



Part of Tibereum Group

AUDITING REPORT

Version Notes

| Version | No. Pages | Date | Revised By | Notes |
|---------|-----------|------------|----------------|-------------|
| 1.0 | Total: 46 | 2022-08-22 | DoD4uFN, Donut | Audit Final |

Audit Notes

| | |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| Audit Date | 2022-08-09 - 2022-12-30 |
| Auditor/Auditors | DoD4uFN, mechwar |
| Auditor/Auditors Contact Information | contact@obeliskauditing.com |
| Notes | Specified code and contracts are audited for security flaws. UI/UX (website), logic, team, and tokenomics are not audited. |
| Audit Report Number | OB569687511 |

Disclaimer

This audit is not financial, investment, or any other kind of advice and is for informational purposes only. This report is not a substitute for doing your own research and due diligence. Obelisk is not responsible or liable for any loss, damage, or otherwise caused by reliance on this report for any purpose. Obelisk has based this audit report solely on the information provided by the audited party and on facts that existed before or during the audit being conducted. Obelisk is not responsible for any outcome, including changes done to the contract/contracts after the audit was published. This audit is fully objective and only discerns what the contract is saying without adding any opinion to it. The audit is paid by the project but neither the auditors nor Obelisk has any other connection to the project and has no obligations other than to publish an objective report. Obelisk will always publish its findings regardless of the outcome of the findings. The audit only covers the subject areas detailed in this report and unless specifically stated, nothing else has been audited. Obelisk assumes that the provided information and material were not altered, suppressed, or misleading. This report is published by Obelisk, and Obelisk has sole ownership of this report. Use of this report for any reason other than for informational purposes on the subjects reviewed in this report including the use of any part of this report is prohibited without the express written consent of Obelisk. In instances where an auditor or team member has a personal connection with the audited project, that auditor or team member will be excluded from viewing or impacting any internal communication regarding the specific audit.

Obelisk Auditing

Defi is a relatively new concept but has seen exponential growth to a point where there is a multitude of new projects created every day. In a fast-paced world like this, there will also be an enormous amount of scams. The scams have become so elaborate that it's hard for the common investor to trust a project, even though it could be legit. We saw a need for creating high-quality audits at a fast phase to keep up with the constantly expanding market. With the Obelisk stamp of approval, a legitimate project can easily grow its user base exponentially in a world where trust means everything. Obelisk Auditing consists of a group of security experts that specialize in security and structural operations, with previous work experience from among other things, PricewaterhouseCoopers. All our audits will always be conducted by at least two independent auditors for maximum security and professionalism.

As a comprehensive security firm, Obelisk provides all kinds of audits and project assistance.

Audit Information

The auditors always conducted a manual visual inspection of the code to find security flaws that automatic tests would not find. Comprehensive tests are also conducted in a specific test environment that utilizes exact copies of the published contract.

While conducting the audit, the Obelisk security team uses best practices to ensure that the reviewed contracts are thoroughly examined against all angles of attack. This is done by evaluating the codebase and whether it gives rise to significant risks. During the audit, Obelisk assesses the risks and assigns a risk level to each section together with an explanatory comment. Take note that the comments from the project team are their opinion and not the opinion of Obelisk.

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Version Notes | 2 |
| Audit Notes | 2 |
| Disclaimer | 2 |
| Obelisk Auditing | 3 |
| Audit Information | 3 |
| Project Information | 6 |
| Audit of Based | 7 |
| Summary Table | 8 |
| Code Analysis | 8 |
| On-Chain Analysis | 9 |
| Findings | 10 |
| Code Analysis | 10 |
| Users Staked Tokens Could Be Drained | 10 |
| Missing Emergency NFT Withdraw Function | 12 |
| Reward Tokens Can Be Withdrawn | 13 |
| Tokens With Transfer Fee Not Supported | 14 |
| Unbounded Loop | 15 |
| Rewards Can Be Lost | 16 |
| No Limit For Protocol Values | 17 |
| Contract Values Can Be Constant Or Immutable | 19 |
| Unused Variables | 20 |
| Unused Events | 21 |
| Using Safe Math In Solidity ^0.8.0 | 22 |
| Inconsistent Error Messages | 23 |
| No Events Emitted For Changes To Protocol Values | 24 |
| Receipt Tokens Does Not Account For Transfers | 26 |
| Staked NFTs Can Be Withdrawn | 29 |
| Receipt Token Can Have Zero Address | 31 |
| Difficult To Find All Mint Operators | 32 |
| No Events Emitted For Changes To Protocol Values | 33 |
| SafeMath8 Is Outdated | 34 |
| On-Chain Analysis | 35 |
| No Timelock | 35 |
| Multisig Low Number of Signers | 37 |
| External Addresses | 38 |
| Externally Owned Accounts | 38 |
| No Externally Owned Accounts | 38 |
| External Contracts | 39 |
| LayerZero Fantom Endpoint | 39 |
| Treasury - Gnosis Safe | 39 |

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Timelock (Operator) | 40 |
| External Tokens | 41 |
| Not Deployed Yet | 41 |
| Appendix A - Reviewed Documents | 42 |
| Deployed Contracts | 42 |
| Libraries And Interfaces | 42 |
| Revisions | 42 |
| Imported Contracts | 42 |
| Appendix B - Risk Ratings | 43 |
| Appendix C - Finding Statuses | 43 |
| Appendix D - Glossary | 44 |
| Contract Structure | 44 |
| Security Concepts | 44 |
| Appendix E - Audit Procedure | 45 |

Project Information

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| Name | Based |
| Description | BASED Next Generation protocol is the first pegless seigniorage protocol exploring DeFi on the FTM Network. We are introducing innovative yield strategies whilst providing inclusivity for Based Finance (V1), that successfully finished emissions. Based Next Gen is a multi-token protocol that consists of the following tokens: \$OBOL - PEGLESS token with elastic supply. \$SMELT - protocol's underlying Perpetual Print (PP) mechanism emitting OBOL. |
| Website | https://basedfinance.io/ |
| Contact | https://twitter.com/BasedFinance_io |
| Contact information | @@athena_goddazz on TG |
| Token Name(s) | N/A |
| Token Short | N/A |
| Contract(s) | See Appendix A |
| Code Language | Solidity |
| Chain | Fantom |

Audit of Based

Obelisk was commissioned by Based on the 7th of August 2022 to conduct a comprehensive audit of Based's additional contracts. The following audit was conducted between the 8th of August 2022 and the 30th of December 2022. Two of Obelisk's security experts went through the related contracts manually using industry standards to find if any vulnerabilities could be exploited either by the project team or users. The reason for the long timeline of the audit is that the contracts were reworked and additional contracts were added during this time. This audit document shows the findings throughout the iterations up until the final deployed contracts.

During the audit of Based's additional contracts, we found multiple instances of risky code. The project team worked fast to solve most of the issues in their contracts.

Only issues #5 and issue #14 are still open. Issue #5 is safe as long as the project team follows their own comment on the issue. Regarding issue #14, please read the in-depth comment from the project team on the issue and its intended behavior.

As the contracts are already deployed, some issues to solve fully would need a re-deploy. The project team has partially solved these issues and we recommend reading through the partially mitigated issues and their associated comment by the project team in order to understand the associated risks.

The informational findings are good to know while interacting with the project but don't directly damage the project in its current state, hence it's up to the project team if they deem that it's worth solving these issues, however, please take note of them.

The team has not reviewed the UI/UX, logic, team, or tokenomics of the Based project.

This document is a summary of the findings that the auditors found. Please read the full document for a complete understanding of the audit.

Summary Table

Code Analysis

| Finding | ID | Severity | Status |
|--|-------|---------------|---------------------|
| Users Staked Tokens Could Be Drained | #0001 | High Risk | Closed |
| Missing Emergency NFT Withdraw Function | #0002 | High Risk | Closed |
| Reward Tokens Can Be Withdrawn | #0003 | Medium Risk | Partially Mitigated |
| Tokens With Transfer Fee Not Supported | #0004 | Medium Risk | Closed |
| Unbounded Loop | #0005 | Low Risk | Open |
| Rewards Can Be Lost | #0006 | Low Risk | Closed |
| No Limit For Protocol Values | #0007 | Low Risk | Partially Closed |
| Contract Values Can Be Constant Or Immutable | #0008 | Informational | Closed |
| Unused Variables | #0009 | Informational | Closed |
| Unused Events | #0010 | Informational | Closed |
| Using Safe Math In Solidity ^0.8.0 | #0011 | Informational | Closed |
| Inconsistent Error Messages | #0012 | Informational | Closed |
| No Events Emitted For Changes To Protocol Values | #0013 | Informational | Partially Closed |
| Receipt Tokens Does Not Account For Transfers | #0014 | Medium Risk | Open |
| Staked NFTs Can Be Withdrawn | #0015 | High Risk | Partially Mitigated |
| Receipt Token Can Have Zero Address | #0016 | Medium Risk | Partially Mitigated |
| Difficult To Find All Mint Operators | #0017 | Low Risk | Partially Mitigated |
| No Events Emitted For Changes To Protocol Values | #0018 | Informational | Open |

| | | | |
|-----------------------|-------|---------------|------|
| SafeMath8 Is Outdated | #0019 | Informational | Open |
|-----------------------|-------|---------------|------|

On-Chain Analysis

| Finding | ID | Severity | Status |
|--------------------------------|-------|-------------|---------------------|
| No Timelock | #0020 | Medium Risk | Partially Mitigated |
| Multisig Low Number of Signers | #0021 | Low Risk | Mitigated |

Findings

Code Analysis

Users Staked Tokens Could Be Drained

| | |
|------------|--------------------------------|
| FINDING ID | #0001 |
| SEVERITY | High Risk |
| STATUS | Closed |
| LOCATION | SmeltRewardPool.sol -> 473-497 |

```
1  function governanceAllocationAdjustment(  
2      uint256 _pid,  
3      uint256 _amount,  
4      address _teamMember  
5  ) external onlyOperator {  
6      PoolInfo storage pool = poolInfo[_pid];  
7      require (pool.token == stater , "team pool only");  
8      //=====make sure this is TEAM POOL ONLY  
9      UserInfo storage user = userInfo[_pid][_teamMember];  
10     updatePool(_pid);  
11     uint256 _pending =  
12     user.amount.mul(pool.accSmeltPerShare).div(1e18).sub(user.rewardDebt);  
13     if (_pending > 0) {  
14         safeSmeltTransfer(protocolFundAddress, _pending);  
15         emit RewardPaid(protocolFundAddress, _pending);  
16     }  
17     if (_amount < user.amount){  
18         uint256 cut = user.amount.sub(_amount);  
19         stater.safeTransfer(protocolFundAddress, cut);  
20     } else if(_amount > user.amount) {  
21         uint256 bonus = _amount.sub(user.amount);  
22         stater.safeTransferFrom(protocolFundAddress, address(this),  
23         bonus);  
24     }  
25     user.amount = _amount;  
26     user.rewardDebt =  
27     user.amount.mul(pool.accSmeltPerShare).div(1e18);  
28     emit TeamMemberAllocationAdjusted(_teamMember, _amount);  
29 }
```

LOCATION

SmeltRewardPool.sol -> 463-467

```
1 function setTeamToken (address _teamToken) public onlyOperator
2 {
3     require (_teamToken != address(0), "cant be 0 address");
4     stater = IERC20(_teamToken);
5 }
```

DESCRIPTION

The function *setTeamToken()* can be set to any ERC20 token that is the token of an existing staking pool. By calling *governanceAllocationAdjustment()*, with an address of a particular user and their staking pool ID, this function could drain the unsuspecting user's staked tokens to the *protocolFundAddress* address.

Then, *governanceAllocationAdjustment()* can be used again, with a teamMember's address, to allocate these funds from *protocolFundAddress* to themselves and use the *withdraw()* function to drain the funds.

Also, the function *governanceAllocationAdjustment()* can be used by the team to assign to themselves from 0% up to 100% of the accrued deposit fees (as long as the *stater* can be changed to any ERC-20).

RECOMMENDATION

Set the *stater* once in the constructor of the contract or make the *stater* a constant.

RESOLUTION

The project team has implemented the recommended changes.

Missing Emergency NFT Withdraw Function

| | |
|------------|--------------------------------|
| FINDING ID | #0002 |
| SEVERITY | High Risk |
| STATUS | Closed |
| LOCATION | SmeltRewardPool.sol -> 343-352 |

```
1 // Withdraw without caring about rewards. EMERGENCY ONLY.
2 function emergencyWithdraw(uint256 _pid) public {
3     PoolInfo storage pool = poolInfo[_pid];
4     UserInfo storage user = userInfo[_pid][msg.sender];
5     uint256 _amount = user.amount;
6     user.amount = 0;
7     user.rewardDebt = 0;
8     pool.token.safeTransfer(msg.sender, _amount);
9     emit EmergencyWithdraw(msg.sender, _pid, _amount);
10 }
```

| | |
|----------------|---|
| DESCRIPTION | The smart contract implements every functionality twice, once for ERC-20 and once for ERC-721 tokens. The emergency withdrawal functionality is implemented only for ERC-20 tokens. |
| RECOMMENDATION | Implement the emergency withdrawal for ERC-721 tokens. |
| RESOLUTION | The project team has implemented the recommended changes. |

Reward Tokens Can Be Withdrawn

| | |
|------------|--------------------------------|
| FINDING ID | #0003 |
| SEVERITY | Medium Risk |
| STATUS | Partially Mitigated |
| LOCATION | SmeltRewardPool.sol -> 499-507 |

```
1  function governanceRecoverUnsupported(  
2      IERC20 _token,  
3      uint256 _amount,  
4      address _to  
5  ) external onlyOperator {  
6      require(address(_token) == address(smelt), "reward token  
only");  
7      _token.safeTransfer(_to, _amount);  
8  }  
9 }
```

| | |
|----------------|--|
| DESCRIPTION | <p>The reward tokens can be withdrawn by the operator using the <i>governanceRecoverUnsupported()</i> function.</p> <p>These kinds of functions are usually used to withdraw tokens that aren't being used by the contract.</p> |
| RECOMMENDATION | Adjust the function to only withdraw unused tokens. |
| RESOLUTION | <p>The project team introduced a timelock of 30 days after the pool's end time that the reward tokens and the pool tokens aren't withdrawable. After this period, any token can be withdrawn.</p> <p>However, a new function was introduced, called <i>moveRewardsToUpdatedContract()</i> which allows the <i>owner</i> of the contract to move the reward tokens to any address, without the time restrictions that were introduced to the <i>governanceRecoverUnsupported()</i> function.</p> <p>The owner and operator roles were transferred to the timelock. The current timelock delay is 24 hours, which is relatively short. The project team has stated their intention to increase the timelock delay after adding a few more pools.</p> |

Tokens With Transfer Fee Not Supported

| | |
|------------|--------------------------------|
| FINDING ID | #0004 |
| SEVERITY | Medium Risk |
| STATUS | Closed |
| LOCATION | SmeltRewardPool.sol -> 235-240 |

```
1         if (_amount > 0) {  
2             pool.token.safeTransferFrom(_sender, address(this),  
_amount);  
3             uint256 depositDebt =  
_amount.mul(pool.depositFee).div(10000);  
4             user.amount = user.amount.add(_amount.sub(depositDebt));  
5             pool.token.safeTransfer(protocolFundAddress, depositDebt);  
6         }
```

| | |
|----------------|--|
| DESCRIPTION | <p>The <i>deposit()</i> function does not support fees on transfer tokens.</p> <p>If the deposited token has a fee on transfer, there can be a discrepancy in the actually received amount. This discrepancy can cause other users to lose their deposits.</p> |
| RECOMMENDATION | <p>Check the token balance before and after the transfer to get the actually received amount.</p> |
| RESOLUTION | <p>The project team has implemented the recommendation. The reward pool does not allow any tokens with transfer fees.</p> |

Unbounded Loop

| | |
|------------|--------------------------------|
| FINDING ID | #0005 |
| SEVERITY | Low Risk |
| STATUS | Open |
| LOCATION | SmeltRewardPool.sol -> 167-172 |

```
1  function massUpdatePools() public {  
2      uint256 length = poolInfo.length;  
3      for (uint256 pid = 0; pid < length; ++pid) {  
4          updatePool(pid);  
5      }  
6  }
```

| | |
|----------------|---|
| DESCRIPTION | Iterating over an unbounded array can cause transactions to revert due to the gas limit. |
| RECOMMENDATION | It is recommended to add an input variable to <i>massUpdatePools()</i> that bounds the loop to a max limit. The function <i>add()</i> which calls <i>massUpdatePools()</i> would also need the same input variable. |
| RESOLUTION | <p>Project team comment: <i>"The number of pools will not exceed 10."</i></p> <p>Obelisk comment: <i>"We recommend adding a limit to the number of pools to add just in case"</i></p> |

Rewards Can Be Lost

| | |
|------------|--------------------------------|
| FINDING ID | #0006 |
| SEVERITY | Low Risk |
| STATUS | Closed |
| LOCATION | SmeltRewardPool.sol -> 379-389 |

```
1  // Safe SMELT transfer function, in case if rounding error causes
   pool to not have enough SMELTs.
2  function safeSmeltTransfer(address _to, uint256 _amount) internal {
3      uint256 _smeltBalance = smelt.balanceOf(address(this));
4      if (_smeltBalance > 0) {
5          if (_amount > _smeltBalance) {
6              smelt.safeTransfer(_to, _smeltBalance);
7          } else {
8              smelt.safeTransfer(_to, _amount);
9          }
10     }
11 }
```

| | |
|----------------|--|
| DESCRIPTION | The function <i>safeSmeltTransfer()</i> transfers the reward tokens to the user. If the smart contract doesn't have enough reward tokens to send to the user, it will send fewer rewards. Although, the existing functionality will reset the user's rewards to 0, even if he doesn't receive rewards. |
| RECOMMENDATION | Don't allow users to withdraw and abandon their rewards using the regular <i>withdraw()</i> functionality. |
| RESOLUTION | The project team has implemented the recommended changes. |

No Limit For Protocol Values

| | |
|------------|--------------------------------|
| FINDING ID | #0007 |
| SEVERITY | Low Risk |
| STATUS | Partially Closed |
| LOCATION | SmeltRewardPool.sol -> 395-448 |

```
1  function add(  
2      bool _isNftPool,  
3      IERC20 _token,  
4      IERC721 _nft,  
5      uint256 _depFee,  
6      uint256 _allocPoint,  
7      bool _withUpdate,  
8      uint256 _lastRewardTime  
9  ) public onlyOperator {  
10     // ...  
11 }
```

LOCATION SmeltRewardPool.sol -> 451-461

```
1  function set(uint256 _pid, uint256 _allocPoint) public onlyOperator  
2  {  
3      massUpdatePools();  
4      PoolInfo storage pool = poolInfo[_pid];  
5      if (pool.isStarted) {  
6          totalAllocPoint = totalAllocPoint.sub(pool.allocPoint).add(  
7              _allocPoint  
8          );  
9      }  
10     pool.allocPoint = _allocPoint;  
11 }
```

DESCRIPTION The following values *_allocPoint* and *_depFee* can be set arbitrarily high, potentially breaking the functionality of the contract.

RECOMMENDATION Add a reasonable upper limit to the values of *_allocPoint* and *_depFee*. A lower limit may be useful as well.

RESOLUTION The project team has partially implemented the recommendation. There is a limit for *_depFee*, but still no limit for *_allocPoint*.

Project team comment: *"alloc points limits will limit the flexibility of expanding at certain times. Have exact numbers and timeframes to emmit correctly."*

Obelisk team comment: *"Setting a high allocation limit (perhaps 10000) should hopefully provide flexibility without allowing unlimited control."*

Contract Values Can Be Constant Or Immutable

| | |
|----------------|--|
| FINDING ID | #0008 |
| SEVERITY | Informational |
| STATUS | Closed |
| LOCATION | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• SmeltRewardPool.sol -> 19: <i>IERC20 public smelt;</i>• SmeltRewardPool.sol -> 64: <i>uint256 public poolStartTime;</i>• SmeltRewardPool.sol -> 67: <i>uint256 public poolEndTime;</i>• SmeltRewardPool.sol -> 69: <i>address public protocolFundAddress;</i>• SmeltRewardPool.sol -> 72: <i>uint256 public smeltPerSecond = 0.00115 ether;</i>• SmeltRewardPool.sol -> 73: <i>uint256 public runningTime = 800 days;</i> |
| DESCRIPTION | Variables which do not change during the operation of a contract can be marked <i>constant</i> or <i>immutable</i> to reduce gas costs and improve code readability. |
| RECOMMENDATION | Mark these variables as <i>constant</i> or <i>immutable</i> as appropriate. |
| RESOLUTION | The project team has implemented the recommended changes. |

Unused Variables

| | |
|------------|---|
| FINDING ID | #0009 |
| SEVERITY | Informational |
| STATUS | Closed |
| LOCATION | <ul style="list-style-type: none">SmeltRewardPool.sol -> 74: <i>uint256 public constant TOTAL_REWARDS = 80000 ether;</i> |

| | |
|----------------|---|
| DESCRIPTION | The noted variables are never used. |
| RECOMMENDATION | Remove the variables or incorporate them into the contract functionality. |
| RESOLUTION | The project team has implemented the recommended changes. |

Unused Events

| | |
|------------|---|
| FINDING ID | #0010 |
| SEVERITY | Informational |
| STATUS | Closed |
| LOCATION | <ul style="list-style-type: none">SmeltRewardPool.sol -> 87: <i>event StringFailure(string stringFailure);</i> |

| | |
|----------------|---|
| DESCRIPTION | The noted events are never used. |
| RECOMMENDATION | Remove the events. |
| RESOLUTION | The project team has implemented the recommended changes. |

Using Safe Math In Solidity ^0.8.0

| | |
|------------|---------------------------|
| FINDING ID | #0011 |
| SEVERITY | Informational |
| STATUS | Closed |
| LOCATION | SmeltRewardPool.sol -> 17 |

```
1 using SafeMath for uint256;
```

| | |
|----------------|---|
| DESCRIPTION | The <i>SafeMath</i> library is imported in <i>SmeltRewardPool.sol</i> , while the contract is using Solidity ^0.8.0, in which the compiler has built-in overflow check. |
| RECOMMENDATION | Remove the <i>SafeMath</i> library from the contract. |
| RESOLUTION | The project team has implemented the recommended changes. |

Inconsistent Error Messages

| | |
|------------|--|
| FINDING ID | #0012 |
| SEVERITY | Informational |
| STATUS | Closed |
| LOCATION | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• SmeltRewardPool.sol -> 223: <i>require (pool.isNftPool == false , "Pool not for ERC20");</i>• SmeltRewardPool.sol -> 310: <i>require (pool.isNftPool == false , "pool for nfts");</i> |

| | |
|----------------|---|
| DESCRIPTION | The error messages for the same require statements are different. |
| RECOMMENDATION | Keep the error messages consistent across the smart contract. |
| RESOLUTION | <p>The same messages appear in different required statements.</p> <p><i>SmeltRewardPool.sol:227</i> <i>SmeltRewardPool.sol:255</i></p> <p>Project team comment: <i>"have appropriate edits for comments."</i></p> |

No Events Emitted For Changes To Protocol Values

| | |
|------------|--------------------------------|
| FINDING ID | #0013 |
| SEVERITY | Informational |
| STATUS | Partially Closed |
| LOCATION | SmeltRewardPool.sol -> 395-448 |

```
1  function add(  
2      bool _isNftPool,  
3      IERC20 _token,  
4      IERC721 _nft,  
5      uint256 _depFee,  
6      uint256 _allocPoint,  
7      bool _withUpdate,  
8      uint256 _lastRewardTime  
9  ) public onlyOperator {  
10     // ...  
11 }
```

| | |
|----------|--------------------------------|
| LOCATION | SmeltRewardPool.sol -> 499-507 |
|----------|--------------------------------|

```
1  function governanceRecoverUnsupported(  
2      IERC20 _token,  
3      uint256 _amount,  
4      address _to  
5  ) external onlyOperator {  
6      require(address(_token) == address(smelt), "reward token  
only");  
7      _token.safeTransfer(_to, _amount);  
8  }  
9 }
```

| | |
|----------|--|
| LOCATION | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• SmeltRewardPool.sol -> 463: <i>function setTeamToken (address _teamToken) public onlyOperator</i>• SmeltRewardPool.sol -> 468: <i>function setOperator(address _operator) external onlyOperator</i>• SmeltRewardPool.sol -> 451: <i>function set(uint256 _pid, uint256 _allocPoint) public onlyOperator</i> |
|----------|--|

| | |
|-------------|--|
| DESCRIPTION | Functions that change important variables should emit events such that users can more easily monitor the change. |
|-------------|--|

| | |
|----------------|---|
| RECOMMENDATION | Emit events from these functions. |
| RESOLUTION | <p>Events were added to the functions except <i>add()</i>, <i>set()</i> and <i>governanceRecoverUnsupported()</i>.</p> <p>Project team comment: <i>"event for add, set are not added to avoid frontrunning for users who call through contract."</i></p> <p>Obelisk comment: <i>"Frontrunners will generally be watching the mem pool to watch for upcoming transactions and will not be deterred by a lack of events."</i></p> |

Receipt Tokens Does Not Account For Transfers

| | |
|------------|--------------------------------|
| FINDING ID | #0014 |
| SEVERITY | Medium Risk |
| STATUS | Open |
| LOCATION | SmeltRewardPool.sol -> 255-257 |

```
1     if (pool.givesReceipts == true) {
2         IBasedReceipt(pool.receiptToken).mint(_sender, _amount);
3     }
```

LOCATION SmeltRewardPool.sol -> 293-295

```
1     if (pool.givesReceipts == true) {
2         IGodFootPrint(pool.receiptToken).mint(_sender,
3         _tokenIds.length*10**18);
3     }
```

LOCATION SmeltRewardPool.sol -> 326-332

```
1     user.amount = user.amount - _tokenIds.length;
2
3     if (pool.givesReceipts == true) {
4         IERC20 godsRcpt = IERC20(pool.receiptToken);
5         require(godsRcpt.balanceOf(_sender)>= _tokenIds.length,
6         "rcpt token amt < withdraw amt");
7         ERC20Burnable(pool.receiptToken).burnFrom(_sender,
8         _tokenIds.length*10**18);
7     }
```

LOCATION SmeltRewardPool.sol -> 351-356

```
1     user.amount = user.amount - (_amount);
2     if (pool.givesReceipts == true) {
3         IERC20 bsdRcpt = IERC20(pool.receiptToken);
4         require(bsdRcpt.balanceOf(msg.sender)>= _amount, "rcpt
5         token amt < withdraw amt");
6         IBasedReceipt(pool.receiptToken).burnFrom(msg.sender,
7         _amount);
6     }
```

LOCATION

SmeltRewardPool.sol -> 390-393

```

1         if (pool.givesReceipts == true) {
2             require(bsdRcpt.balanceOf(msg.sender) >= _amount, "rcpt
token amt < withdraw amt");
3             IBasedReceipt(pool.receiptToken).burnFrom(msg.sender,
_amount);
4         }

```

LOCATION

SmeltRewardPool.sol -> 418-421

```

1         if (pool.givesReceipts == true) {
2             require(godsRcpt.balanceOf(_sender) >= userIds.length,
"rcpt token amt < withdraw amt");
3             ERC20Burnable(pool.receiptToken).burnFrom(_sender,
userIds.length*10**18);
4         }

```

DESCRIPTION

The receipt token can be transferable. This can lead to incorrect accounting of user funds since user amounts are tracked within the protocol in *user.amount* and receipt tokens are also minted/burned when depositing or withdrawing. If some amount of receipt tokens are transferred, then user funds can become stuck within the protocol. User funds can no longer be withdrawn.

RECOMMENDATION

If the intended behavior of the receipt token is to allow other users to withdraw funds then the contract needs to be modified in such a way to no longer track user funds individually within the protocol.

Although, if the intended behavior of the receipt token is to only allow the original owner to withdraw from the protocol, then it is recommended to either remove the receipt tokens implementation or prevent tokens from being transferable.

Furthermore, the NFTs are non-fungible tokens thus, exchanging them for fungible tokens without keeping track of the owners, will allow anyone to withdraw any NFT from the same collection. The recommendation is to not provide receipt tokens for the NFT pools.

RESOLUTION

Project team comment: "Receipt tokens are implemented into Smelt Reward Pool to allow depositors use these

tokens in other contracts and on other blockchains.

We purposely kept the user info trackable in the pool as an added security measure to make sure only those who deposited funds into our pools can withdraw their funds. - If receipt tokens are lost or stolen - user will be able to still claim their rewards and other malicious actors won't have any access to investor's staked position.

Same logic applies to NFT pool - only those who deposited - can withdraw their nfts, receipt tokens will eventually be bridged to other chains and used elsewhere.

Issuing a fungible receipt token for non-fungible nft lets our investors be more flexible and withdraw any nft they like from their staked position.

We announced risks associated with loss of receipt tokens."

Staked NFTs Can Be Withdrawn

| | |
|------------|--------------------------------|
| FINDING ID | #0015 |
| SEVERITY | High Risk |
| STATUS | Partially Mitigated |
| LOCATION | SmeltRewardPool.sol -> 591-609 |

```
1  function governanceRecoverUnsupportedNft(  
2      IERC721 _token,  
3      uint256[] calldata _tokenIds,  
4      address _to  
5  ) external onlyOperator {  
6      if (block.timestamp < poolEndTime + 30 days) {  
7          uint256 length = poolInfo.length;  
8          for (uint256 pid = 0; pid < length; ++pid) {  
9              PoolInfo storage pool = poolInfo[pid];  
10             require(_token != pool.nft, "pool.nft");  
11         }  
12     }  
13     if (_tokenIds.length > 0) {  
14         for (uint256 i = 0; i < _tokenIds.length; ++i) {  
15             PoolInfo storage pool = poolInfo[i];  
16             pool.nft.safeTransferFrom(address(this), _to,  
17                 _tokenIds[i]);  
18         }  
19     }
```

DESCRIPTION

User staked NFTs can be withdrawn by the operator using the *governanceRecoverUnsupportedNft()* function. The call *pool.nft.safeTransferFrom(address(this), _to, _tokenIds[i]);* does not use the input variable *_token* rather it uses the pool's NFT address. Thus, by providing an arbitrary *_token* address that is not any pool's NFT address, the operator can withdraw all user-staked NFTs.

There is a mechanism in place to prevent withdrawing the NFTs before the rewards end plus 30 days, but if the operator provides an arbitrary *_token* address that is not any pool's NFT address, he can withdraw them anytime.

Although, the NFTs are withdrawable 30 days after the end of rewards even if this issue is resolved.

RECOMMENDATION

Use the input variable *_token* instead of *pool.nft* when transferring unsupported NFTs.

RESOLUTION

Project team comment: "Contract is already deployed - we deployed a timelock and set multisig to operate the timelock. This should erase all issues with owner calling governanceRecoverUnsupported function."

Obelisk Comment: "The owner and operator roles were transferred to the timelock. The current timelock delay is 24 hours, which is relatively short. The project team has stated their intention to increase the timelock delay after adding a few more pools."

Receipt Token Can Have Zero Address

| | |
|------------|--------------------------------|
| FINDING ID | #0016 |
| SEVERITY | Medium Risk |
| STATUS | Partially Mitigated |
| LOCATION | SmeltRewardPool.sol -> 514-515 |

```
1      givesReceipts: _givesReceipts,  
2      receiptToken: _receiptToken
```

| | |
|----------------|---|
| DESCRIPTION | If <i>giveReceipts</i> is true, then <i>receiptToken</i> should be a valid address. Otherwise, protocol functionality would be broken since the protocol assumes that <i>receiptToken</i> is a valid address when <i>giveReceipts</i> is true. |
| RECOMMENDATION | Check that <i>receiptToken</i> is a non-zero address when <i>giveReceipts</i> is true. |
| RESOLUTION | <p>Project team comment: "We will make sure receipt tokens are non 0 address contracts of course when adding other pools (with receipt tokens option)"</p> <p>Obelisk Comment: "The current pools were correctly configured. Care should be taken when deploying future pools to avoid this issue."</p> |

Difficult To Find All Mint Operators

| | |
|------------|--|
| FINDING ID | #0017 |
| SEVERITY | Low Risk |
| STATUS | Partially Mitigated |
| LOCATION | SmeltFtmReceipt.sol -> 68-70 ObolFtmReceipt.sol -> 68-70 GodFootPrint.sol -> 117-119 |

```
1     function setMintOperator(address _operator, bool _isEnabled) public  
    onlyOwner{  
2         mintOperators[_operator] = _isEnabled;  
3     }
```

| | |
|----------------|--|
| DESCRIPTION | Mint operators as part of mapping would be difficult for a user to identify all mint operators for the token. |
| RECOMMENDATION | Create an array to store the operators. |
| RESOLUTION | <p>Project team comment: "contracts are deployed. Mint operator of all 3 contracts is SmeltRewardPool. Ownership of all 3 receipt token contracts has been moved to a multisig as well for safety measures."</p> <p>Obelisk Comment: "The owner and operator roles were transferred to the timelock. The current timelock delay is 24 hours, which is relatively short. The project team has stated their intention to increase the timelock delay after adding a few more pools."</p> |

No Events Emitted For Changes To Protocol Values

| | |
|------------|--|
| FINDING ID | #0018 |
| SEVERITY | Informational |
| STATUS | Open |
| LOCATION | SmeltFtmReceipt.sol -> 68-70 ObolFtmReceipt.sol -> 68-70 GodFootPrint.sol -> 117-119 |

```
1    function setMintOperator(address _operator,bool _isEnabled) public  
    onlyOwner{  
2        mintOperators[_operator] = _isEnabled;  
3    }
```

| | |
|----------------|--|
| DESCRIPTION | Functions that change important variables should emit events such that users can more easily monitor the change. |
| RECOMMENDATION | Emit events from these functions. |
| RESOLUTION | N/A |

SafeMath8 Is Outdated

| | |
|------------|---|
| FINDING ID | #0019 |
| SEVERITY | Informational |
| STATUS | Open |
| LOCATION | SmeltFtmReceipt.sol -> 23 ObolFtmReceipt.sol -> 23 |

```
1 using SafeMath8 for uint8;
```

| | |
|----------------|--|
| DESCRIPTION | The source code for SafeMath8 is outdated and inherits a known issue with memory leaks with the original SafeMath implementation. https://github.com/OpenZeppelin/openzeppelin-contracts/pull/2462/commits |
| RECOMMENDATION | It does not seem that SafeMath8 is being used. It is recommended to remove it. |
| RESOLUTION | N/A |

On-Chain Analysis

No Timelock

| | |
|------------|---|
| FINDING ID | #0020 |
| SEVERITY | Medium Risk |
| STATUS | Partially Mitigated |
| LOCATION | <p>SmeltRewardPool 0x7A1f47c8a26fD895228947ffc0482F3dD9c2cA29</p> <p>SmeltFtmReceipt 0x2733C1DAa3891E7c9Cdf9bC2aCAD74Aa78578B3b</p> <p>ObolFtmReceipt 0x4ef20669E38751E4a585638d12dCFc6FF3635Dd1</p> <p>GodFootPrint 0xbe9e38e6e3386d67e1b7a3754dc39a8cd8b82b08</p> |

| | |
|-------------|--|
| DESCRIPTION | <p>The noted contracts have not had their ownership transferred to a timelock contract.</p> <p>The current owner/operators are: 0xf7cd324f26ce0c7a53471d8818b5c17cb532d4a7, 0xa4fe067c4646c7b7ca8944c60490fdb176e3acd3</p> <p>The current mint operator is: 0x7a1f47c8a26fd895228947ffc0482f3dd9c2ca29 (SmeltRewardPool)</p> <p>The functions that owner/operator (0xf7cd324f26ce0c7a53471d8818b5c17cb532d4a7) of SmeltRewardPool can call are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• add()• set()• setOperator()• governanceAllocationAdjustment()• moveRewardsToUpdatedContract()• governanceRecoverUnsupported()• governanceRecoverUnsupportedNft() <p>The functions that owner</p> |
|-------------|--|

| | |
|----------------|--|
| | <p>(0xa4fe067c4646c7b7ca8944c60490fdb176e3acd3) of SmeltFtmReceipt and ObolFtmReceipt can call are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • governanceRecoverUnsupported() • setMintOperator() • burnFrom() (Implicitly through the mint operator, currently only SmeltRewardPool contract) • mint() (Implicitly through the mint operator, currently only SmeltRewardPool contract) <p>The functions that owner (0xa4fe067c4646c7b7ca8944c60490fdb176e3acd3) of GodFootPrint can call are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • governanceRecoverUnsupported() • setMintOperator() • mint() (Implicitly through the mint operator, currently only SmeltRewardPool contract) |
| RECOMMENDATION | Transfer ownership to a timelock contract. Obelisk recommends a timelock delay of at least 72 hours. |
| RESOLUTION | <p>The Operator of SmeltRewardPool (0x7A1f47c8a26fD895228947ffc0482F3dD9c2cA29)</p> <p>Was transferred to: Timelock 0x1f661f620f889694e064967fc4ef377ce540fd97</p> <p>The owner of these contracts: ObolFtmReceipt 0x4ef20669E38751E4a585638d12dCFc6FF3635Dd1, GodFootPrint 0xBe9E38E6e3386D67e1b7A3754dc39a8cd8b82b08, SmeltFtmReceipt 0x2733C1DAa3891E7c9Cdf9bC2aCAD74Aa78578B3b, SmeltRewardPool 0x7A1f47c8a26fD895228947ffc0482F3dD9c2cA29</p> <p>Was transferred to: MultiSig 0xf7cd324f26ce0c7a53471d8818b5c17cb532d4a7.</p> |

Multisig Low Number of Signers

| | |
|------------|--------------|
| FINDING ID | #0021 |
| SEVERITY | Low Risk |
| STATUS | Mitigated |
| LOCATION | The Multisig |

| | |
|----------------|---|
| DESCRIPTION | The Multisig requires 1/2 signers to execute a transaction. This is a low proportion of people with access. |
| RECOMMENDATION | <p>Clearly identify each signer for reference.</p> <p>Require that a majority of the owners sign any transactions.</p> |
| RESOLUTION | <p>The project team added another address to the Multisig and increased the threshold to 2/3 signers.</p> <p>Multisig signers: 0xa4fe067c4646c7b7ca8944c60490fdb176e3acd3 0xbf43880db8cbba67b520f76faf3e6f3840b419f1 0xb9b22504b9071291e938e0e582934a82c4a4670c</p> <p>Obelisk Comment: "Note that Obelisk has not verified who these signers are."</p> |

External Addresses

Externally Owned Accounts

No Externally Owned Accounts

External Contracts

These contracts are not part of the audit scope.

LayerZero Fantom Endpoint

| | |
|---------|---|
| ADDRESS | 0xb6319cc6c8c27a8f5daf0dd3df91ea35c4720dd7 |
| USAGE | 0xbe9e38e6e3386d67e1b7a3754dc39a8cd8b82b08 <i>GodFootPrint.lzEndpoint</i> |
| IMPACT | <ul style="list-style-type: none">has elevated permissions as owner, operator, or other |

Treasury - Gnosis Safe

| | |
|---------|--|
| ADDRESS | 0xf7CD324F26cE0C7A53471d8818b5C17cB532D4A7 |
| USAGE | 0x7A1f47c8a26fD895228947ffc0482F3dD9c2cA29 <i>SmeltRewardPool.owner</i> 0x4ef20669E38751E4a585638d12dCFc6FF3635Dd1 <i>ObolFtmReceipt.owner</i> 0xBe9E38E6e3386D67e1b7A3754dc39a8cd8b82b08 <i>GodFootPrint.owner</i> 0x2733C1DAa3891E7c9Cdf9bC2aCAD74Aa78578B3b <i>SmeltFtmReceipt.owner</i> |
| IMPACT | <ul style="list-style-type: none">receives transfer of tokens deposited by usershas elevated permissions as owner, operator, or other |

Timelock (Operator)

| | |
|---------|--|
| ADDRESS | 0x1f661f620f889694e064967fc4ef377ce540fd97 |
| USAGE | 0x7A1f47c8a26fD895228947ffc0482F3dD9c2cA29 <i>SmeltRewardPool.operator</i> |
| IMPACT | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• receives transfer of tokens deposited by users• has elevated permissions as owner, operator, or other |

External Tokens

These contracts are not part of the audit scope.

Not Deployed Yet

Appendix A - Reviewed Documents

Deployed Contracts

| Document | Address |
|---------------------|--|
| GodFootPrint.sol | 0xBe9E38E6e3386D67e1b7A3754dc39a8cd8b82b08 |
| ObolFtmReceipt.sol | 0x4ef20669E38751E4a585638d12dCFc6FF3635Dd1 |
| SmeltFtmReceipt.sol | 0x2733C1DAa3891E7c9Cdf9bC2aCAD74Aa78578B3b |
| SmeltRewardPool.sol | 0x7A1f47c8a26fD895228947ffc0482F3dD9c2cA29 |

Libraries And Interfaces

IBasedReceipt.sol
IGodFootPrint.sol
LzApp.sol
NonblockingLzApp.sol

Revisions

| | |
|------------|--|
| Revision 1 | a63e16383f5220f6eddd738fee6512dff0fb78a9 |
| Revision 2 | a3f3b3de971a801f781d2c50d6d2bc7a779a0aec |
| Revision 3 | ead349ba8b9b4b86cb6d386837a02cfcd30a6f4b |
| Revision 4 | ad4c1e5d2a8d09b1f86d9685caae2839e3986567 |

Imported Contracts

| | |
|--------------|-------|
| OpenZeppelin | 4.5.0 |
|--------------|-------|

Appendix B - Risk Ratings

| Risk | Description |
|---------------|--|
| High Risk | Security risks that are <i>almost certain</i> to lead to <i>impairment or loss of funds</i> . Projects are advised to fix as soon as possible. |
| Medium Risk | Security risks that are <i>very likely</i> to lead to <i>impairment or loss of funds</i> with <i>limited impact</i> . Projects are advised to fix as soon as possible. |
| Low Risk | Security risks that can lead to <i>damage to the protocol</i> . Projects are advised to fix. Issues with this rating might be used in an exploit with other issues to cause significant damage. |
| Informational | Noteworthy information. Issues may include code conventions, missing or conflicting information, gas optimizations, and other advisories. |

Appendix C - Finding Statuses

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| Closed | Contracts were modified to permanently resolve the finding. |
| Mitigated | The finding was resolved on-chain. The issue may require monitoring, for example in the case of a time lock. |
| Partially Closed | Contracts were modified to partially fix the issue |
| Partially Mitigated | The finding was resolved by project specific methods which cannot be verified on chain. Examples include compounding at a given frequency, or the use of a multisig wallet. |
| Open | The finding was not addressed. |

Appendix D - Glossary

Contract Structure

Contract: An address with which provides functionality to users and other contracts. They are implemented in code and deployed to the blockchain.

Protocol: A system of contracts which work together.

Stakeholders: The users, operators, owners, and other participants of a contract.

Security Concepts

Bug: A defect in the contract code.

Exploit: A chain of events involving bugs, vulnerabilities, or other security risks which damages a protocol.

Funds: Tokens deposited by users or other stakeholders into a protocol.

Impairment: The loss of functionality in a contract or protocol.

Security risk: A circumstance that may result in harm to the stakeholders of a protocol. Examples include vulnerabilities in the code, bugs, excessive permissions, missing timelock, etc.

Vulnerability: A vulnerability is a flaw that allows an attacker to potentially cause harm to the stakeholders of a contract. They may occur in a contract's code, design, or deployed state on the blockchain.

Appendix E - Audit Procedure

A typical Obelisk audit uses a combination of the three following methods:

Manual analysis consists of a direct inspection of the contracts to identify any security issues. Obelisk auditors use their experience in software development to spot vulnerabilities. Their familiarity with common contracts allows them to identify a wide range of issues in both forked contracts as well as original code.

Static analysis is software analysis of the contracts. Such analysis is called “static” as it examines the code outside of a runtime environment. Static analysis is a powerful tool used by auditors to identify subtle issues and to verify the results of manual analysis.

On-chain analysis is the audit of the contracts as they are deployed on the block-chain. This procedure verifies that:

- deployed contracts match those which were audited in manual/static analysis;
- contract values are set to reasonable values;
- contracts are connected so that interdependent contract function correctly;
- and the ability to modify contract values is restricted via a timelock or DAO mechanism. (We recommend a timelock value of at least 72 hours)

Each obelisk audit is performed by at least two independent auditors who perform their analysis separately.

After the analysis is complete, the auditors will make recommendations for each issue based on best practice and industry standards. The project team can then resolve the issues, and the auditors will verify that the issues have been resolved with no new issues introduced.

Our auditing method lays a particular focus on the following important concepts:

- Quality code and the use of best practices, industry standards, and thoroughly tested libraries.
- Testing the contract from different angles to ensure that it works under a multitude of circumstances.
- Referencing the contracts through databases of common security flaws.

Follow Obelisk Auditing for the Latest Information



ObeliskOrg



ObeliskOrg



Part of Tibereum Group