

## **EGL**

## Smart Contract Security Audit

Prepared by: Halborn

Date of Engagement: June 27th, 2021 - July 7th, 2021

Visit: Halborn.com

DOCU	MENT REVISION HISTORY	4
CONT	ACTS	4
1	EXECUTIVE OVERVIEW	5
1.1	INTRODUCTION	6
1.2	AUDIT SUMMARY	6
1.3	TEST APPROACH & METHODOLOGY	6
	RISK METHODOLOGY	7
1.4	SCOPE	9
2	ASSESSMENT SUMMARY & FINDINGS OVERVIEW	10
3	FINDINGS & TECH DETAILS	11
3.1	(HAL-01) DIVIDE BEFORE MULTIPLY - LOW	13
	Description	13
	Code Location	13
	Risk Level	13
	Recommendation	13
	Remediation Plan	13
3.2	(HAL-02) LACK OF MULTIPLE VOTING CHECK - LOW	14
	Description	14
	Code Location	14
	Risk Level	15
	Recommendation	15
	Remediation Plan	16
3.3	(HAL-03) LACK OF ACCESS CONTROL ON THE MANAGEMENT PARAMETER.	S - 17
	Description	17

	Code Location	17
	Risk Level	17
	Recommendation	17
	Remediation Plan	18
3.4	(HAL-04) USE OF BLOCK.TIMESTAMP - LOW	19
	Description	19
	Code Location	19
	Recommendation	20
	Remediation Plan	20
3.5	(HAL-05) MISSING EVENT HANDLER - LOW	21
	Description	21
	Risk Level	22
	Recommendation	22
	Remediation Plan	22
3.6	(HAL-06) IGNORED RETURN VALUES - LOW	23
	Description	23
	Code Location	23
	Risk Level	23
	Recommendation	23
	Remediation Plan	24
3.7	(HAL-07) USE OF ASSERT - INFORMATIONAL	25
	Description	25
	Code Location	25
	Risk Level	27
	Recommendation	27
	Remediation Plan	28

3.8	(HAL-08) MISSING RE-ENTRANCY PROTECTION - INFORMATIONAL	29
	Description	29
	Code Location	29
	Recommendation	31
	Remediation Plan	31
3.9	(HAL-09) BLOCK TIMESTAMP ALIAS USAGE - INFORMATIONAL	32
	Description	32
	Code Location	32
	Recommendation	33
	Remediation Plan	33
4	AUTOMATED TESTING	34
4.1	STATIC ANALYSIS REPORT	35
	Description	35
	Results	35
4.2	AUTOMATED SECURITY SCAN	37
	MYTHX	37

### DOCUMENT REVISION HISTORY

VERSION	MODIFICATION	DATE	AUTHOR
0.1	Document Creation	06/27/2021	Gokberk Gulgun
0.5	Document Updates	07/02/2021	Gokberk Gulgun
1.0	Final Version	07/07/2021	Gabi Urrutia
1.1	Remediation Plan	07/21/2021	Gokberk Gulgun
1.1	Remediation Review	07/26/2021	Gabi Urrutia

### 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
Gokberk Gulgun	Halborn	Gokberk.Gulgun@halborn.com

# EXECUTIVE OVERVIEW

### 1.1 INTRODUCTION

EGL engaged Halborn to conduct a security assessment on their Smart contract beginning on June 27th, 2021 and July 7th, 2021.

The security assessment was scoped to the smart contract repository. An audit of the security risk and implications regarding the changes introduced by the development team at EGL prior to its production release shortly following the assessments deadline.

Though this security audit's outcome is satisfactory, only the most essential aspects were tested and verified to achieve objectives and deliverables set in the scope due to time and resource constraints. It is essential to note the use of the best practices for secure smart-contract development.

### 1.2 AUDIT SUMMARY

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

The purpose of this audit to achieve the following:

- Ensure that smart contract functions are intended.
- Identify potential security issues with the smart contracts.

### 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 the smart contract audit. While manual testing is recommended to uncover flaws in logic, process, and implementation; automated testing techniques help enhance coverage of smart contracts and can quickly identify items that do not follow security best practices. The following phases and associated tools were used throughout the term of the audit:

- Research into architecture and purpose.
- Smart Contract manual code read 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.
- Static Analysis of security for scoped contract, and imported functions.(Slither)
- Scanning of solidity files for vulnerabilities, security hotspots or bugs. (MythX)
- Symbolic Execution / EVM bytecode security assessment (Manticore)
- Testnet deployment (Truffle, Ganache)

#### 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. It's quantitative model ensures repeatable and accurate measurement while enabling users to see the underlying vulnerability characteristics that was 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

The security assessment was scoped to the smart contracts :

- EglContract.sol
- EglToken.sol

#### Specific commit ID of the contract:

1c02789e5f0c89a12f2e7a505a6c07da5c37f8f1

#### Remediated commit ID of the contract :

07889444d8b40ea2cd5845850b6008c995d8c144

#### OUT-OF-SCOPE:

Other smart contracts in the repository, external libraries and economics attacks.

# 2. ASSESSMENT SUMMARY & FINDINGS OVERVIEW

CRITICAL	HIGH	MEDIUM	LOW	INFORMATIONAL
0	0	0	6	3

### LIKELIHOOD

(HAL-04)			
(HAL-02) (HAL-06)	(HAL-01) (HAL-03)		
	(HAL-05)		
(HAL-07) (HAL-08) (HAL-09)			

SECURITY ANALYSIS	RISK LEVEL	REMEDIATION DATE
HAL01 - DIVIDE BEFORE MULTIPLY	Low	ACKNOWLEDGED: 07/21/2021
HAL02 - LACK OF MULTIPLE VOTING CHECK	Low	SOLVED: 07/21/2021
HAL03 - LACK OF ACCESS CONTROL ON THE MANAGEMENT PARAMETERS	Low	NOT APPLICABLE: 07/21/2021
HAL04 - USE OF BLOCK.TIMESTAMP	Low	NOT APPLICABLE: 07/21/2021
HAL05 - MISSING EVENT HANDLER	Low	SOLVED: 07/21/2021
HAL06 - IGNORED RETURN VALUES	Low	SOLVED: 07/21/2021
HAL07 - USE OF ASSERT	Informational	SOLVED: 07/21/2021
HAL08 - MISSING RE-ENTRANCY PROTECTION	Informational	SOLVED: 07/21/2021
HAL09 - BLOCK TIMESTAMP ALIAS USAGE	Informational	NOT APPLICABLE: 07/21/2021

# FINDINGS & TECH DETAILS

# 3.1 (HAL-01) DIVIDE BEFORE MULTIPLY - LOW

#### Description:

Solidity integer division might truncate. As a result, performing multiplication before division can sometimes avoid loss of precision. In this audit, there are multiple instances found where division is being performed before multiplication operation in the EglContract.sol.

Code Location:

EglContract.sol Line #968

#### Risk Level:

Likelihood - 2 Impact - 3

#### Recommendation:

Consider doing multiplication operation before division to prevail precision in the values in non floating data type.

#### Remediation Plan:

**ACKNOWLEDGED:** actualDelta is multiplied by DECIMAL\_PRECISION before being divided by eglDelta, then the precision is maintained by EGL Team.

# 3.2 (HAL-02) LACK OF MULTIPLE VOTING CHECK - LOW

#### Description:

In the vote progress, the pre-condition checks are not applied on the function. Although \_internalVote function prevents to multiple votes, the initial checks should complete at the beginning of the function.

#### Code Location:

EglContract.sol Line #968

```
Listing 2: EglContract.sol (Lines )
       function vote(
           uint _gasTarget,
           uint8 _lockupDuration
       )
           external
           whenNotPaused
           require(_eglAmount >= 1 ether, "EGL:AMNT_TOO_LOW");
           require(_eglAmount <= eglToken.balanceOf(msg.sender), "EGL</pre>
               : INSUFFICIENT_EGL_BALANCE");
           require(eglToken.allowance(msg.sender, address(this)) >=
               _eglAmount, "EGL:INSUFFICIENT_ALLOWANCE");
           if (block.timestamp > currentEpochStartDate.add(
               epochLength))
               tallyVotes();
           eglToken.transferFrom(msg.sender, address(this),
               _eglAmount);
           _internalVote(
               msg.sender,
                _lockupDuration,
```

```
498 );
499 }
```

#### Risk Level:

Likelihood - 1 Impact - 3

#### Recommendation:

The initial checks should complete through 'require()' function. The sample solution can be seen below.

```
Listing 3: EglContract.sol (Lines 9)
       function vote(
           external
           whenNotPaused
       {
       require(voters[msg.sender].tokensLocked == 0, "EGL:
           ALREADY_VOTED");
           require(_eglAmount >= 1 ether, "EGL:AMNT_TOO_LOW");
           require(_eglAmount <= eglToken.balanceOf(msg.sender), "EGL</pre>
               : INSUFFICIENT_EGL_BALANCE");
           require(eglToken.allowance(msg.sender, address(this)) >=
               _eglAmount, "EGL:INSUFFICIENT_ALLOWANCE");
           if (block.timestamp > currentEpochStartDate.add(
               epochLength))
               tallyVotes();
           eglToken.transferFrom(msg.sender, address(this),
               _eglAmount);
           _internalVote(
               msg.sender,
```

#### Remediation Plan:

**SOLVED:** Validations were completed in the internal function by EGL Team.

# 3.3 (HAL-03) LACK OF ACCESS CONTROL ON THE MANAGEMENT PARAMETERS - LOW

#### Description:

In the MockEglGenesis contract, canWithdraw and canContribute variable is defined as a public function. These function could be called by anyone. Although, the contract named as MockEglGenesis, the modifier should add at the beginning of the function.

#### Code Location:

MockEglGenesis.sol Line #33-39

#### Risk Level:

```
Likelihood - 2
Impact - 3
```

#### Recommendation:

It is recommend to add onlyOwner modifier at the beginning of the function. Example remediated code can be seen below.

Remediation Plan:

NOT APPLICABLE: The mock-up contracts are added only for testing purpose.

### 3.4 (HAL-04) USE OF BLOCK.TIMESTAMP - LOW

#### Description:

In the EGL, The contracts are using block.timestamp. The global variable block.timestamp does not necessarily hold the current time, and may not be accurate. Miners can influence the value of block.timestamp to perform Maximal Extractable Value (MEV) attacks. There is no guarantee that the value is correct, only that it is higher than the previous block's timestamp.

#### Code Location:

EglContract.sol Line #33-39

```
Listing 6: EglContract.sol (Lines 392)
       function claimSupporterEgls(uint _gasTarget, uint8
           _lockupDuration) external whenNotPaused {
           require(remainingSupporterBalance > 0, "EGL:
               SUPPORTER_EGLS_DEPLETED");
           require(remainingBptBalance > 0, "EGL:BPT_BALANCE_DEPLETED
               ");
           require(
               eglGenesis.canContribute() == false && eglGenesis.
                   canWithdraw() == false,
               "EGL: GENESIS LOCKED"
           require(supporters[msg.sender].claimed == 0, "EGL:
               ALREADY_CLAIMED");
           (uint contributionAmount, uint cumulativeBalance, ,) =
               eglGenesis.contributors(msg.sender);
           require(contributionAmount > 0, "EGL:NOT_CONTRIBUTED");
           if (block.timestamp > currentEpochStartDate.add(
               epochLength))
               tallyVotes();
```

#### Recommendation:

Use block.number instead of block.timestamp or now to reduce the risk of MEV attacks. Check if the timescale of the project occurs across years, days and months rather than seconds. If possible, it is recommended to use Oracles.

#### Remediation Plan:

NOT APPLICABLE: the EGL Team considers safe the usage of block.timestamp because 900 seconds of drift from miners is preferable to other options. Calculating time from the block could be wrong if there is a fork or upgrade – timestamps are less vulnerable to a change in block duration that could occur with Ethereum 2.0 upgrades or hard forks. Use of oracles would create a dependency on the health of a third party service and potentially incur additional fees.

# 3.5 (HAL-05) MISSING EVENT HANDLER - LOW

#### Description:

In the EglContract contract, the some of functions do not emit event after the progress. Events are a method of informing the transaction initiator about the actions taken by the called function. It logs its emitted parameters in a specific log history, which can be accessed outside of the contract using some filter parameters.

EglContract.sol Line #~542

EglContract.sol Line #~640

#### Risk Level:

Likelihood - 2 Impact - 2

#### Recommendation:

Consider as much as possible declaring events at the end of function. Events can be used to detect the end of the operation.

#### Remediation Plan:

**SOLVED:** The Withdraw event is now emitted from the internal withdraw function, as well as Pause and Unpause events are emitted from the parent functions.

# 3.6 (HAL-06) IGNORED RETURN VALUES - LOW

#### Description:

The return value of an external call is not stored in a local or state variable. In the EglContract.sol contract, there are a few instances where the multiple methods are called and the return value (bool) is ignored.

#### Code Location:

EglContract.sol Line #~491,522,545,560,631,915

```
Listing 9: EglContract.sol (Lines 491)

491 eglToken.transferFrom(msg.sender, address(this), _eglAmount);

492
```

#### Risk Level:

Likelihood - 1 Impact - 3

#### Recommendation:

Add a return value check to avoid an unexpected crash of the contract. Return value checks provide better exception handling. As an other solution, Use SafeERC20 on the both networks when possible and ensure that the transfer/transferFrom return value is checked. A custom function named safeTransferFrom can be implemented that checks the return value of the transferFrom function and makes sure that the funds were transferred.

#### Remediation Plan:

SOLVED: The return values are now checked on the transferFrom function.

```
Listing 10: EglContract.sol (Lines )

491 bool success = eglToken.transferFrom(msg.sender, address(
this), _eglAmount);

492 require(success, "EGL:TOKEN_TRANSFER_FAILED");
```

# 3.7 (HAL-07) USE OF ASSERT - INFORMATIONAL

#### Description:

In the solidity, assert() and require() functions are used for protecting contract on the unexceptional behaviours. With the assert() function, it is not possible to evaluate return value.

Code Location:

EglContract.sol Line #802

```
Listing 11: EglContract.sol (Lines 802)

795    function _internalVote(
796         address _voter,
797         uint _gasTarget,
798         uint _eglAmount,
799         uint8 _lockupDuration,
800         uint _releaseTime
801    ) internal {
802         assert(_voter != address(0));
803         ...
804    }
```

EglContract.sol Line #1049

EglContract.sol Line #1077

EglContract.sol Line #1107

Risk Level:

Likelihood - 1

Impact - 1

#### Recommendation:

It is recommended to use require() function instead of assert() function. This change will improve code readability. The example code snippet can be seen below.

#### Remediation Plan:

**SOLVED:** The assert() function is replaced by require() function on the related statements.

### 3.8 (HAL-08) MISSING RE-ENTRANCY PROTECTION - INFORMATIONAL

#### Description:

To protect against cross-function reentrancy attacks, it may be necessary to use a mutex. By using this lock, an attacker can no longer exploit the vote and re-vote functions with a recursive call. OpenZeppelin has it's own mutex implementation called ReentrancyGuard which provides a modifier to any function called nonReentrant that guards the function with a mutex against Reentrancy attacks.

#### Code Location:

```
Listing 17: EglContract.sol (Lines 491)
       function vote(
           uint8 _lockupDuration
           external
           require(_eglAmount >= 1 ether, "EGL:AMNT_TOO_LOW");
           require(_eglAmount <= eglToken.balanceOf(msg.sender), "EGL</pre>
               : INSUFFICIENT_EGL_BALANCE");
           require(eglToken.allowance(msg.sender, address(this)) >=
               _eglAmount, "EGL:INSUFFICIENT_ALLOWANCE");
           if (block.timestamp > currentEpochStartDate.add(
               epochLength))
               tallyVotes();
           eglToken.transferFrom(msg.sender, address(this),
               _eglAmount);
           _internalVote(
               msg.sender,
                _lockupDuration,
```

```
Listing 18: EglContract.sol (Lines 522)
       function reVote(
       )
           external
       {
           require(voters[msg.sender].tokensLocked > 0, "EGL:
               NOT_VOTED");
           if (_eglAmount > 0) {
               require(_eglAmount >= 1 ether, "EGL:AMNT_TOO_LOW");
               require(_eglAmount <= eglToken.balanceOf(msg.sender),</pre>
                   "EGL: INSUFFICIENT_EGL_BALANCE");
               require(eglToken.allowance(msg.sender, address(this))
                   >= _eglAmount, "EGL:INSUFFICIENT_ALLOWANCE");
               eglToken.transferFrom(msg.sender, address(this),
                   _eglAmount);
           if (block.timestamp > currentEpochStartDate.add(
               epochLength))
               tallyVotes();
           uint originalReleaseDate = voters[msg.sender].releaseDate;
           _eglAmount = _eglAmount.add(_internalWithdraw(msg.sender))
           _internalVote(
               msg.sender,
           );
           emit ReVote(msg.sender, _gasTarget, _eglAmount, now);
```

#### Recommendation:

In the EglContract.sol contract, the vote() and reVote() functions are missing nonReentrant guard. Use the nonReentrant modifier to avoid introducing future vulnerabilities.

#### Remediation Plan:

**SOLVED:** The re-entrancy protection was added into the function.

# Listing 19: EglContract.sol (Lines 522) 509 function reVote(uint \_gasTarget,uint \_eglAmount, uint8 \_lockupDuration) external whenNotPaused nonReentrant 510 function vote(uint \_gasTarget,uint \_eglAmount, uint8 \_lockupDuration) external whenNotPaused nonReentrant

# 3.9 (HAL-09) BLOCK TIMESTAMP ALIAS USAGE - INFORMATIONAL

#### Description:

During a manual static review, the Halborn Team noticed the use of now. The global variable now is deprecated after the pragma version  $\vee 0.7.0$ .

Solidity Pragma Version 0.7.0 - Now Deprecated

#### Code Location:

```
Listing 20: EglContract.sol (Lines 763)
       function addSeedAccount(address _seedAccount, uint _seedAmount
           ) public onlyOwner {
           require(_seedAmount <= remainingSeederBalance, "EGL:</pre>
               INSUFFICIENT_SEED_BALANCE");
           require(seeders[_seedAccount] == 0, "EGL:ALREADY_SEEDER");
           require(voters[_seedAccount].tokensLocked == 0, "EGL:
               ALREADY_HAS_VOTE");
           require(eglToken.balanceOf(_seedAccount) == 0, "EGL:
               ALREADY_HAS_EGLS");
           require(now < firstEpochStartDate.add(</pre>
               minLiquidityTokensLockup), "EGL:SEED_PERIOD_PASSED");
           (uint contributorAmount,,,) = eglGenesis.contributors(
               _seedAccount);
           require(contributorAmount == 0, "EGL:IS_CONTRIBUTOR");
           remainingSeederBalance = remainingSeederBalance.sub(
               _seedAmount);
           remainingDaoBalance = remainingDaoBalance.sub(_seedAmount)
           seeders[_seedAccount] = _seedAmount;
           emit SeedAccountAdded(
               remainingSeederBalance,
           );
       }
```

#### Recommendation:

Use block.number instead of block.timestamp or now reduce the influence of miners. If it is not possible to use block.number, now should replace with block.timestamp.

#### Remediation Plan:

NOT APPLICABLE: now was replaced by block.timestamp function. EGL Team considers safe the usage of block.timestamp because 900 seconds of drift from miners is preferable to other options. Calculating time from the block could be wrong if there is a fork or upgrade – timestamps are less vulnerable to a change in block duration that could occur with Ethereum 2.0 upgrades or hard forks. the use of oracles would create a dependency on the health of a third party service and potentially incur additional fees.

# AUTOMATED TESTING

### 4.1 STATIC ANALYSIS REPORT

#### Description:

Halborn used automated testing techniques to enhance coverage of certain areas of the scoped contract. Among the tools used was Slither, a Solidity static analysis framework. After Halborn verified all the contracts in the repository and was able to compile them correctly into their abi and binary formats. 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:

```
INFO:Detectors:
Ownsbitings adeable__upp (mode_modules/@ppenrappails/contracts.uppradeable/access/Ownsbitingsradeable.sole7x) shadows:
Ownsbitingsradeable__upp (mode_modules/@ppenrappails/contracts.uppradeable/pictory/RECO/ERCOEdupradeable.sole3x)
ERC20Expeptingsradeable__upp (mode_modules/@ppenrappails/contracts.uppradeable/token/RECO/ERCOEdupradeable.sole3x)

- ERC20Uppradeable__upp (mode_modules/@ppenrappails/contracts-uppradeable/token/RECO/ERC20Uppradeable.sole3x)

- ERC20Uppradeable__upp (mode_modules/@ppenrappails/contracts-uppradeable/token/RECO/ERC20Uppradeable.sole3x)

- ERC20Uppradeable_upp (mode_modules/@ppenrappails/contracts-uppradeable/token/RECO/ERC20Uppradeable.sole3x)

- ERC20Uppradeable_upp (mode_modules/@ppenrappails/contracts-uppradeable/token/ERC20/ERC20Uppradeable.sole3x)

- ERC20Uppradeable_upp (mode_modules/@ppenrappails/contracts-uppradeable/token/ERC20/ERC20Uppradeable.sole3x)

- ERC20Uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppradeable_uppra
```

```
EglContract.tallyVotes() (contracts/EglContract.sol8966-790) performs a multiplication on the result of a division:

-actual Hreshold = votingfireshold.add(DECHMAL_PRECISION.mul(2025, d.M/UKEKS__M_YEAR.mul(2))). | (restriction on the result of a division:

-actual Hreshold = votingfireshold.add(DECHMAL_PRECISION.mul(2026, d.M/UKEKS__M_YEAR.mul(2))). | (restriction on the result of a division:

-actual Hreshold = votingfireshold.add(DECHMAL_PRECISION.decomposition). | (restriction on the result of a division:

-actual Hreshold = votingfireshold.add(DECHMAL_PRECISION.decomposition). | (restriction). | (restrictio
```

```
INFO:Detectors:

Reentrancy in EglContract._issueCreatorRewards(uint256) (contracts/EglContract.sol#906-930):

External calls:

- eglToken.transfer(creatorRewardsAddress,creatorRewardForEpoch) (contracts/EglContract.sol#916)

State vartables written after the call(s):

- lastSertalizedEgl = serializedEgl (contracts/EglContract.sol#929)

- remainingCreatorReward = renainingCreatorReward.sub(creatorRewardForEpoch) (contracts/EglContract.sol#917)

Reentrancy th EglContract.clainSeederEgls(uint256,uint8) (contracts/EglContract.sol#450-469):

External ralls:
                                                                                                                                                                                                                     ract.clainseederEgis(uint256,uint8) (contracts/EgiContract.sol#450-469):

5:

1) (contracts/EgiContract.sol#453)

Token.transfer(creatorRewardsAddress,creatorRewardForEpoch) (contracts/EgiContract.sol#916) es written after the cali(s):

1: (efmgs.sender.gastargets,seedAnount, lockupDuration,releaseDate) (contracts/EgiContract.sol#462-468) ethGasLimitSum = epochGasLimitSum.add(int256(block.gaslimit)) (contracts/EgiContract.sol#815) te(mgs.sender.gastargets,seedAnount, lockupDuration,releaseDate) (contracts/EgiContract.sol#462-468) ethVoteCount = epochVoteCount.add(i) (contracts/EgiContract.sol#816) (contracts/EgiContract.sol#462-468) ethVoteCount = epochVoteCount.add(i) (contracts/EgiContract.sol#816) (contracts/EgiContract.sol#462-468) argetSum[i] = gasTargetSum[i].add(_gasTarget.mul(voteWeight)) (contracts/EgiContract.sol#831) ers/smgs.gasGarel (contracts/EgiContract.sol#462-468) eulation = tokensIncirculation.add(seedAnount) (contracts/EgiContract.sol#462-468) exheightsSum[i] = voteWeightsSum[i] add(voteWeight) (contracts/EgiContract.sol#462-468) exheightsSum[i] = voteWeightsSum[i] add(voteWeight) (contracts/EgiContract.sol#838) exheightsSum[i] = voteWeightsSum[i] add(voteWeight) (contracts/EgiContract.sol#462-468) exheightsSum[i] = voteWeightsSum[i] add(voteWeight) (contracts/EgiContract.sol#462-468) exheightsSum[i] = voteWeightsSum[i] add(egiAnount) (contracts/EgiContract.sol#383) exheightsSum[i] = voteWeightsSum[i] add(egiAnount) (contracts/EgiContract.sol#3834-441) exhibits (contracts/EgiContract.sol#462-468) exhibits (contracts/EgiContract.sol#381-441) exhibits (contracts/EgiContract.sol#3834-441) 
                                                                                            y in EglContract.clainSupporterEgls(uint256_uint8) (contracts/EglContract.sol#381-441):

xternal calls:
    tallyVotes() (contracts/EglContract.sol#394)
        - eglToken.transfer(crestorRewardsAddress,creatorRewardForEpoch) (contracts/EglContract.sol#916)

tate variables written after the call(s):
        | internalVote(nsg.sender.gasTarget,bonusEglSupe.lockupDuration,firstEpochStartDate.add(epochLength.nul(WEEKS_IN_VEAR))) (contracts/EglContract.sol#344-440)
        | epochGasLinitisum add(int256(block.gasliniti)) (contracts/EglContract.sol#315)
        | internalVote(nsg.sender.gasTarget,bonusEglSupe.lockupDuration,firstEpochStartDate.add(epochLength.nul(WEEKS_IN_VEAR))) (contracts/EglContract.sol#434-440)
        | epochVoteCount = epochVo
                                                               y in EgiContract.revote(uint256,uint256,uint8) (contracts/EgiContract.sol#510-538):
xternal calls:
- egiJoken.transferFrom(msg.sender,address(this), egiAmount) (contracts/EgiContract
                                                                                                                                                              .
nsferFron(msg.sender,address(this),_eglAmount) (contracts/EglContract.sol#523)
(contracts/EplContract.sol#523)
                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               (contracts/EglContract.sol#530-536)
EglContract.sol#815)
(contracts/EglContract.sol#530-536)
```

### 4.2 AUTOMATED SECURITY SCAN

#### MYTHX:

Halborn used automated security scanners to assist with detection of well-known security issues, and to identify low-hanging fruit 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 testers machine and sent the compiled results to the analyzers to locate any vulnerabilities. Only security-related findings are shown below.

#### Results:

Report for contracts/EglContract.sol https://dashboard.mythx.io/#/console/analyses/b5337dd4-706a-4d9d-9024-65a72c4dd976

Line	SWC Title	Severity	Short Description		
89	(SWC-131) Presence of unused variables	Low	Unused state variable "supporterEglsTotal".		
90	(SWC-131) Presence of unused variables	Low	Unused state variable "poolTokensHeld".		
284	(SWC-000) Unknown	Medium	Function could be marked as external.		
554	(SWC-120) Weak Sources of Randomness from Chain Attributes	Low	Potential use of "block.number" as source of randonmness.		
555	(SWC-120) Weak Sources of Randomness from Chain Attributes	Low	Potential use of "block.number" as source of randonmness.		
782	(SWC-000) Unknown	Medium	Function could be marked as external.		
875	(SWC-128) DOS With Block Gas Limit	Medium	Loop over unbounded data structure.		
980	(SWC-120) Weak Sources of Randomness from Chain Attributes	Low	Potential use of "block.number" as source of randonmness.		
1111	(SWC-128) DoS With Block Gas Limit	Medium	Loop over unbounded data structure.		

All relevant findings were founded in the manual code review.

THANK YOU FOR CHOOSING

