Stackswap Audit Report

Tintash

November 10, 2021



Table of Contents

2
3
3 3 3 3 3 4 5 5 6 6

1 Report Details

- Prepared For: Sungmin Aum aum@lucidefi.ai
- Version: git commit e0d1638f7f70743cfa9c3970de55ca94ea794eed
- Reviewers:
 - Faried Nawaz faried@tintash.com
 - Saad Shafiq saad.shafiq@tintash.com

2 Summary

During the months of September and October 2021, Stackswap engaged with Tintash to review their smart contracts before their service went live. The contracts include

- DAO and governance contracts
- Several SIP-10 compliant tokens
- Liquidity pool and token swap contracts

Tintash conducted the review over a period of three weeks, with two engineers working on commits #d82f273 and later #e0d1638. The code base contained several older versions of contracts that were identified and not checked for problems.

We made a first pass going over all the contracts to try and gain an understanding of the system, and then deeper passes covering everything from issues with the syntax and use of extraneous/dead code to trying to find weak spots in the interactions between the contracts. Lastly, though not required as part of the review, we looked into superficial ways to cut down transaction execution costs.

During the course of our review, Stackswap implemented suggestions from another reviewer which helped clean up and simplify the code. However, this left some test cases related to the DAO and governance contracts broken. We provided a patch to get things working again.

We did not find any major issues with the contracts. There were a few edge-cases where the code could do a little more sanity checking of the contract call inputs, but nothing critical.

We found areas where improving the test cases to check returned values would lead to better testing of the smart contracts; some tests cases passed properly, though for the wrong reasons.

As Clarity is a relatively new language, there are no tools available to perform detailed semantic analysis of code. In particular, common tasks like identifying unused function parameters and internal variables, and identifying private functions and variables that are never used in a contract, have to be done manually. While a few issues were found of this nature, they were all low priority ones: no cases were found where such code could result in runtime flaws.

At the time of writing this report, all suggested Improvements and fixes are implemented in Stackswap commit #056057eb.

Name	Stackswap
Version	e0d1638
Type	Clarity
Platform	Stacks
Method	Whitebox
Reviewers	2

3 Findings

Recommendation	\mathbf{Type}	Severity
Governance - block-height should be checked for voting	Bug	Low
Governance - votes and tokens count	Improvement	-
One step mint - use already written functions	Improvement	-
Stackswap v1 - Manual fee re-calculation	Improvement	-
vSTSW - User id for staking	Improvement	-
Poxlsoft v2 - Unused principal argument in poxlv2	Improvement	-
Poxlsoft v2 - divide by zero	Bug	Low
General readability and cleanup - utility function	Improvement	-
Test cases - changes in test cases	Improvement	-

The system was also audited against recent vulnerabilities found in Arkadiko Swap¹, but no issues were found.

4 Recommendations

4.1 Test cases

- All the test cases should check the values returned by contract calls. They should follow an .expectOk() or .expectErr() with a check for the value they should see, using something like .expectBool(true) or .expectUint(4127). For example tests/governance_test.ts appears to work properly, but this is only because the error condition returned by the function call is not checked; at least one of the calls should fail because of ERR_BLOCK_PASSED, but actually fails with ERR_NOT_ENOUGH_BALANCE.
- The SIP-10 governance test cases are not properly updated to work properly, but this is only because the error condition returned by the function call is the new vSTSW token instead of STSW
- Changes in tests are provided as separate file tests.diff

4.2 General readability and cleanup

- Several contract functions start off with a lengthy block of code to ensure the callers are valid. Instead of inlining the checks, we recommend that they be separated out into private functions.
- A few functions in several contracts have a **begin** where they don't need one: either the function body contains just one expression, or the **begin** is inside a **let** expression.
- stake-tokens in stackswap-farming.clar sets a user variable but does not use it.
- Usage of fully qualified contract principal is not needed when deployed by same principal.
- Whitespaces, tabs and comments add up in cost calculation. Unused or commented code should be removed and code comments should be minimum.
- Many contracts have duplicates in project, with names suffixed as -bad or version numbers.

4.3 Smart Contracts

4.3.1 Governance

Multiple Governance Tokens

is-token-accepted in the governance contract only accepts vSTSW tokens instead of either STSW or vSTSW; this makes many test cases fail because the accounts do not have vSTSW minted.

¹https://arkadikofinance.medium.com/arkadiko-swap-post-mortem-f38cef95ff28

Recommendation

Update test cases to use vSTSW and make sure that STSW is not used in newer versions.

Possible Governance Contract Modification

An unlikely way to break the system was found by voting for a proposal to change the governance contract to an invalid principal. After discussion with Stackswap, it appears that this is not possible due to how DAO voting is conducted.

Ending Block Check for Voting

The voting functions do not check block-height against the proposal's end-block-height value. In the unlikely case that the (end-proposal) function is not called (Stackswap's cron jobs do not fire or their servers are unreachable), some votes can be made after voting on the proposal should have ended.

Recommendation

Check for end-block-height in voting functions to ensure that voting period is active.

Calling end-proposal

end-proposal is a public function which can be called by anyone with a valid proposal-id.

Recommendation

This should be guarded by is-council or proposer.

Miscellaneous

- The votes-by-member and tokens-by-member maps can be merged. The two fields (vote-count or amount) are redundant and one can be removed.
- proposer is not used in proposals map. Is this for web only?
- BASIC_PRINCIPAL is used as default proposer. This can be optional and set to none. But obviously this will need unwraping when used.
- Error name ERR_PROPOSAL_IS_NOT_OPEN assertion against false value, is not clearly readable.
- Since is-open is a bool value so

```
(asserts! (is-eq (get is-open proposal) false) (err
ERR_PROPOSAL_IS_NOT_OPEN))
```

can be written as

(asserts! (get is-open proposal) (err ERR_PROPOSAL_IS_NOT_OPEN))

4.3.2 One Step Mint

Redfinition, Private and Public functions

There are a few private remove-token-inner functions that do the same work as the public remove-token functions, except for the tx-sender check. The public ones look like they can reuse the private ones.

Recommendation

For example remove-soft-token can use private remove-soft-token-inner function.

Miscellaneous

The remove-all functions can simply do

(var-set soft-token-list (list))

instead of using the empty-token-list variable (slightly lowering runtime cost this way).

4.3.3 Stackswap V1

Merge to Update Tuples

There are several cases where the lp-data tuple can be updated by merging new tuple values on top of an existing lp-data instead of creating a new tuple.

Recommendation

An example of this could be

```
(unwrap! (contract-call? token-liquidity-trait set-lp-data (merge pair {
  fee-to-address: address
}) token-x token-y) ERR_LP_DATA_SET)
```

Unused get-fees

The swap-x-for-y and swap-y-for-x do not take advantage of the new get-fees function in stackswap-swap-fee-v1.clar.

Recommendation

Either use get-fees in swap-*-for-* functions or remove unused stackswap-swap-fee-v1 contract.

Possible Duplication

In following function

- add-to-position
- reduce-position
- swap-x-for-y
- swap-y-for-x
- collect-fees

let block is used for transaction verification. This block is doing same calculations for almost all variables.

Recommendation

This can be moved in a private function to avoid duplication. While making this change take care of differences like transfer-*-result.

4.3.4 vSTSW token

Staking Info

A user can callstake-tokens several times, and there's no way for them to later query the contract (using get-user-info) for their details of their staking call.

Recommendation

It might be helpful if stake-tokens function returns the user-idx value at the end of the function.

Unused Parameters

Parameter idx: uint in UserStakingCount map is not used in contract.

Recommendation

If idx: uint is removed then also remove merge and use simple map-set in reclaim-token function for UserStakingCount map.

Staking for zero Months

In function stake-tokens it is possible to set month as u0

Recommendation

Add validation for zero value.

4.3.5 Poxl Soft V2

Unused Principal

The claim-mining-reward-at-block, set-mining-reward-claimed, and mint-coinbase functions make use of a principal as a function argument. But it is eventually not used in the called mint-coinbase function; that uses tx-sender directly.

Recommendation

Use passed down principal argument in mint-coinbase funciton.

Divide by Zero

The reward-cycle-lengh-to-set value is not checked for to see if it's greater than u0 when the token is initialized. This can lead to a division-by-zero runtime error in other functions like get-reward-cycle.

Recommendation

 $Check \verb"reward-cycle-length-to-set" value range$

Possible Integer Overflow

Recommendation

Although this is an unlikely value for VRF, but further evaluation is required for range verification.

4.3.6 Common Recommendations

Use contract-caller to guard crucial funcitons instead of tx-sender. This is best explained here².

²https://app.sigle.io/friedger.id/HuOT9tNQC8fTXOsK28D7e