

BLOCKSTARS TECHNOLOGY



it@blockstars.com.au

SMART CONTRACTS CODE REVIEW AND SECURITY ANALYSIS REPORT

Handle-forex

17/09/2021

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|------------------|
| <i>Introduction.....</i> | <i>3</i> |
| <i>Project Scope and Specifications.....</i> | <i>4</i> |
| <i>Analysis Result and Suggestions.....</i> | <i>5</i> |
| Smart Contract: TGE.sol..... | 5 |
| Smart Contract: ForexVesting.sol | 7 |
| Smart Contract: Forex.sol | 8 |
| Smart Contract: Signature.sol..... | 9 |
| <i>Executive Summary</i> | <i>10</i> |

INTRODUCTION

This report contains confidential information of audit summary of Forex tokens related smart contract programs running in Handle.fi project. It analyses security vulnerabilities, smart contract best practices, and possible attacks, using popular analysis tools and linters. We outlined our systematic approach to evaluate potential security issues in core smart contracts in Handle-forex project and provide additional suggestions for improvement.

The basic information of Handle.fi Forex Tokens project

| Item | Description |
|----------------|---|
| Issuer | Handle.fi |
| Website | https://handle.fi/ |
| Source | Smart contract programs (Handle-forex) |
| Language | Solidity |
| Blockchain | Ethereum |
| Git Repository | https://github.com/handle-fi/handle-forex |
| Audit method | Static analysis using symbolic execution tools |

PROJECT SCOPE AND SPECIFICATIONS

Scope of this project is to identify smart contract vulnerabilities to improve the coding practice in Handle forex token related smart contracts implemented for Handle.fi project. We classified the security vulnerabilities of smart contracts in three categories according to their impact level, such as critical, medium, and low class of vulnerabilities. Moreover, we used the impact level definitions from the recent smart contract security analysis research works [[ref1](#), [ref2](#)]. and assigned proper impact values for the identified smart contract vulnerabilities in Handle.fi Forex tokens project.

IP1: It raises critical behaviours and attackers can make benefit by using this vulnerability.

IP2: It raises critical behaviours and attackers cannot make benefit using this vulnerability.

IP3: It raises critical behaviours and attackers cannot trigger them externally (If they trigger, they cannot make benefit.

IP4: Contract works normally, and it leads to potential risks of errors when external programs call the contract.

IP5: It works normally, and it will not lead risks for external callers. But there is no re-usability, and it leads to gas wastage.

| Impact Levels | Severity |
|---------------|-------------------|
| IP1 | High Critical |
| IP2 | Moderate Critical |
| IP3 | Average Critical |
| IP4 | Less Critical |
| IP5 | Normal Risk |

ANALYSIS RESULT AND SUGGESTIONS

We used different tools and linters to analyse given smart contracts from Handle.fi Forex tokens project. The major tools we used to analyse smart contracts are Mythx (Consensys), and Solhint linter. The platforms we integrated to test the contracts are Remix, Visual Studio Code, Truffle, and Openzeppelin Test Environment.

Smart Contract: TGE.sol

FINDING 1

Issue: Unchecked returned value from low-level external call

Severity: IP3 (Average Critical)

Contract: TGE.sol

Function name: call()

Description:

- Low-level external calls return a boolean value. If the callee halts with an exception, 'false' is returned and execution continues in the caller. The caller should check whether an exception happened and react accordingly to avoid unexpected behavior.
- For example it is often desirable to wrap low-level external calls in require() so the transaction is reverted if the call fails.
- Eg: Return value check is recommended to use as below in Line 136

```
(bool success, )= msg.sender.call{value: currentDeposit + deposit - userCap}("");  
require(success, "Failed to send"); // check return value before write logics
```

```
deposit = userCap - currentDeposit;
```

- Further it is recommended to use openzeppelin SafeMath utils for integer variables to avoid integer arithmetic issues.

Exact Place of usage:

```
msg.sender.call{value: currentDeposit + deposit - userCap}(""); - Line 136
```

```
msg.sender.call{value: ethDeposited + deposit - depositCap}(""); - Line 141
```

```
if (eth > 0) msg.sender.call{value: eth}(""); - Line 187
```

```
if (balance > 0) msg.sender.call{value: self.balance}(""); - Line 364
```

Smart Contract Weakness Classification: SWC-104

FINDING 2

Issue: Dependence on predictable environment variable

Severity: IP4 (Less Critical)

Contract: TGE.sol

Variable name: block.timestamp

Description:

- A control flow decision is made based on The block.timestamp environment variable. The block.timestamp environment variable is used to determine a control flow decision.
- Avoid using any of those environment variables and be aware that use of these variables introduces a certain level of trust into miners.
- But, It is more critical if you use the block.timestamp values in calculations related to funds.

Exact place of usage:

```
require(  
    _generationStartDate > block.timestamp, Line - 83  
    "Start date must be in the future"  
);  
  
return block.timestamp >= generationStartDate; Line – 267  
  
return block.timestamp > generationStartDate + generationDuration; Line – 274  
  
return claimDate != 0 && block.timestamp >= claimDate; - Line – 281  
  
claimDate = block.timestamp + 1; - Line – 377
```

Smart Contract Weakness Classification: SWC-116

FINDING 3

Issue: A floating pragma is set

Severity: IP5 (Normal Risk)

Contract: TGE.sol

Description:

- The current pragma Solidity directive is ""^0.8.0"".
- It is recommended to specify a fixed compiler version to ensure that the bytecode produced does not vary between builds.
Eg: `pragma solidity 0.8.0;`
- This is especially important if you rely on bytecode-level verification of the code.

Exact place of usage:

`pragma solidity ^0.8.0;` - [Line 2](#)

Smart Contract Weakness Classification: SWC-103

Smart Contract: ForexVesting.sol

FINDING 1

Issue: Dependence on predictable environment variable

Severity: IP4 (Less Critical)

Contract: ForexVesting.sol

Variable name: block.timestamp

Description:

- A control flow decision is made based on The block.timestamp environment variable. The block.timestamp environment variable is used to determine a control flow decision.
- Avoid using any of those environment variables and be aware that use of these variables introduces a certain level of trust into miners.
- It is more critical if you use the block.timestamp values in calculations related to funds

Exact place of usage:

`require(`


```
block.timestamp >= participant.lastClaimDate + minimumClaimDelay, - Line 84  
"Must wait before next claim"  
);  
uint256 elapsed = block.timestamp - lastClaimDate; - Line 111  
return _balanceOf(account, block.timestamp); - Line 145  
claimStartDate = block.timestamp + 1; - Line 227  
return claimStartDate != 0 && block.timestamp >= claimStartDate; - Line 234
```

Smart Contract Weakness Classification: SWC-116

FINDING 2

Issue: A floating pragma is set

Severity: IP5 (Normal Risk)

Contract: ForexVesting.sol

Description:

- The current pragma Solidity directive is ""^0.8.0"".
- It is recommended to specify a fixed compiler version to ensure that the bytecode produced does not vary between builds.
[Eg: pragma solidity 0.8.0;](#)
- This is especially important if you rely on bytecode-level verification of the code.

Exact place of usage:

pragma solidity ^0.8.0; - [Line 2](#)

Smart Contract Weakness Classification: SWC-103

Smart Contract: Forex.sol

FINDING 1

Issue: A floating pragma is set

Severity: IP5 (Normal Risk)

Contract: Forex.sol

Description:

- The current pragma Solidity directive is ""^0.8.0"".
- It is recommended to specify a fixed compiler version to ensure that the bytecode produced does not vary between builds.
Eg: [pragma solidity 0.8.0;](#)
- This is especially important if you rely on bytecode-level verification of the code.

Exact place of usage:

pragma solidity ^0.8.0; - Line 2

Smart Contract Weakness Classification: SWC-103

Smart Contract: Signature.sol

FINDING 1

Issue: A floating pragma is set

Severity: IP5 (Normal Risk)

Contract: Signature.sol

Description:

- The current pragma Solidity directive is ""^0.8.0"".
- It is recommended to specify a fixed compiler version to ensure that the bytecode produced does not vary between builds.
Eg: [pragma solidity 0.8.0;](#)

Exact place of usage:

pragma solidity ^0.8.0; - Line 2

Smart Contract Weakness Classification: SWC-103

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Contracts | Findings & SWC | Status | Action |
|------------------|---|-------------------------------|---|
| TGE.sol | Unchecked returned value from low-level external call - SWC-104 | IP3 (Average Critical) | Recommended to correct |
| | Dependence on predictable environment variable - SWC-116 | IP4 (Less Critical) | Better to avoid the use of timestamp value. Can be ignored since the timestamp value is not used in fund related calculations. |
| | A floating pragma is set - SWC-103 | IP5 (Normal Risk) | Can be ignored |
| ForexVesting.sol | Dependence on predictable environment variable - SWC-116 | IP4 (Less Critical) | Better to avoid the use of timestamp value. Can be ignored since the timestamp value is not used in fund related calculations. |
| | A floating pragma is set - SWC-103 | IP5 (Normal Risk) | Can be ignored |
| Forex.sol | A floating pragma is set - SWC-103 | IP5 (Normal Risk) | Can be ignored |
| Signature.sol | A floating pragma is set - SWC-103 | IP5 (Normal Risk) | Can be ignored |