

# ORBXBALL STABLECOINS YP00L SMART CONTRACT AUDIT

March 22, 2021

MixBytes()

# CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
DISCLAIMER.....	1
PROJECT OVERVIEW.....	1
SECURITY ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY.....	2
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	4
PROJECT DASHBOARD.....	4
2. FINDINGS REPORT.....	6
2.1. CRITICAL.....	6
2.2. MAJOR.....	6
MJR-1 No check <code>_amt</code> value under withdraw.....	6
2.3. WARNING.....	8
WRN-1 There is no input parameter processing in the method.....	8
WRN-2 The approval value obtained in the constructor may not be enough for the long term of the smart contract.....	9
2.4. COMMENTS.....	10
CMT-1 Not informative names of functions and variables.....	10
CMT-2 Event is probably missing.....	11
3. ABOUT MIXBYTES.....	12

# 1. INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 DISCLAIMER

The audit makes no statements or warranties about utility of the code, safety of the code, suitability of the business model, investment advice, endorsement of the platform or its products, regulatory regime for the business model, or any other statements about fitness of the contracts to purpose, or their bug free status. The audit documentation is for discussion purposes only. The information presented in this report is confidential and privileged. If you are reading this report, you agree to keep it confidential, not to copy, disclose or disseminate without the agreement of Yearn. If you are not the intended recipient(s) of this document, please note that any disclosure, copying or dissemination of its content is strictly forbidden.

## 1.2 PROJECT OVERVIEW

Basic Solidity Smart Contract for creating your own Yearn Strategy.

## 1.3 SECURITY ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

At least 2 auditors are involved in the work on the audit who check the provided source code independently of each other in accordance with the methodology described below:

- 01 "Blind" audit includes:
  - > Manual code study
  - > "Reverse" research and study of the architecture of the code based on the source code only

Stage goal:  
Building an independent view of the project's architecture  
Finding logical flaws
- 02 Checking the code against the checklist of known vulnerabilities includes:
  - > Manual code check for vulnerabilities from the company's internal checklist
  - > The company's checklist is constantly updated based on the analysis of hacks, research and audit of the clients' code

Stage goal:  
Eliminate typical vulnerabilities (e.g. reentrancy, gas limit, flashloan attacks, etc.)
- 03 Checking the logic, architecture of the security model for compliance with the desired model, which includes:
  - > Detailed study of the project documentation
  - > Examining contracts tests
  - > Examining comments in code
  - > Comparison of the desired model obtained during the study with the reversed view obtained during the blind audit

Stage goal:  
Detection of inconsistencies with the desired model
- 04 Consolidation of the reports from all auditors into one common interim report document
  - > Cross check: each auditor reviews the reports of the others
  - > Discussion of the found issues by the auditors
  - > Formation of a general (merged) report

Stage goal:  
Re-check all the problems for relevance and correctness of the threat level  
Provide the client with an interim report
- 05 Bug fixing & re-check.
  - > Client fixes or comments on every issue
  - > Upon completion of the bug fixing, the auditors double-check each fix and set the statuses with a link to the fix

Stage goal:  
Preparation of the final code version with all the fixes
- 06 Preparation of the final audit report and delivery to the customer.

Findings discovered during the audit are classified as follows:

## FINDINGS SEVERITY BREAKDOWN

Level	Description	Required action
Critical	Bugs leading to assets theft, fund access locking, or any other loss funds to be transferred to any party	Immediate action to fix issue
Major	Bugs that can trigger a contract failure. Further recovery is possible only by manual modification of the contract state or replacement.	Implement fix as soon as possible
Warning	Bugs that can break the intended contract logic or expose it to DoS attacks	Take into consideration and implement fix in certain period
Comment	Other issues and recommendations reported to/acknowledged by the team	Take into consideration

Based on the feedback received from the Customer's team regarding the list of findings discovered by the Contractor, they are assigned the following statuses:

Status	Description
Fixed	Recommended fixes have been made to the project code and no longer affect its security.
Acknowledged	The project team is aware of this finding. Recommendations for this finding are planned to be resolved in the future. This finding does not affect the overall safety of the project.
No issue	Finding does not affect the overall safety of the project and does not violate the logic of its work.

## 1.4 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The audited scope includes four implementations of the BaseStrategy strategy for tokens: DAI, USDC, USDT and TUSD. The strategies implemented profit management rules that the user will receive after depositing their tokens in vaults for each token. Interestingly, the strategy for each token depends on three other tokens to work.

## 1.5 PROJECT DASHBOARD

Client	Yearn
Audit name	Orbxball Stablecoins Ypool
Initial version	5d80af7aeeff9f9b8f6d47d0334d36db3e97e5e47a07367d3dc91ade10211dad328675a8b9793372
Final version	7a07367d3dc91ade10211dad328675a8b9793372
SLOC	924
Date	2021-02-22 - 2021-03-22
Auditors engaged	2 auditors

## FILES LISTING

StrategyDAIypool.sol	StrategyDAIypool.sol
StrategyTUSDypool.sol	StrategyTUSDypool.sol
StrategyUSDCypool.sol	StrategyUSDCypool.sol
StrategyUSDTypool.sol	StrategyUSDTypool.sol

## FINDINGS SUMMARY

Level	Amount
Critical	0
Major	1
Warning	2
Comment	2

## CONCLUSION

Smart contracts have been audited and several suspicious places have been spotted. During the audit no critical issues were found, one issue was marked as major because it could lead to some undesired behavior, also several warnings and comments were found and fixed by the client. After working on the reported findings all of them were resolved or acknowledged (if the problem was not critical). So, the contracts are assumed as secure to use according to our security criteria. Final commit identifier with all fixes: `7a07367d3dc91ade10211dad328675a8b9793372`

# 2. FINDINGS REPORT

## 2.1 CRITICAL

Not Found

## 2.2 MAJOR

MJR-1	No check <code>_amt</code> value under withdraw
File	StrategyDAIypool.sol StrategyTUSDypool.sol StrategyUSDCypool.sol StrategyUSDTypool.sol
Severity	Major
Status	Fixed at 7a07367d

### DESCRIPTION

At the lines:

- StrategyDAIypool.sol#L207
  - StrategyTUSDypool.sol#L207
  - StrategyUSDCypool.sol#L207
  - StrategyUSDTypool.sol#L207
- there are not valid available balance on the contract. This will lead to the fact that the `_WithdrawSome()` function will not always work.

At the lines:

- StrategyDAIypool.sol#L265
  - StrategyTUSDypool.sol#L265
  - StrategyUSDCypool.sol#L265
  - StrategyUSDTypool.sol#L265
- the same in the `forceW()` function.

### RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended to add additional check `_amt` value under withdraw operation:

```
if (_amt > _before){
    _amt = _before;
}
```



## 2.3 WARNING

<b>WRN-1</b>	There is no input parameter processing in the method
<b>File</b>	StrategyDAIypool.sol StrategyTUSDypool.sol StrategyUSDCypool.sol StrategyUSDTypool.sol
<b>Severity</b>	Warning
<b>Status</b>	Acknowledged

### DESCRIPTION

At the lines:

- StrategyDAIypool.sol#L112
  - StrategyTUSDypool.sol#L112
  - StrategyUSDCypool.sol#L112
  - StrategyUSDTypool.sol#L112
- the `adjustPosition()` method has an input variable `_debtOutstanding`.  
But there is no processing of this variable in the body of the function.

### RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended to either add handling to the variable or remove this variable.

<b>WRN-2</b>	The approval value obtained in the constructor may not be enough for the long term of the smart contract
<b>File</b>	StrategyDAIypool.sol StrategyTUSDypool.sol StrategyUSDCypool.sol StrategyUSDTypool.sol
<b>Severity</b>	Warning
<b>Status</b>	Acknowledged

## DESCRIPTION

Smart contracts call `safeApprove()` functions for different tokens. But in the process of work, the obtained value will only decrease. If this value decreases to zero, then the tokens will remain locked in the contract forever.

It is at the following lines:

- StrategyDAIypool.sol#L48-L54
- StrategyTUSDypool.sol#L48-L54
- StrategyUSDCypool.sol#L48-L54
- StrategyUSDTypool.sol#L48-L54

## RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended to add a function to increase the value of approvals.

## 2.4 COMMENTS

<b>CMT-1</b>	Not informative names of functions and variables
<b>File</b>	StrategyDAIypool.sol StrategyTUSDypool.sol StrategyUSDCypool.sol StrategyUSDTypool.sol
<b>Severity</b>	Comment
<b>Status</b>	Acknowledged

### DESCRIPTION

For the function names `forceD ()` and `forceW ()`, it is not clear what these functions are used for.

It is at the following lines:

- StrategyDAIypool.sol#L250 and StrategyDAIypool.sol#L263
- StrategyTUSDypool.sol#L250 and StrategyTUSDypool.sol#L263
- StrategyUSDCypool.sol#L250 and StrategyUSDCypool.sol#L263
- StrategyUSDTypool.sol#L250 and StrategyUSDTypool.sol#L263

For the names of the variables `p` and `_p`, it is impossible to understand what these variables are used for.

It is on the following lines:

- StrategyDAIypool.sol#L40 and StrategyDAIypool.sol#L98-L105
- StrategyTUSDypool.sol#L40 and StrategyTUSDypool.sol#L98-L105
- StrategyUSDCypool.sol#L40 and StrategyUSDCypool.sol#L98-L105
- StrategyUSDTypool.sol#L40 and StrategyUSDTypool.sol#L98-L105

Correct names of functions and variables make programs easier to use.

### RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended to give correct names to functions and variables.

<b>CMT-2</b>	Event is probably missing
<b>File</b>	StrategyDAIypool.sol StrategyTUSDypool.sol StrategyUSDCypool.sol StrategyUSDTypool.sol
<b>Severity</b>	Comment
<b>Status</b>	Acknowledged

## DESCRIPTION

At the lines:

- StrategyDAIypool.sol#L250-L261
- StrategyTUSDypool.sol#L250-L261
- StrategyUSDCypool.sol#L250-L261
- StrategyUSDTypool.sol#L250-L261  
in method `forceD()` should probably emit an event `ForceDeposit`.

At the lines:

- StrategyDAIypool.sol#L263-L273
- StrategyTUSDypool.sol#L263-L273
- StrategyUSDCypool.sol#L263-L273
- StrategyUSDTypool.sol#L263-L273  
in method `forceW()` should probably emit an event `ForceWithdraw`.

At the lines:

- StrategyDAIypool.sol#L57-L63
- StrategyTUSDypool.sol#L57-L63
- StrategyUSDCypool.sol#L57-L63
- StrategyUSDTypool.sol#L57-L63  
the methods `setThreshold()` and `setSlip` should probably emit the events:  
`NewThreshold` and `NewSlip`.

## RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended to create new events.

# 3. ABOUT MIXBYTES

MixBytes is a team of blockchain developers, auditors and analysts keen on decentralized systems. We build open-source solutions, smart contracts and blockchain protocols, perform security audits, work on benchmarking and software testing solutions, do research and tech consultancy.

## BLOCKCHAINS



Ethereum



Cosmos



EOS



Substrate

## TECH STACK



Python



Solidity



Rust



C++

## CONTACTS



[https://github.com/mixbytes/audits\\_public](https://github.com/mixbytes/audits_public)



<https://mixbytes.io/>



[hello@mixbytes.io](mailto:hello@mixbytes.io)



<https://t.me/MixBytes>



<https://twitter.com/mixbytes>