



Bracket.fi – Channels and EpochChannels

Smart Contract Security Audit

Prepared by: Halborn

Date of Engagement: December 19th, 2022 – December 28th, 2022

Visit: Halborn.com

DOCUMENT REVISION HISTORY	5
CONTACTS	6
1 EXECUTIVE OVERVIEW	7
1.1 INTRODUCTION	8
1.2 AUDIT SUMMARY	8
1.3 TEST APPROACH & METHODOLOGY	9
RISK METHODOLOGY	10
1.4 SCOPE	12
2 ASSESSMENT SUMMARY & FINDINGS OVERVIEW	13
3 FINDINGS & TECH DETAILS	14
3.1 (HAL-01) ERC-20 TRANSFER IGNORING RETURN VALUE - LOW	16
Description	16
Risk Level	16
Recommendation	16
Remediation Plan	16
3.2 (HAL-02) CENTRALIZATION RISK - INFORMATIONAL	17
Description	17
Risk Level	17
Recommendation	17
Remediation Plan	17
3.3 (HAL-03) IMMUTABLE DEPENDENCIES OF THE EPOCH CHANNELS CONTRACT - INFORMATIONAL	18
Description	18
Risk Level	18

Recommendation	18
Remediation Plan	18
3.4 (HAL-04) HARDCODED STATE VARIABLE - INFORMATIONAL	20
Description	20
Risk Level	20
Recommendation	20
Remediation Plan	21
3.5 (HAL-05) MISSING ZERO ADDRESS CHECK - INFORMATIONAL	22
Description	22
Code Location	22
Risk Level	22
Recommendation	22
Remediation Plan	22
3.6 (HAL-06) FLOATING PRAGMA - INFORMATIONAL	23
Description	23
Risk Level	23
Recommendation	23
Remediation Plan	23
3.7 (HAL-07) > 0 CONSUMES MORE GAS THAN != 0 FOR UINTS - INFORMATIONAL	24
Description	24
Code Location	24
Risk Level	24
Recommendation	24

	Remediation Plans	24
4	MANUAL TESTING	25
4.1	RE-ENTRANCY ATTACKS	26
	Description	26
	Results	26
4.2	INVALID OFFERS AND CHANNELS	27
	Description	27
	Results	27
4.3	ADD AND REDUCE AVAILABLE FUNCTIONS	28
	Description	28
	Results	28
4.4	FUND MANAGEMENT	29
	Description	29
	Results	29
4.5	ACCESS CONTROLS	30
	Description	30
	Results	30
4.6	CLAIM AND PAY/WITHDRAW WORKFLOW	31
	Description	31
	Results	32
4.7	UNCLAIMED POLICY TRANSFER	33
	Description	33
	Results	33
4.8	PROPER CALCULATIONS	34
	Description	34

	Results	34
4.9	COMISSION HANDLING	35
	Description	35
	Results	35
5	AUTOMATED TESTING	36
5.1	STATIC ANALYSIS REPORT	37
	Description	37
	Results	37
5.2	AUTOMATED SECURITY SCAN	41
	Description	41
	Results	41

DOCUMENT REVISION HISTORY

VERSION	MODIFICATION	DATE	AUTHOR
0.1	Document Creation	12/29/2022	Manuel García
0.2	Document Updates	12/29/2022	Manuel García
0.3	Final Draft	12/29/2022	Manuel García
0.4	Draft Review	12/29/2022	Ataberk Yavuzer
0.5	Draft Review	01/02/2023	Piotr Cielas
0.6	Draft Review	01/02/2023	Gabi Urrutia
1.0	Remediation Plan	01/13/2023	Manuel García
1.1	Remediation Plan Review	01/16/2023	Roberto Reigada
1.2	Remediation Plan Review	01/16/2023	Piotr Cielas
1.3	Remediation Plan Review	01/16/2023	Gabi Urrutia
1.4	Epoch Channels Changes Review	01/28/2023	Manuel García

CONTACTS

CONTACT	COMPANY	EMAIL
Rob Behnke	Halborn	Rob.Behnke@halborn.com
Steven Walbroehl	Halborn	Steven.Walbroehl@halborn.com
Gabi Urrutia	Halborn	Gabi.Urrutia@halborn.com
Piotr Cielas	Halborn	Piotr.Cielas@halborn.com
Roberto Reigada	Halborn	Roberto.Reigada@halborn.com
Manuel García	Halborn	Manuel.Diaz@halborn.com
Diogo Pereira	Halborn	Diogo.Pereira@halborn.com
Ataberk Yavuzer	Halborn	Ataberk.Yavuzer@halborn.com



EXECUTIVE OVERVIEW



1.1 INTRODUCTION

Bracket.fi Channels allows users to bet on the price of an asset to go out of the money (OTM) i.e. outside predefined volatility parameters. If the price stays within the range defined by the funder, the users can bet against it by paying a premium and receive rewards as long as the price stays in the money (ITM) for the duration of the channel.

Epoch Channels is based on Channels. The channels are defined by the contract owner and users are betting against each other, paying a predefined premium betting if the asset price stays ITM or goes OTM once the expiry time is reached. The premiums are then being redistributed to the winning side.

Bracket.fi engaged Halborn to conduct a security audit on their smart contracts beginning on December 19th, 2022 and ending on December 28th, 2022 . The security assessment was scoped to the programs provided in the [bracketx-halborn](#) GitLab repository. Commit hashes and further details can be found in the Scope section of this report.

1.2 AUDIT SUMMARY

The team at Halborn was provided 2 weeks for the engagement and assigned 2 full-time security engineers to audit the security of the programs in scope. The security engineers are blockchain and smart contract security experts with advanced penetration testing and smart contract hacking skills, and deep knowledge of multiple blockchain protocols.

The purpose of the audits is to:

- Identify potential security issues within the programs
- Ensure that smart contract functions operate as intended

In summary, Halborn identified some improvements to reduce the likelihood and impact of multiple risks, which has been successfully addressed by

Bracket.fi . The main ones are the following:

- When performing ERC20 token transfers, the returned value was not being checked. Some non-standard ERC20 tokens don't revert upon unsuccessful ERC20 transfer; however, they return false. In order to address this Bracket.fi wrapped the transfer functions in a require statement that reverted the transaction unless it returned true.

1.3 TEST APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

Halborn performed a combination of manual and automated security testing to balance efficiency, timeliness, practicality, and accuracy in regard to the scope of this audit. While manual testing is recommended to uncover flaws in logic, process, and implementation; automated testing techniques help enhance coverage of the code and can quickly identify items that do not follow the security best practices. The following phases and associated tools were used during the audit:

- Research into architecture and purpose
- Smart contract manual code review and walkthrough
- Graphing out functionality and contract logic/connectivity/functions ([solgraph](#))
- Manual assessment of use and safety for the critical Solidity variables and functions in scope to identify any arithmetic related vulnerability classes
- Manual testing by custom scripts
- Scanning of solidity files for vulnerabilities, security hot-spots or bugs. ([MythX](#))
- Static Analysis of security for scoped contract, and imported functions. ([Slither](#))
- Testnet deployment ([Brownie](#), [Remix IDE](#), [Ganache](#), [Foundry](#))

RISK METHODOLOGY:

Vulnerabilities or issues observed by Halborn are ranked based on the risk assessment methodology by measuring the **LIKELIHOOD** of a security incident and the **IMPACT** should an incident occur. This framework works for communicating the characteristics and impacts of technology vulnerabilities. The quantitative model ensures repeatable and accurate measurement while enabling users to see the underlying vulnerability characteristics that were used to generate the Risk scores. For every vulnerability, a risk level will be calculated on a scale of 5 to 1 with 5 being the highest likelihood or impact.

RISK SCALE - LIKELIHOOD

- 5 - Almost certain an incident will occur.
- 4 - High probability of an incident occurring.
- 3 - Potential of a security incident in the long term.
- 2 - Low probability of an incident occurring.
- 1 - Very unlikely issue will cause an incident.

RISK SCALE - IMPACT

- 5 - May cause devastating and unrecoverable impact or loss.
- 4 - May cause a significant level of impact or loss.
- 3 - May cause a partial impact or loss to many.
- 2 - May cause temporary impact or loss.
- 1 - May cause minimal or un-noticeable impact.

The risk level is then calculated using a sum of these two values, creating a value of 10 to 1 with 10 being the highest level of security risk.

CRITICAL	HIGH	MEDIUM	LOW	INFORMATIONAL
----------	------	--------	-----	---------------

- 10 - CRITICAL
- 9 - 8 - HIGH
- 7 - 6 - MEDIUM
- 5 - 4 - LOW

3 - 1 - VERY LOW AND INFORMATIONAL

1.4 SCOPE

Code Repositories:

- BNPL Contracts Repository: [bracketx-halborn](#)
- Commit ID:
 - Audit: [0c8dc3237b7530e0cdbe0e68928adbc8b167971b](#)
 - Remediation: [7aa426ee0a8f367aca5875267d9872bac05ec17d](#)
 - Remediation: [6fe5621f23b7cd09bc4d3396b9573c18c154d36c](#)
 - EpochChannels Changes: [f9a1ffbfd4a65e9d68ea6d06d9c75d9007760c22](#)
- Smart contracts in scope:
 1. Channel.sol
 2. CNFT.sol
 3. ChanOffers.sol
 4. ChanLib.sol
 5. ChanConfig.sol
 6. ChanMaxKeeper.sol
 7. ChanKeeper.sol
 8. EpochChannels.sol
 9. PriceProd.sol

Out-of-Scope:

- Third-party libraries and dependencies
- Economic attacks
- Attacks based on third-party oracle price manipulation.

2. ASSESSMENT SUMMARY & FINDINGS OVERVIEW

CRITICAL	HIGH	MEDIUM	LOW	INFORMATIONAL
0	0	0	1	6

LIKELIHOOD

IMPACT

(HAL-01)				
(HAL-02)				
(HAL-03) (HAL-04) (HAL-05) (HAL-06) (HAL-07)				

SECURITY ANALYSIS	RISK LEVEL	REMEDIATION DATE
HAL01 - ERC-20 TRANSFER IGNORING RETURN VALUE	Low	SOLVED - 01/13/2023
HAL02 - CENTRALIZATION RISK	Informational	SOLVED - 01/13/2023
HAL03 - IMMUTABLE DEPENDENCIES OF THE EPOCH CHANNELS CONTRACT	Informational	SOLVED - 01/13/2023
HAL04 - HARDCODED STATE VARIABLE	Informational	SOLVED - 01/13/2023
HAL05 - MISSING ZERO ADDRESS CHECK	Informational	SOLVED - 01/13/2023
HAL06 - FLOATING PRAGMA	Informational	SOLVED - 01/13/2023
HAL07 - > 0 CONSUMES MORE GAS THAN != 0 FOR UINTS	Informational	SOLVED - 01/13/2023



FINDINGS & TECH DETAILS



3.1 (HAL-01) ERC-20 TRANSFER IGNORING RETURN VALUE - LOW

Description:

In the `Channel` contract, when transferring the commission from the contract to the owner the transfer function is not wrapped with a `require` statement, meaning the return value of the `transfer` function is ignored.

While failed USDC transfers are reverted, it is important to note that some failed ERC-20 token transfers may return a boolean `false` instead, which may lead to processing transactions that otherwise should be reverted.

Listing 1: `contracts/Channel.sol` (Line 362)

```
362 IERC20(usdc).transfer payable(owner()), v.commishUSDC);
```

Risk Level:

Likelihood - 1

Impact - 4

Recommendation:

Wrap the transfer function with a `require` statement to ensure failed ERC20 token transfers are always reverted.

Remediation Plan:

SOLVED: ERC20 token transfers were wrapped with a `require` statement which the transaction revert unless transfer returns `true`.

Commit ID: [6fe5621f23b7cd09bc4d3396b9573c18c154d36c](#).

3.2 (HAL-02) CENTRALIZATION RISK - INFORMATIONAL

Description:

The `CNFT` contract implements methods for the contract owner to mint and set policies. While the probability of this happening is very low, if the private keys of the owner account are compromised, a malicious user could potentially mint NFTs and use the `setPolicy()` function to steal other users' policies.

Listing 2: contracts/CNFT.sol (Line 56)

```
56 function setPolicy(uint256 tokenId, ChanLib.CPolicy memory policy)
57     external
58     onlyBrkt
59 {
60     Policies[tokenId] = policy;
61 }
```

Risk Level:

Likelihood - 1

Impact - 2

Recommendation:

Remove the owner from the `onlyBrkt()` modifier.

Remediation Plan:

SOLVED: The contract owner was removed from the `onlyBrkt` modifier.

Commit ID: [7aa426ee0a8f367aca5875267d9872bac05ec17d](#).

3.3 (HAL-03) IMMUTABLE DEPENDENCIES OF THE EPOCH CHANNELS CONTRACT - INFORMATIONAL

Description:

In the `EpochChannels` contract, the addresses of the pricing contract and the Ethereum/USD Price Feed Oracle is set on initialization. However, these addresses cannot be changed later on if those contracts are deprecated or their private keys are compromised.

Listing 3: `contracts/EpochChannels.sol` (Line 70)

```
70 function initialize(address _pricing, address _eth) external
↳ initializer {
71     __Ownable_init();
72     __Pausable_init();
73     __ReentrancyGuard_init();
74     require(_pricing != address(0) && _eth != address(0), "ZADDR")
↳ ;
75     pricing = _pricing;
76     ETH = _eth;
```

Risk Level:

Likelihood - 1

Impact - 1

Recommendation:

Implement a function to change the dependencies addresses.

Remediation Plan:

SOLVED: The Bracket team added the `cnlLinks` functions to change dependency addresses.

Commit ID: [7aa426ee0a8f367aca5875267d9872bac05ec17d](#).

3.4 (HAL-04) HARDCODED STATE VARIABLE – INFORMATIONAL

Description:

In the `EpochChannels` contract, the minimum USD amount a user can invest in an Epoch Channel `MIN_BUY_USD` is hardcoded into the `initialize` function. Moreover, unlike other parameters, there is no setter function to change this parameter. In case this value needs to be changed, the contract needs to be redeployed.

Listing 4: `contracts/EpochChannels.sol` (Line 70)

```

70 function initialize(address _pricing, address _eth) external
    ↳ initializer {
71     __Ownable_init();
72     __Pausable_init();
73     __ReentrancyGuard_init();
74     require(_pricing != address(0) && _eth != address(0), "ZADDR")
    ↳ ;
75     pricing = _pricing;
76     ETH = _eth;
77     COMMISH = 975e15;
78     // 1 - 2.5% in 18 digits
79     MAX_MULT = 19;
80     MAX_DELAY = 180;
81     // 3min
82     MIN_BUY_USD = 9e18;

```

Risk Level:

Likelihood - 1

Impact - 1

Recommendation:

Implement a setter function for the `MIN_BUY_USD` state variable.

Remediation Plan:

SOLVED: The Bracket team added the `setMinBuyUSD` function to change the `MIN_BUY_USD` state variable.

Commit ID: [7aa426ee0a8f367aca5875267d9872bac05ec17d](#).

3.5 (HAL-05) MISSING ZERO ADDRESS CHECK - INFORMATIONAL

Description:

Missing several zero address checks within the code base can lead to accidentally setting the `eth` or `channel` address to the `0` address.

Code Location:

- ChanConfig.sol: `setEth()`, `initialize()`
- CNFT.sol: `setChannel()`
- ChanMaxKeeper.sol: `initialize()`, `cngLinks`
- ChanKeeper.sol: `initialize()`, `cngLinks`
- ChanOffers.sol: `cngLinks()`
- PriceProd.sol: `initialize()`

Risk Level:

Likelihood - 1

Impact - 1

Recommendation:

Add a `require()` check for zero address for the addresses that impact core functionality and can lead to losses.

Remediation Plan:

SOLVED: The Bracket team implemented several zero address checks in above code locations.

Commit ID: [7aa426ee0a8f367aca5875267d9872bac05ec17d](#).

3.6 (HAL-06) FLOATING PRAGMA - INFORMATIONAL

Description:

The contracts in scope use the floating pragma `^0.8.12`. The contract should be deployed with the same compiler version and flags that they have been tested with thoroughly. Locking the pragma helps to ensure that contracts do not accidentally get deployed using, for example, either an outdated compiler version that might introduce bugs that affect the contract system negatively or a pragma version too new which has not been extensively tested.

Risk Level:

Likelihood - 1

Impact - 1

Recommendation:

Consider locking the pragma version with known bugs for the compiler version. When possible, do not use floating pragma in the final live deployment. Specifying a fixed compiler version ensures that the bytecode produced does not vary between builds. This is especially important if you rely on bytecode-level verification of the code.

Listing 5: contracts/EpochChannels.sol (Line 1)

```
1 // SPDX-License-Identifier: apache-2.0
2 pragma solidity 0.8.12;
```

Remediation Plan:

SOLVED: The pragma was modified to specify a fixed compiler version.

Commit ID: [7aa426ee0a8f367aca5875267d9872bac05ec17d](#).

3.7 (HAL-07) > 0 CONSUMES MORE GAS THAN != 0 FOR UINTS - INFORMATIONAL

Description:

The use of `>` sign consumes more gas than `!=` sign. There are some cases where both can be used indistinctly, such as in unsigned integers where numbers cannot be negative, and as such, there is only a need to check that a number is not 0.

Code Location:

EpochChannel.sol:

- Line 133, 171 and 193: `require(_epoch > 0...`
- Line 230: `require(_invId > 0...`
- Line 248: `if (amt > 0){...`

Risk Level:

Likelihood - 1

Impact - 1

Recommendation:

Use `!=` instead of `>` in cases where both can be used.

Remediation Plans:

SOLVED: `> 0` was replaced by `!= 0` for uint comparison, where both can be used interchangeably.

Commit ID: [7aa426ee0a8f367aca5875267d9872bac05ec17d](#).



MANUAL TESTING



In the manual testing phase, the following scenarios were simulated. The scenarios listed below were selected based on the severity of the vulnerabilities Halborn was testing the program for.

4.1 RE-ENTRANCY ATTACKS

Description:

As the smart contracts transfer native assets on some of the functions tested, all functions were reviewed in depth to exclude the possibility of a re-entrancy attack.

Results:

All the functions were found to be using `nonReentrant` modifier from the OpenZeppelin's `ReentrancyGuardUpgradeable` library.

4.3 ADD AND REDUCE AVAILABLE FUNCTIONS

Description:

Both 'addAvailable' and 'reduceAvailable' as well as any function which change the `FunderAvil` state variable values were reviewed in-depth to ensure user's balance is properly tracked and updated, and it cannot lead to loss of funds.

Results:

The funds were properly tracked over multiple calls to these functions. No security issues were found.

4.4 FUND MANAGEMENT

Description:

Halborn tested fund management to verify funder is unable to withdraw the money locked for a bought Policy.

[illegible]

Results:

The funder is credited when the policy is bought and the balance is redistributed when the policy is claimed, making it impossible for the funder to retrieve those funds while the policy is open.

4.5 ACCESS CONTROLS

Description:

Access controls in every function in the contracts in scope were reviewed and checked.

Results:

All functions have proper access control. For example:

- a) `addAvailable` and `reduceAvailable` functions only modify the state variable for the `msg.sender` address, preventing anyone from modifying other users balance.
- b) The `claim` function in the `Channels` contract can be called by anyone. However, it can only be called once the policy is expired.
- c) The `startChan`, `claim` and `pay` functions in the `EpochChannels` contract can be called by anyone. However, `startChan` can only be called after the estimated start time, while `claim` and `pay` can only be called once the channel is expired.
- d) The `mintCNFT` and `setPolicy` function can only be called by the `Channel` contract or the contract owner.
- e) The `setChannel` function can only be called by the contract owner.
- f) The `newChannel` function can only be called by the contract owner.
- g) All the non-view functions in the `ChanConfig` contract can only be called by the contract owner.

MANUAL TESTING

Claim and pay/withdraw workflows were reviewed in-depth. The simulated scenarios included trying to claim a non-expired policy, check proper fund returns upon canceling, etc.

31

Results:

All workflows work as intended and no security related issues were found.

4.7 UNCLAIMED POLICY TRANSFER

Description:

Transferring non-expired and unclaimed policies NFTs was tested as Bracket team requires it for regulatory compliance.

```

ADDING FUNDS:
Asset: 0x0000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000
Value: 500000000000.0
User: 0x33A4622B82D4c04a53e170c638B944ce27cffe3
Transaction set: 0xf209ad06c4a7991823272089ef71fd844c1036d054c37d5a247965a619389c82b
Gas price: 0.0 gwei Gas limit: 12000000 Nonce: 19
FakeUSDC.transfer confirmed Block: 20 Gas used: 51067 (0.43%)

Transaction set: 0x961798f7f00cffd1313e3966428a92a95a7d2e2b56e8f82599430df72599ec7
Gas price: 0.0 gwei Gas limit: 12000000 Nonce: 0
FakeUSDC.increaseAllowance confirmed Block: 21 Gas used: 45148 (0.30%)

Transaction set: 0x748554460d1ce95e5f730ee4bb6e8034a8fc40f45e0a7bee77e08280ff5336b
Gas price: 0.0 gwei Gas limit: 12000000 Nonce: 1
Channel.addAvailable confirmed Block: 22 Gas used: 63816 (0.53%)

Current version: 1
CREATING OFFER:
Asset: [100, 50, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0]
Amount: 0x0000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000001
User: 0x33A4622B82D4c04a53e170c638B944ce27cffe3
Transaction set: 0x083941694ad32b4cf6a36ea8ef5db5682b284f86944d2474201c721b0fa4d
Gas price: 0.0 gwei Gas limit: 12000000 Nonce: 2
ChanOffers.setOffer confirmed Block: 23 Gas used: 130752 (1.09%)

BUYING OFFER:
Asset: 0x0000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000001
Funder: 0x33A4622B82D4c04a53e170c638B944ce27cffe3
ID: 0
Max Price: 1e+21
Min Price: 1e+18
User: 0x03f0436666e46d0cf19518b61AE2B121458534a5
Value: 0.3ETH 500.0USD
Transaction set: 0x2c8e6f3b9218c45fe681ea47391203f727b76a2f686c8a2f2dfba13e5aab9e2a
Gas price: 0.0 gwei Gas limit: 12000000 Nonce: 0
Channel.buyPolicy confirmed Block: 24 Gas used: 465617 (3.88%)

Offer bought, NFT id: 1
TRANSFERING NFT 1 FROM ACCOUNTS 2 TO ACCOUNTS 3
Transaction set: 0x32b2bc5772d5a21797bfbf2492131cbcfb86dc0385291c9249c9ca7680d6798d6
Gas price: 0.0 gwei Gas limit: 12000000 Nonce: 20
CNFT.transferFrom confirmed (UNCLAIMED) Block: 25 Gas used: 31047 (0.26%)

```

Results:

The **CNFT** contract successfully prevented users from transferring unclaimed policies in all **transferFrom** and **safeTransferFrom** functions.

4.8 PROPER CALCULATIONS

Description:

All calculations involving msg.value and user's balances, as well as price conversions from ETH to USD with the `multFactor` function were reviewed and fuzzed to detect miscalculations or value loss during decimal conversions.

Results:

Calculations were properly performed, no decimal precision loss or miscalculation was identified.

4.9 COMISSION HANDLING

Description:

Correct commission handling and collection was tested, including performing multiple actions while keeping track of the commissions collected.

Results:

All commissions are properly transferred to the contract owner.



AUTOMATED TESTING



5.1 STATIC ANALYSIS REPORT

Description:

Halborn used automated testing techniques to enhance the coverage of certain areas of the smart contracts in scope. Among the tools used was Slither, a Solidity static analysis framework. After Halborn verified the smart contracts in the repository and was able to compile them correctly into their ABIs and binary format, Slither was run against the contracts. This tool can statically verify mathematical relationships between Solidity variables to detect invalid or inconsistent usage of the contracts' APIs across the entire code-base.

Results:

Channel.sol

```
Reentrancy in Channel.buyPolicy(address,address,uint8,uint256,uint256) (contracts/Channel.sol#198-318):
  External calls:
    - (success2,data2) = address(this).call(abi.encodeWithSignature(uint256,address,uint256).msg.sender,v.premiumUSD) (contracts/Channel.sol#254-256)
  External calls sending eth:
    - address(address(owner(i))).transfer(v.commissionETH) (contracts/Channel.sol#247)
  State variables written after the call(s):
    - FunderAvail[assetID,funder] = v.availableDiv(div2) (contracts/Channel.sol#254)
  Reference: https://github.com/crytic/slither/wiki/Detector-Documentation#reentrancy-vulnerabilities

Channel.claim(uint256) (contracts/Channel.sol#326-383) ignores return value by IERC20(usdc).transfer(address(owner(i)).v.commissionUSD) (contracts/Channel.sol#362)
Channel.withdraw() (contracts/Channel.sol#386-398) ignores return value by IERC20(usdc).transfer(msg.sender,amountUSD) (contracts/Channel.sol#386)
Reference: https://github.com/crytic/slither/wiki/Detector-Documentation#unchecked-transfer

Channel.claim(uint256) (contracts/Channel.sol#326-383) uses a dangerous strict equality:
  - require(bool,string)(v.claimTime == v.p.timeExpired || outOfChannel,TOOEARLY) (contracts/Channel.sol#338)
Channel.claim(uint256) (contracts/Channel.sol#326-383) uses a dangerous strict equality:
  - v.p.claimSettled == 0 (contracts/Channel.sol#348)
Reference: https://github.com/crytic/slither/wiki/Detector-Documentation#dangerous-strict-equalities

Channel.buyPolicy(address,address,uint8,uint256,uint256).v (contracts/Channel.sol#265) is a local variable never initialized
Channel.claim(uint256).v (contracts/Channel.sol#327) is a local variable never initialized
ChanOffers.setOffer(address,uint16(s),uint16).i_scope_0 (contracts/ChanOffers.sol#96) is a local variable never initialized
ChanOffers.setOffer(address,uint16(s),uint16).i (contracts/ChanOffers.sol#97) is a local variable never initialized
Reference: https://github.com/crytic/slither/wiki/Detector-Documentation#uninitialized-local-variables

CNFT.setChannel(address) (contracts/CNFT.sol#44-48) should emit an event for:
  - channel = _channel (contracts/CNFT.sol#45)
Reference: https://github.com/crytic/slither/wiki/Detector-Documentation#missing-events-access-control

CNFT.setChannel(address)._channel (contracts/CNFT.sol#44) lacks a zero-check on :
  - channel = _channel (contracts/CNFT.sol#45)
ChanConfig.initialize(address).eth (contracts/ChanConfig.sol#33) lacks a zero-check on :
  - ETH = eth (contracts/ChanConfig.sol#32)
ChanConfig.setETH(address).eth (contracts/ChanConfig.sol#40) lacks a zero-check on :
  - ETH = eth (contracts/ChanConfig.sol#39)
ChanOffers.cngLinks(address,address)._pricing (contracts/ChanOffers.sol#52) lacks a zero-check on :
  - pricing = _pricing (contracts/ChanOffers.sol#53)
ChanOffers.cngLinks(address,address)._config (contracts/ChanOffers.sol#52) lacks a zero-check on :
  - config = _config (contracts/ChanOffers.sol#54)
Reference: https://github.com/crytic/slither/wiki/Detector-Documentation#missing-zero-address-validation

Reentrancy in Channel.addAvailable(address,uint256) (contracts/Channel.sol#151-162):
  External calls:
    - require(bool,string)(IERC20(usdc).transferFrom(msg.sender,address(this),_usdcValue),T) (contracts/Channel.sol#154-157)
  State variables written after the call(s):
    - FunderAvail[assetID,msg.sender] = priceAmt.add(_usdcValue) (contracts/Channel.sol#160)
Reentrancy in Channel.buyPolicy(address,address,uint8,uint256,uint256) (contracts/Channel.sol#198-318):
  External calls:
    - (success2,data2) = address(this).call(abi.encodeWithSignature(uint256,address,uint256).msg.sender,v.premiumUSD) (contracts/Channel.sol#254-256)
  External calls sending eth:
    - address(address(owner(i))).transfer(v.commissionETH) (contracts/Channel.sol#247)
  State variables written after the call(s):
    - pendingETHWithdrawals[owner(i)] = pendingETHWithdrawals[owner(i)].add(v.commissionETH) (contracts/Channel.sol#275-277)
    - pendingETHWithdrawals[funder] = pendingETHWithdrawals[funder].add(v.funderETHpay) (contracts/Channel.sol#279-281)
Reentrancy in Channel.claim(uint256) (contracts/Channel.sol#326-383):
```

```

External calls:
- CNYT(binfo).setClaimed_policyNum (contracts/Channel.sol#346)
- ERC20(usdc).transfer(address(owner(){}), v.commisHUSD() (contracts/Channel.sol#362)
State variables written after the call(s):
- FunderAvail(v.p.funder) = FunderAvail(v.p.asset[]|v.p.funder).add(v.commisUSDUSD) (contracts/Channel.sol#369)
- pendingUSDWithdrawals(v.owner) = pendingUSDWithdrawals(v.owner).add(v.claimAtUSD) (contracts/Channel.sol#365)
Reference: https://github.com/cryptic/silver/wiki/Detector-Documentation#reentrancy-vulnerabilities-2

Reentrancy in Channel, addVail(address, uint256) (contracts/Channel.sol#151-162):
External calls:
- require(bool, string)(ERC20(usdc).transferFrom(msg.sender, address(this), usdcValue), T1) (contracts/Channel.sol#154-157)
Event emitted after the call(s):
- ClaimVail(asset, msg.sender, priorAt, FunderAvail(asset[msg.sender]) (contracts/Channel.sol#161)
Reentrancy in Channel, buyPolicy(address, address, uint8, uint256, uint256) (contracts/Channel.sol#190-310):
External calls:
- (success2, data2) = address(binfo).call(abi.encodeWithSignature(minCNYT(address, uint256), msg.sender, v.premiumUSD)) (contracts/Channel.sol#234-236)
- CNYT(binfo).setPolicy(v.id.p) (contracts/Channel.sol#285)
External calls sending eth:
- address(owner(){}).transfer(v.commisETH) (contracts/Channel.sol#247)
Event emitted after the call(s):
- PolicyBuyerEV(v.id.msg.sender, funder_asset, offerId, v.verbaTabl_offerId, v.hPriceUSD, v.LowPriceUSD, msg.value, v.premiumUSD) (contracts/Channel.sol#287-297)
- PolicyBuyerEV(v.id.msg.sender, funder_asset, offerId, v.verbaTabl_offerId, v.hPriceUSD, v.LowPriceUSD, v.prizeCoin, v.funderTHpay) (contracts/Channel.sol#289-309)
Reentrancy in Channel, claim(uint256) (contracts/Channel.sol#326-383):
External calls:
- CNYT(binfo).setClaimed_policyNum (contracts/Channel.sol#346)
- ERC20(usdc).transfer(address(owner(){}), v.commisHUSD() (contracts/Channel.sol#362)
Event emitted after the call(s):
- ClaimVail(v.p.funder_policyNum, v.p.asset, v.owner, v.claimTime, v.claimPrice, v.claimAtUSD, v.commisHUSD, v.addVailUSD) (contracts/Channel.sol#372-382)
Reentrancy in Channel, withdraw() (contracts/Channel.sol#386-399):
External calls:
- address(msg.sender).transfer(amountETH) (contracts/Channel.sol#392)
Event emitted after the call(s):
- Withdrawn(msg.sender, amountETH, amountUSD) (contracts/Channel.sol#398)
Reference: https://github.com/cryptic/silver/wiki/Detector-Documentation#reentrancy-vulnerabilities-3

Channel, buyPolicy(address, address, uint8, uint256, uint256) (contracts/Channel.sol#190-310) uses timestamp for comparisons
Dangerous comparisons:
- require(bool, string)(v.premiumUSD == ChanConfig(config, MIN_PHEM, MIN) (contracts/Channel.sol#211)
- require(bool, string)(v.p.actualOfferId == 0 || v.offerId) (contracts/Channel.sol#216)
- require(bool, string)(v.prizeCoin == _maxAssetPrice, SLIP1) (contracts/Channel.sol#224)
- require(bool, string)(v.prizeCoin == _minAssetPrice, SLIP2) (contracts/Channel.sol#225)
- require(bool, string)(v.verbaTabl_offerId == uint256(0) || v.offerId) (contracts/Channel.sol#228)
- require(bool, string)(v.availUSD == v.maxClaimUSD, AVAIL) (contracts/Channel.sol#243)
- require(bool, string)(success2, IP1) (contracts/Channel.sol#257)
- assert(bool)(v.id != 0) (contracts/Channel.sol#259)
Channel, claim(uint256) (contracts/Channel.sol#326-383) uses timestamp for comparisons
Dangerous comparisons:
- require(bool, string)(v.p.claimed == false, CLAIMED) (contracts/Channel.sol#329)
- require(0 < v.claimPrice < v.p.LowPriceUSD || (v.claimPrice > v.p.hPriceUSD) (contracts/Channel.sol#336)
- require(bool, string)(v.claimTime == v.p.timeExpired || outOfChannel, TIMEOUT) (contracts/Channel.sol#338)
- require(bool, string)(v.prizeCoin == v.p.prizeCoinUSD, MAX CLAIM) (contracts/Channel.sol#343)
- v.p.claimAtUSD == 0 (contracts/Channel.sol#347)
- v.addVailUSD == 0 (contracts/Channel.sol#367)
Reference: https://github.com/cryptic/silver/wiki/Detector-Documentation#block-timestamp

CNYT.safeTransferFrom(address, address, uint256, bytes) (contracts/CNYT.sol#98-106) compares to a boolean constant:
- require(bool, string)(tokenid == 1 & tokenid == _tokens.current() & Policies[tokenid].claimed == true, UNCLAIMED) (contracts/CNYT.sol#104)
Channel, claim(uint256) (contracts/Channel.sol#326-383) compares to a boolean constant:
- require(bool, string)(v.p.claimed == false, CLAIMED) (contracts/Channel.sol#329)
Reference: https://github.com/cryptic/silver/wiki/Detector-Documentation#boolean-equality

Pragma version<0.8.12 (contracts/CNYT.sol#2) allows old versions
Pragma version<0.8.12 (contracts/ChanConfig.sol#3) allows old versions
Pragma version<0.8.12 (contracts/Channel.sol#4) allows old versions
Pragma version<0.8.12 (contracts/ChanLab.sol#5) allows old versions
Pragma version<0.8.12 (contracts/ChanOffers.sol#5) allows old versions
Pragma version<0.8.12 (contracts/Channel, sol#2) allows old versions
Pragma version<0.8.12 (contracts/PrizeCoin.sol#3) allows old versions
solc<0.8.12 is not recommended for deployment
Reference: https://github.com/cryptic/silver/wiki/Detector-Documentation#incorrect-versions-of-solidity

Low Level call in Channel, buyPolicy(address, address, uint8, uint256, uint256) (contracts/Channel.sol#190-310):
- (success2, data2) = address(binfo).call(abi.encodeWithSignature(minCNYT(address, uint256), msg.sender, v.premiumUSD)) (contracts/Channel.sol#234-236)
Reference: https://github.com/cryptic/silver/wiki/Detector-Documentation#low-level-calls

Parameter CNYT.setChannel(address), channel (contracts/CNYT.sol#44) is not in mixedCase
Parameter CNYT.Policies (contracts/CNYT.sol#22) is not in mixedCase
Variable CNYT._tokens (contracts/CNYT.sol#25) is not in mixedCase
Function ChanConfig.setMIN_AVAIL_NEW(uint256) (contracts/ChanConfig.sol#84-86) is not in mixedCase
Function ChanConfig.setMIN_PHEM(uint256) (contracts/ChanConfig.sol#98-99) is not in mixedCase
Function ChanConfig.setMIN_PRICE(uint256) (contracts/ChanConfig.sol#92-94) is not in mixedCase
Function ChanConfig.setCLAIM_COMMITSH(uint256) (contracts/ChanConfig.sol#96-98) is not in mixedCase
Variable ChanConfig.MIN_AVAIL_NEW (contracts/ChanConfig.sol#12) is not in mixedCase
Variable ChanConfig.MIN_PHEM (contracts/ChanConfig.sol#13) is not in mixedCase
Variable ChanConfig.PHEM_COMMITSH (contracts/ChanConfig.sol#14) is not in mixedCase
Variable ChanConfig.CLAIM_COMMITSH (contracts/ChanConfig.sol#15) is not in mixedCase
Variable ChanConfig.T1N (contracts/ChanConfig.sol#16) is not in mixedCase
Variable ChanConfig.Vers (contracts/ChanConfig.sol#17) is not in mixedCase
Parameter ChanOffers.initialize(address, address), _pricing (contracts/ChanOffers.sol#82) is not in mixedCase
Parameter ChanOffers.initialize(address, address), _config (contracts/ChanOffers.sol#82) is not in mixedCase
Parameter ChanOffers.cngLinks(address, address), _pricing (contracts/ChanOffers.sol#82) is not in mixedCase
Parameter ChanOffers.cngLinks(address, address), _config (contracts/ChanOffers.sol#82) is not in mixedCase
Variable ChanOffers.offers (contracts/ChanOffers.sol#82) is not in mixedCase
Struct Channel.buyLocals (contracts/Channel.sol#177-192) is not in CapWords
Struct Channel.claimLocals (contracts/Channel.sol#321-321) is not in CapWords
Parameter Channel, _address, address, address, address, address), _binfo (contracts/Channel.sol#8) is not in mixedCase
Parameter Channel, initialize(address, address, address, address), _usdc (contracts/Channel.sol#98) is not in mixedCase
Parameter Channel, initialize(address, address, address, address), _pricing (contracts/Channel.sol#93) is not in mixedCase
Parameter Channel, initialize(address, address, address, address), _offers (contracts/Channel.sol#92) is not in mixedCase
Parameter Channel, initialize(address, address, address, address), _config (contracts/Channel.sol#91) is not in mixedCase
Parameter Channel, cngLinks(address, address, address, address), _binfo (contracts/Channel.sol#113) is not in mixedCase
Parameter Channel, cngLinks(address, address, address, address), _binfo (contracts/Channel.sol#113) is not in mixedCase
Parameter Channel, cngLinks(address, address, address, address), _pricing (contracts/Channel.sol#114) is not in mixedCase
Parameter Channel, cngLinks(address, address, address, address), _offers (contracts/Channel.sol#115) is not in mixedCase
Parameter Channel, cngLinks(address, address, address, address), _config (contracts/Channel.sol#116) is not in mixedCase
Parameter Channel, addVail(address), _usdc (contracts/Channel.sol#140) is not in mixedCase
Parameter Channel, addVail(address, uint256), _usdcValue (contracts/Channel.sol#151) is not in mixedCase
Parameter Channel, reduceVail(address, uint256), _usdcValue (contracts/Channel.sol#167) is not in mixedCase
Parameter Channel, buyPolicy(address, address, uint8, uint256, uint256), _asset (contracts/Channel.sol#199) is not in mixedCase
Parameter Channel, buyPolicy(address, address, uint8, uint256, uint256), _offerId (contracts/Channel.sol#201) is not in mixedCase
Parameter Channel, buyPolicy(address, address, uint8, uint256, uint256), _minAssetPrice (contracts/Channel.sol#202) is not in mixedCase
Parameter Channel, buyPolicy(address, address, uint8, uint256, uint256), _minAssetPrice (contracts/Channel.sol#203) is not in mixedCase
Parameter Channel, claim(uint256), _policyNum (contracts/Channel.sol#326) is not in mixedCase
Variable Channel.funderAvail (contracts/Channel.sol#369) is not in mixedCase
Reference: https://github.com/cryptic/silver/wiki/Detector-Documentation#conformance-to-solidity-naming-conventions

Reentrancy in Channel, buyPolicy(address, address, uint8, uint256, uint256) (contracts/Channel.sol#190-310):
External calls:
- address(owner(){}).transfer(v.commisETH) (contracts/Channel.sol#247)
State variables written after the call(s):
- FunderAvail(_asset[]|funder) = v.availUSD.div(1e12) (contracts/Channel.sol#284)
- pendingETHWithdrawals(owner()) = pendingETHWithdrawals(owner(){}).add(v.commisETH) (contracts/Channel.sol#275-277)
- pendingETHWithdrawals(funder) = pendingETHWithdrawals(funder).add(v.funderETHpay) (contracts/Channel.sol#279-281)
Event emitted after the call(s):
- PolicyBuyerEV(v.id.msg.sender, funder_asset, offerId, v.verbaTabl_offerId, v.hPriceUSD, v.LowPriceUSD, msg.value, v.premiumUSD) (contracts/Channel.sol#287-297)
- PolicyBuyerEV(v.id.msg.sender, funder_asset, offerId, v.verbaTabl_offerId, v.hPriceUSD, v.LowPriceUSD, v.prizeCoin, v.funderTHpay) (contracts/Channel.sol#289-309)
Reentrancy in Channel, withdraw() (contracts/Channel.sol#386-399):
External calls:
- address(msg.sender).transfer(amountETH) (contracts/Channel.sol#392)
State variables written after the call(s):
- pendingUSDWithdrawals[msg.sender] = 0 (contracts/Channel.sol#395)
Event emitted after the call(s):
- Withdrawn(msg.sender, amountUSD, amountUSD) (contracts/Channel.sol#398)

```

CNFT.sol

```

CNFT.setChannel(address) (contracts/CNFT.sol#44-46) should emit an event for:
  - channel = _channel (contracts/CNFT.sol#45)
Reference: https://github.com/crytic/sliether/wiki/Detector-Documentation#missing-events-access-control

CNFT.setChannel(address)._channel (contracts/CNFT.sol#44) lacks a zero-check on :
  - channel = _channel (contracts/CNFT.sol#45)
Reference: https://github.com/crytic/sliether/wiki/Detector-Documentation#missing-zero-address-validation

CNFT.safeTransferFrom(address,address,uint256,bytes) (contracts/CNFT.sol#99-100) compares to a boolean constant:
  - require(bool,string)(tokenId == 1 && tokenId == _tokenId.current() && Policies[tokenId].claimed == true,UNCLAIMED) (contracts/CNFT.sol#104)
Reference: https://github.com/crytic/sliether/wiki/Detector-Documentation#boolean-equality

ChanLib.multFactor(uint256,uint256) (contracts/ChanLib.sol#37-43) is never used and should be removed
Reference: https://github.com/crytic/sliether/wiki/Detector-Documentation#dead-code

Pragma version^0.8.12 (contracts/CNFT.sol#2) allows old versions
Pragma version^0.8.12 (contracts/ChanLib.sol#3) allows old versions
solc-0.8.12 is not recommended for deployment
Reference: https://github.com/crytic/sliether/wiki/Detector-Documentation#incorrect-versions-of-solidity

Parameter CNFT.setChannel(address)._channel (contracts/CNFT.sol#44) is not in mixedCase
Variable CNFT.Policies (contracts/CNFT.sol#23) is not in mixedCase
Variable CNFT._tokenIds (contracts/CNFT.sol#25) is not in mixedCase
Reference: https://github.com/crytic/sliether/wiki/Detector-Documentation#conformance-to-solidity-naming-conventions
./contracts/CNFT.sol analyzed (19 contracts with 61 detectors), 10 result(s) found

```

ChanOffers.sol

```

ChanOffers.setOffer(address,uint16[s],uint16).i (contracts/ChanOffers.sol#97) is a local variable never initialized
ChanOffers.setOffers(address,uint16[s],uint16)._i_scope_0 (contracts/ChanOffers.sol#98) is a local variable never initialized
Reference: https://github.com/crytic/sliether/wiki/Detector-Documentation#uninitialized-local-variables

ChanConfig.initialize(address).eth (contracts/ChanConfig.sol#33) lacks a zero-check on :
  - ETH = eth (contracts/ChanConfig.sol#33)
ChanConfig.setETH(address).eth (contracts/ChanConfig.sol#49) lacks a zero-check on :
  - ETH = eth (contracts/ChanConfig.sol#50)
ChanOffers.cngLinks(address,address)._pricing (contracts/ChanOffers.sol#52) lacks a zero-check on :
  - pricing = _pricing (contracts/ChanOffers.sol#53)
ChanOffers.cngLinks(address,address)._config (contracts/ChanOffers.sol#52) lacks a zero-check on :
  - config = _config (contracts/ChanOffers.sol#54)
Reference: https://github.com/crytic/sliether/wiki/Detector-Documentation#missing-zero-address-validation

ChanLib.multFactor(uint256,uint256) (contracts/ChanLib.sol#37-43) is never used and should be removed
Reference: https://github.com/crytic/sliether/wiki/Detector-Documentation#dead-code

Pragma version^0.8.12 (contracts/ChanConfig.sol#3) allows old versions
Pragma version^0.8.12 (contracts/ChanLib.sol#3) allows old versions
Pragma version^0.8.12 (contracts/ChanOffers.sol#3) allows old versions
solc-0.8.12 is not recommended for deployment
Reference: https://github.com/crytic/sliether/wiki/Detector-Documentation#incorrect-versions-of-solidity

Function ChanConfig.setMIN_AVAIL_NEW(uint256) (contracts/ChanConfig.sol#84-86) is not in mixedCase
Function ChanConfig.setMIN_PREM(uint256) (contracts/ChanConfig.sol#88-90) is not in mixedCase
Function ChanConfig.setPREM_COMMISH(uint256) (contracts/ChanConfig.sol#92-94) is not in mixedCase
Function ChanConfig.setCLAIM_COMMISH(uint256) (contracts/ChanConfig.sol#96-98) is not in mixedCase
Variable ChanConfig.MIN_AVAIL_NEW (contracts/ChanConfig.sol#82) is not in mixedCase
Variable ChanConfig.MIN_PREM (contracts/ChanConfig.sol#83) is not in mixedCase
Variable ChanConfig.PREM_COMMISH (contracts/ChanConfig.sol#84) is not in mixedCase
Variable ChanConfig.CLAIM_COMMISH (contracts/ChanConfig.sol#85) is not in mixedCase
Variable ChanConfig.ETH (contracts/ChanConfig.sol#86) is not in mixedCase
Variable ChanConfig.Vers (contracts/ChanConfig.sol#87) is not in mixedCase
Parameter ChanOffers.initialize(address,address)._pricing (contracts/ChanOffers.sol#92) is not in mixedCase
Parameter ChanOffers.initialize(address,address)._config (contracts/ChanOffers.sol#92) is not in mixedCase
Parameter ChanOffers.cngLinks(address,address)._pricing (contracts/ChanOffers.sol#92) is not in mixedCase
Parameter ChanOffers.cngLinks(address,address)._config (contracts/ChanOffers.sol#92) is not in mixedCase
Variable ChanOffers.offers (contracts/ChanOffers.sol#93) is not in mixedCase
Reference: https://github.com/crytic/sliether/wiki/Detector-Documentation#conformance-to-solidity-naming-conventions
./contracts/ChanOffers.sol analyzed (11 contracts with 61 detectors), 26 result(s) found

```

ChanLib.sol

```

ChanLib.multFactor(uint256,uint256) (contracts/ChanLib.sol#37-43) is never used and should be removed
Reference: https://github.com/crytic/sliether/wiki/Detector-Documentation#dead-code

Pragma version^0.8.12 (contracts/ChanLib.sol#3) allows old versions
solc-0.8.12 is not recommended for deployment
Reference: https://github.com/crytic/sliether/wiki/Detector-Documentation#incorrect-versions-of-solidity
./contracts/ChanLib.sol analyzed (3 contracts with 61 detectors), 3 result(s) found

```

ChanConfig.sol

```

ChanConfig.initialize(address).eth (contracts/ChanConfig.sol#33) lacks a zero-check on :
  - ETH = eth (contracts/ChanConfig.sol#33)
ChanConfig.setETH(address).eth (contracts/ChanConfig.sol#49) lacks a zero-check on :
  - ETH = eth (contracts/ChanConfig.sol#50)
Reference: https://github.com/crytic/sliether/wiki/Detector-Documentation#missing-zero-address-validation

ChanLib.multFactor(uint256,uint256) (contracts/ChanLib.sol#37-43) is never used and should be removed
Reference: https://github.com/crytic/sliether/wiki/Detector-Documentation#dead-code

Pragma version^0.8.12 (contracts/ChanConfig.sol#3) allows old versions
Pragma version^0.8.12 (contracts/ChanLib.sol#3) allows old versions
solc-0.8.12 is not recommended for deployment
Reference: https://github.com/crytic/sliether/wiki/Detector-Documentation#incorrect-versions-of-solidity

Function ChanConfig.setMIN_AVAIL_NEW(uint256) (contracts/ChanConfig.sol#84-86) is not in mixedCase
Function ChanConfig.setMIN_PREM(uint256) (contracts/ChanConfig.sol#88-90) is not in mixedCase
Function ChanConfig.setPREM_COMMISH(uint256) (contracts/ChanConfig.sol#92-94) is not in mixedCase
Function ChanConfig.setCLAIM_COMMISH(uint256) (contracts/ChanConfig.sol#96-98) is not in mixedCase
Variable ChanConfig.MIN_AVAIL_NEW (contracts/ChanConfig.sol#82) is not in mixedCase
Variable ChanConfig.MIN_PREM (contracts/ChanConfig.sol#83) is not in mixedCase
Variable ChanConfig.PREM_COMMISH (contracts/ChanConfig.sol#84) is not in mixedCase
Variable ChanConfig.CLAIM_COMMISH (contracts/ChanConfig.sol#85) is not in mixedCase
Variable ChanConfig.ETH (contracts/ChanConfig.sol#86) is not in mixedCase
Variable ChanConfig.Vers (contracts/ChanConfig.sol#87) is not in mixedCase
Reference: https://github.com/crytic/sliether/wiki/Detector-Documentation#conformance-to-solidity-naming-conventions
./contracts/ChanConfig.sol analyzed (7 contracts with 61 detectors), 10 result(s) found

```

ChanMaxKeeper.sol

```

solc-0.8.12 is not recommended for deployment
Reference: https://github.com/crytic/sliether/wiki/Detector-Documentation#incorrect-versions-of-solidity
./contracts/ChanMaxKeeper.sol analyzed (29 contracts with 61 detectors), 1 result(s) found

```

ChanKeeper.sol

```

solc-0.8.12 is not recommended for deployment
Reference: https://github.com/crytic/sliether/wiki/Detector-Documentation#incorrect-versions-of-solidity
./contracts/ChanKeeper.sol analyzed (29 contracts with 61 detectors), 1 result(s) found

```

PriceProd.sol


```
PriceProd.setGracePeriod(uint256) (contracts/PriceProd.sol#235-37) should emit an event for:
- GRACE_PERIOD_TIME = gp (contracts/PriceProd.sol#236)
Reference: https://github.com/crytic/sliether/wiki/Detector-Documentation#missing-events-arithmetic

PriceProd.getLatestPrice(address) (contracts/PriceProd.sol#62-117) uses timestamp for comparisons
- timeSinceUp <= GRACE_PERIOD_TIME (contracts/PriceProd.sol#81)
Reference: https://github.com/crytic/sliether/wiki/Detector-Documentation#block-timestamp

PriceProd.getLatestPrice(address) (contracts/PriceProd.sol#62-117) compares to a boolean constant:
- Depeg(asset) == true && price >= 1e8 (contracts/PriceProd.sol#113)
Reference: https://github.com/crytic/sliether/wiki/Detector-Documentation#boolean-equality

Pragma version">=8.12" (contracts/PPricing.sol#3) allows old versions
Pragma version">=8.12" (contracts/PriceProd.sol#2) allows old versions
solc-0.8.12 is not recommended for deployment
Reference: https://github.com/crytic/sliether/wiki/Detector-Documentation#incorrect-versions-of-solidity

Variable PriceProd.GRACE_PERIOD_TIME (contracts/PriceProd.sol#15) is not in mixedCase
Variable PriceProd.Depeg (contracts/PriceProd.sol#17) is not in mixedCase
Reference: https://github.com/crytic/sliether/wiki/Detector-Documentation#conformance-to-solidity-naming-conventions
./contracts/PriceProd.sol analyzed (9 contracts with 61 detectors), 8 result(s) found
```

5.2 AUTOMATED SECURITY SCAN

Description:

Halborn used automated security scanners to assist with detection of well-known security issues and to identify low-hanging fruits on the targets for this engagement. Among the tools used was MythX, a security analysis service for Ethereum smart contracts. MythX performed a scan on the smart contracts and sent the compiled results to the analyzers in order to locate any vulnerabilities.

Results:

Channel.sol

Report for Jobs/Bracket/brownie/contracts/Channel.sol
<https://dashboard.mythx.io/#/console/analyses/21b2cf46-8245-4663-acde-8ee55c34e2ef>

Line	SWC Title	Severity	Short Description
2	(SWC-103) Floating Pragma	Low	A floating pragma is set.

CNFT.sol

Report for Jobs/Bracket/brownie/contracts/CNFT.sol
<https://dashboard.mythx.io/#/console/analyses/33ae33b0-4ef7-4290-ac39-35417818f4c8>

Line	SWC Title	Severity	Short Description
2	(SWC-103) Floating Pragma	Low	A floating pragma is set.

ChanOffers.sol

Report for Jobs/Bracket/brownie/contracts/ChanOffers.sol
<https://dashboard.mythx.io/#/console/analyses/3d2f61da-9cbb-457a-b638-655118a71cb4>

Line	SWC Title	Severity	Short Description
3	(SWC-103) Floating Pragma	Low	A floating pragma is set.
91	(SWC-113) DoS with Failed Call	Medium	Multiple calls are executed in the same transaction.

ChanLib.sol

Report for Jobs/Bracket/brownie/contracts/ChanLib.sol
<https://dashboard.mythx.io/#/console/analyses/d19e26e9-d469-4da5-8bdf-c5458eed4ded>

Line	SWC Title	Severity	Short Description
3	(SWC-103) Floating Pragma	Low	A floating pragma is set.

ChanConfig.sol

Report for Jobs/Bracket/brownie/contracts/ChanConfig.sol
<https://dashboard.mythx.io/#/console/analyses/1e98413e-87df-4104-9b3b-be24f3c22b6>

Line	SWC Title	Severity	Short Description
3	(SWC-103) Floating Pragma	Low	A floating pragma is set.
17	(SWC-108) State Variable Default Visibility	Low	State variable visibility is not set.

ChanMaxKeeper.sol

Report for Jobs/Bracket/brownie/contracts/ChanMaxKeeper.sol
<https://dashboard.mythx.io/#/console/analyses/23ab38ff-dbbc-4954-bc62-c998bdfb77f>

Line	SWC Title	Severity	Short Description
2	(SWC-103) Floating Pragma	Low	A floating pragma is set.

ChanKeeper.sol

Report for Jobs/Bracket/brownie/contracts/ChanKeeper.sol
<https://dashboard.mythx.io/#/console/analyses/f8f76c93-1114-4c4b-9ae2-76ae956db25>

Line	SWC Title	Severity	Short Description
2	(SWC-103) FloatingPragma	Low	A floating pragma is set.

PriceProd.sol

Report for Jobs/Bracket/brownie/contracts/PriceProd.sol
<https://dashboard.mythx.io/#/console/analyses/f6b83141-6910-453b-8832-d94f6670f1bb>

Line	SWC Title	Severity	Short Description
2	(SWC-103) FloatingPragma	Low	A floating pragma is set.
11	(SWC-123) RequirementViolation	Low	Requirement violation.
70	(SWC-123) RequirementViolation	Low	Requirement violation.
81	(SWC-116) TimestampDependence	Low	A control flow decision is made based on The block.timestamp environment variable.

- No major issues were found by MythX.
- No issues were found by MythX on the remaining smart contracts.



THANK YOU FOR CHOOSING

// HALBORN

