



# **Purpose of Profit Foundation Smart Contracts Review | January 2025**

---

by ChainSafe Systems | January 2025

# Table of contents

---

- 1. Introduction
  - Defining Severity
    - Referencing updated code
    - Disclaimer
- 2. Executive Summary
- 3. Line-by-line review
  - `src/BuyPurpose.sol`
  - `src/PFP.sol`
  - `src/PurposeRewards.sol`

# 1. Introduction

---

Date	Auditor(s)
January 2025	Anderson Lee

**Purpose of Profit Foundation** requested **ChainSafe Systems** to perform a review of the Purpose smart contracts. The contracts can be identified by the following git commit hash:

5521dbc0544e1bef281afdb9aa4cb3a95ff95991

There are 3 contracts in scope.

After the initial review, **Purpose of Profit Foundation** team applied a number of updates which can be identified by the following git commit hash: ccfdd1505e4f8ca1bc5fe60b79fed5b2a39c4d7b

Additional verification was performed after that.

# Defining Severity

Each finding is assigned a severity level.

Note	Notes are informational in nature. They are typically suggestions around best practices or readability. Code maintainers should use their own judgment as to whether to address such issues.
Optimization	Optimizations are objective in nature but are not security vulnerabilities. These should be addressed unless there is a clear reason not to.
Minor	Minor issues are objective in nature but are not security vulnerabilities. These should be addressed unless there is a clear reason not to.
Major	Major 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.
Critical	Critical issues are directly exploitable security vulnerabilities that need to be fixed.

## Referencing updated code

Resolved	The finding has been acknowledged and the team has since updated the code.
Rejected	The team dismissed this finding and no changes will be made.

## Disclaimer

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

## 2. Executive Summary

---

There are **no** known compiler bugs for the specified compiler version (0.8.20), that might affect the contracts' logic.

There were **0 critical**, **0 major**, **1 minor**, 10 informational/optimization issues identified in the initial version of the contracts.

We are looking forward to future engagements with the Purpose of Profit Foundation team.

## 3. Line-by-line review

### src/BuyPurpose.sol

**L2** Note Acknowledged

Floating pragma. Consider using the fixed pragma version that was used for development and tests.

**L11** Optimization Resolved

The `pfpToken` variable is only set in the constructor. It could be made immutable.

**L12** Optimization Acknowledged

The `priceFeed` variable is only set in the constructor. It could be made immutable.

**L13** Optimization Resolved

The `TOKEN_PRICE_USD` variable is only set with a hardcoded value during the deployment. It could be made constant.

**L45** Minor Acknowledged

```
function getLatestETHPrice() public view returns (uint256) {
    (, int256 answer,,, ) = priceFeed.latestRoundData();
    require(answer > 0, "Invalid price from Chainlink");
    return uint256(answer * 10 ** 10); // Convert price to 18 decimals
}
```

The `getLatestETHPrice()` function could return stale results. The Chainlink's `latestRoundData()` function also returns the timestamp which the price was updated but the `getLatestETHPrice()` function doesn't check the timestamp. As a result, the function could return an outdated price. Consider adding a check if the timestamp which the price was updated is within the certain period from the current time.

**L54** Note Acknowledged

Deprecated Eth transfer function. Consider using `.call()` function to send ether and check the return value.

### src/PurposeRewards.sol

**L2** Note Resolved

Floating pragma. Consider using the fixed pragma version that was used for development and tests.

**L58** Note Resolved  
The `TierFilled` event is not used.

**L60** Note Resolved  
The `StakerAdded` event is not used.

**L230,236** Optimization Resolved  
The `tier.stakes[msg.sender]` variable is read twice from storage. Consider caching the value and using it in the function.

**L334,340** Optimization Resolved  
The `tier.stakes[msg.sender]` is read twice from storage. Consider using the `userStake` memory variable while updating `rewardDebt` .