdrawFromLP</i> (L402)
<b>Description</b>	Stargate is using a complex system of cross-chain liquidity management, where liquidity is scattered among different chains. Using <i>stargateRouter.instantRedeemLocal</i> may not be enough to withdraw the entire LP position.
<b>Recommendation</b>	Consider improving the logic of <i>_withdrawFromLP</i> by calling multiple different functions of <i>stargateRouter</i> to support a better withdrawal operation.
<b>Resolution</b>	

<b>Issue #02</b>	<b>ERC20 approvals of <i>type(uint256).max</i></b>
<b>Severity</b>	<b>Low</b>
<b>Location</b>	<i>Strategy.sol</i> - <i>_initializeThis</i> (L107)
<b>Description</b>	Approving the maximum value of <i>uint256</i> is a known practice to save gas. However, this pattern was proven to increase the impact of an attack many times in the past, in case the approved contract gets hacked.
<b>Recommendation</b>	Consider approving the exact amount that's needed to be transferred, or alternatively, add an external function that allows the revocation of approvals.



---

## Resolution

---

Issue #03	<b><i>Strategy.claimAndSellRewards, prepareReturn</i> - Potential "sandwiching" front-running vectors</b>
-----------	---

Severity	Low
----------	-----

Location	<i>Strategy.sol</i> 1. <i>claimAndSellRewards</i> 2. <i>prepareReturn</i>
----------	---

Description	<p><i>_sellRewardsUniv3</i> is using <i>amountOutMinimum = 0</i>, and <i>_sellRewardsCurve</i> is using an on-chain price quote, both are susceptible to "sandwiching" attacks where the front-runner can order the transactions so that he will be able to buy the asset on a different AMM #1, sell it on the current AMM that is used by the strategy (denoted by AMM #2), to push the price down, then include the transaction that calls either <i>claimAndSellRewards</i> or <i>prepareReturn</i> which will push the price even lower, then the front-runner can buy the asset on AMM #2 and sell it back on AMM #1.</p>
-------------	---

Recommendation	<p>While both <i>claimAndSellRewards</i> and <i>prepareReturn</i> are susceptible, <i>prepareReturn</i> is harder to mitigate, since adding another parameter is impossible due to the <i>Strategy</i> interface. <i>prepareReturn</i> is called in the context of <i>harvest</i> which is called by a keeper bot using flashbots API, that is slashed if performing a sandwich attack, which reduces this risk significantly. The risk is left open for <i>claimAndSellRewards</i>, however, and thus it is recommended to add a <i>minAmountOut</i> parameter to <i>claimAndSellRewards</i>.</p>
----------------	--

---

## Resolution

---



# Observations

1. Addresses used as external dependencies are injected in the initialization phase, which violates Yearn's production policy, specifying that addresses should be hardcoded instead.

# Recommendations

Recommendation #01	Gas optimizations
Description	<i>Strategy.withdrawSome</i> - <i>balanceOfStakedLPToken</i> is called twice (lines 276-277) instead of once.





