



# **Sky: Lockstake**

## **Security Review**

Cantina Managed review by:

**Christoph Michel**, Lead Security Researcher

**Mario.eth**, Lead Security Researcher

August 18, 2025

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
1.1	About Cantina . . . . .	2
1.2	Disclaimer . . . . .	2
1.3	Risk assessment . . . . .	2
1.3.1	Severity Classification . . . . .	2
<b>2</b>	<b>Security Review Summary</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Findings</b>	<b>4</b>
3.1	Low Risk . . . . .	4
3.1.1	LockstakeInit.updateClipper is missing stUSDS.rely(clipper) . . . . .	4
3.2	Informational . . . . .	4
3.2.1	Mixed usage of DAI and USDS in comments . . . . .	4
3.2.2	Misleading comment in LockstakeClipper.kick about triggering bad debt accounting	4

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 About Cantina

Cantina is a security services marketplace that connects top security researchers and solutions with clients. Learn more at [cantina.xyz](https://cantina.xyz)

## 1.2 Disclaimer

Cantina Managed provides a detailed evaluation of the security posture of the code at a particular moment based on the information available at the time of the review. While Cantina Managed endeavors to identify and disclose all potential security issues, it cannot guarantee that every vulnerability will be detected or that the code will be entirely secure against all possible attacks. The assessment is conducted based on the specific commit and version of the code provided. Any subsequent modifications to the code may introduce new vulnerabilities that were absent during the initial review. Therefore, any changes made to the code require a new security review to ensure that the code remains secure. Please be advised that the Cantina Managed security review is not a replacement for continuous security measures such as penetration testing, vulnerability scanning, and regular code reviews.

## 1.3 Risk assessment

Severity	Description
<b>Critical</b>	<i>Must fix as soon as possible (if already deployed).</i>
<b>High</b>	Leads to a loss of a significant portion (>10%) of assets in the protocol, or significant harm to a majority of users.
<b>Medium</b>	Global losses <10% or losses to only a subset of users, but still unacceptable.
<b>Low</b>	Losses will be annoying but bearable. Applies to things like griefing attacks that can be easily repaired or even gas inefficiencies.
<b>Gas Optimization</b>	Suggestions around gas saving practices.
<b>Informational</b>	Suggestions around best practices or readability.

### 1.3.1 Severity Classification

The severity of security issues found during the security review is categorized based on the above table. Critical findings have a high likelihood of being exploited and must be addressed immediately. High findings are almost certain to occur, easy to perform, or not easy but highly incentivized thus must be fixed as soon as possible.

Medium findings are conditionally possible or incentivized but are still relatively likely to occur and should be addressed. Low findings a rare combination of circumstances to exploit, or offer little to no incentive to exploit but are recommended to be addressed.

Lastly, some findings might represent objective improvements that should be addressed but do not impact the project's overall security (Gas and Informational findings).

## 2 Security Review Summary

Sky Protocol is a decentralised protocol developed around the USDS stablecoin.

From Jul 28th to Aug 8th the Cantina team conducted a review of [lockstake](#) on commit hash [37c18fe3](#). The team identified a total of **3** issues in the following risk categories:

**Issues Found**

<b>Severity</b>	<b>Count</b>	<b>Fixed</b>	<b>Acknowledged</b>
Critical Risk	0	0	0
High Risk	0	0	0
Medium Risk	0	0	0
Low Risk	1	1	0
Gas Optimizations	0	0	0
Informational	2	1	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>

The Cantina Managed team reviewed Sky's [lockstake](#) holistically on commit hash [d4dbe6ea](#) and concluded that all the issues were addressed and no new vulnerabilities were identified.

## 3 Findings

### 3.1 Low Risk

#### 3.1.1 LockstakeInit.updateClipper is missing stUSDS.rely(clipper)

**Severity:** Low Risk

**Context:** LockstakeInit.sol#L311

**Description:** The stUsds contract needs to rely the new clipper so it can call stUsds.cut(..) upon auctions that end with bad protocol debt.

This call is missing in updateClipper, even though the function seems to support migrating from an activated clipper:

```
// stopped could be 0, meaning new clipper should also be activated!
se.clipper.file("stopped", se.oldClipper.stopped());
// copy over current mom state
if (se.oldClipper.wards(address(clipperMom)) == 1) {
    se.clipper.rely(address(clipperMom));
}
```

If the init spell ends up activating the new clipper with .file("stopped", 0), it won't be fully operational. Bad debt liquidations will revert in newClipper.take -> stUsds.cut.

**Recommendation:** Consider performing the stUSDS.rely(clipper) call in updateClipper. In addition, the team mentioned that the (old) clipper will be deactivated (stopped = 3) during the migration, same for the new clipper for the initial period of the stUSDS launch. As an alternative, change updateClipper to always deactivate the new clipper and consider adding another function that activates it to the deploy scripts.

**Sky:** Fixed in commit 43662905.

**Cantina Managed:** Fix verified. Script now checks the old clipper is deactivated and has no active auctions before running. updateClipper and removeClipper have been merged, new enableLiquidations function has been added.

### 3.2 Informational

#### 3.2.1 Mixed usage of DAI and USDS in comments

**Severity:** Informational

**Context:** LockstakeClipper.sol

**Description:** Many comments within the LockstakeClipper retained from the Maker code still talk about "DAI" - e.g., "get DAI from caller," "remaining DAI target", "Don't collect more than tab of DAI" but we also have references to USDS uint256 tab; // Usds to raise rad].

Using a mixed reference can be confusing for the readers.

**Recommendation:** Consider sticking to one naming convention.

**Sky:** Acknowledged, decided to keep as it is to avoid further changes and a bigger diff at this stage.

**Cantina Managed:** Acknowledged by the client.

#### 3.2.2 Misleading comment in LockstakeClipper.kick about triggering bad debt accounting

**Severity:** Informational

**Context:** LockstakeClipper.sol#L279

**Description:** Usually, **bad debt** refers to losses to the protocol, i.e., what is used for the cut call in clipper.take. In clipper.kick (which starts the liquidation), one does not know yet if there'll be bad debt but the comment talks about triggering *bad debt accounting*.

```
// Trigger bad debt accounting (will update line accordingly)
if (cuttee != address(0)) { CutteeLike(cuttee).drip(); }
```

This comment is therefore slightly misleading or could be misinterpreted.

**Recommendation:** Consider rephrasing it, for example:

```
// Trigger new auction accounting (will update line accordingly)  
if (cuttee != address(0)) { CutteeLike(cuttee).drip(); }
```

**Sky:** This was done in commit [c217ac96](#). And the final version in commit [43662905](#).

**Cantina Managed:** Fix verified.