

Smart Contract Audit – Tosdis Finance

Date: April 16,2021

Report for: Tosdis Finance

By: CyberUnit.Tech



This document may contain confidential information about IT systems and the customer's intellectual property and information about potential vulnerabilities and exploitation methods.

The report contains confidential information. This information can be used internally by the customer. The customer can release the information after fixing all vulnerabilities.

Document

Name	Tosdis Finance
Link	https://kovan.etherscan.io/address/0xfle4ede634da80646facfe6b4c176dc0f0 5c95b6#code
Date	15/04/21



Table of contents

Scope	4
Executive Summary	4
Severity Definitions	5
AS-IS overview	5
IDOMaster AS-IS overview	7
IDOMaster Audit overview	8
IDOPool AS-IS overview	9
IDOPool Audit overview	10
Conclusion	11
Disclaimers	12
Appendix A. Evidences	13
Appendix B. Automated tools reports	
Appendix C. Automated tools GAS usage reports	



Introduction

This report presents the Customer`s smart contract's security assessment findings and its code review conducted between April 6 – April 15 2021

Scope

The scope of the project is Tosdis smart contract, which can be found by the link below:

https://kovan.etherscan.io/address/0xfle4ede634da80646facfe6b4c176dc0f05c95b6#code

We have scanned this smart contract for commonly known and more specific vulnerabilities. Here are some of the widely known vulnerabilities that are considered (the complete list includes them but does not limit them):

- Reentrancy
- Timestamp Dependence
- Gas Limit and Loops
- DoS with (Unexpected) Throw
- DoS with Block Gas Limit
- Transaction-Ordering Dependence
- Style guide violation
- Transfer forwards all gas
- ERC20 API violation
- Compiler version not fixed
- Unchecked external call Unchecked math
- Unsafe type inference
- Implicit visibility level

Executive Summary

Our team performed an analysis of code functionality, manual audit, and automated checks with Slither and remix IDE (see Appendix B pic 1-2). All issues found during automated analysis reviewed have been manually, and application vulnerabilities are



presented in the Audit overview section. A general overview is presented in the AS-IS section, and you can find all found issues in the Audit overview section.

We found two low and one medium issue in a smart contract.

Severity Definitions

Risk Level	Description
Critical	Critical vulnerabilities are usually straightforward to exploit and can lead to tokens loss etc.
High	High-level vulnerabilities are difficult to exploit; however, they also significantly do not impact smart contract execution, e.g., public access to crucial functions.
Medium	Medium-level vulnerabilities are essential to fix; however, they can't lead to tokens loss.
Low	Low-level vulnerabilities are mostly related to outdated, unused, etc., code snippets that can't significantly impact execution.
Lowest / Code Style / Best Practice	Lowest-level vulnerabilities, code style violations, and info statements can't affect smart contract execution and can be ignored.

AS-TS overview

IDOMaster contract consists of the next smart contracts:

- 1. Address.sol, Context.sol, ERC20Burnable.sol, Ownable.sol, Pausable.sol, SafeERC20.sol, SafeMath.sol, Whitelist.sol, ERC20.sol, ReentrancyGuard.sol
- 2. IERC2O.sol, IidoMaster.sol, IStakingPool.sol, IUniswapV2Pair.sol contracts interfaces
- 3. IDOMaster.sol, IDOPool.sol

Contracts from point 1 were compared to original "Openzeppelin" templates no logic differences were found. They are considered secure.

Contracts from point 2 are Helpers Interfaces that include header files.



Contracts from point 3 The IDOmaster classes implementing the IDOmaster protocol will be detailed in the report.



IDOMaster AS-IS overview

IDOMaster.sol contract inherits the class - Ownable

IDOMaster contract init function:

SetFreeToken function was called with the following parameters:

uint256(_newFeeToken)

setFeeAmount function was called with following parameters:

uint256(_newFeeAmount)

SetFreeWallet function was called with the following parameters:

address(payable _newFeeWallet)

SetBurnPercent function was called with the following parameters:

- uint256(_newBurnPercent)
- uint256(_newDivider)

setFeeFundsPercent function was called with the following parameters:

• uint256(_feeFundsPercent)

setFeeFundsPercent function was called with the following parameters:

- IStakingPool(_disStakingPool)
- IStakingPool(_lpDisStakingPool)
- IUniswapV2Pair(_lpUniswapV2Pair)
- bool(_disReserveO)

setFeeFundsPercent function was called with the following parameters:

- uint256(_vipDisAmount)
- uint256(_vipPercent)
- uint256(_holdersDisAmount)
- uint256(_holdersPercent)
- uint256(_publicDisAmount)
- uint256(_publicPercent)

createIDO function was called with the following parameters:

- uint256(_tokenPrice)
- ERC20(_rewardToken)
- uint256(_startTimestamp)
- uint256(_finishTimestamp)
- uint256(_startClaimTimestamp)
- uint256(_minEthPayment)
- uint256(_maxEthPayment)



- uint256(_maxDistributedTokenAmount)
- bool(_hasWhitelisting)
- bool(_enableTierSystem)

isContract function was called with the following parameters:

address(_addr)

getMaxEthPayment function was called with the following parameters:

- address(user)
- uint256(maxEthPayment)

getFullDisBalance function was called with the following parameters:

address(user)

getFeeWallet function was called without parameters.

IDOMaster Audit overview

Critical

No critical severity vulnerabilities were found.

<u>High</u>

No high severity vulnerabilities were found.

Medium

 Use of strict equalities that an attacker can easily manipulate. (see Appendix A pic. 1 for evidence)

<u>Low</u>

2. Different versions of Solidity are used in Version used: ['0.7.3', '>=0.6.0<0.8.0', '>=0.6.2<0.8.0'] (see Appendix A pic. 2 for evidence)



IDOPool AS-IS overview

IDOPool.sol contract inherits the class Ownable, Pausable, Whitelist, ReentrancyGuard.

IDOPool.sol contract init functions:

getTokenAmount function was called with the following parameters:

• address(ethAmount)

claimFor function was called with the following parameters:

address[](memory _addresses)

processClaim function was called with the following parameters:

address(_receiver)

pay function was called without parameters.

claim function was called without parameters.

withdrawFunds function was called without parameters.

withdrawNotSoldTokens function was called without parameters.

ReentrancyGuard.sol contract init functions:

nonReentrant function was called without parameters.



IDOPool Audit overview

Critical

No critical severity vulnerabilities were found.

<u>High</u>

No high severity vulnerabilities were found.

Medium

No medium severity vulnerabilities were found.

Low

1. Different versions of Solidity are used in Version used: ['0.7.3', '>=0.6.0<0.8.0', '>=0.6.2<0.8.0'] (see Appendix A pic. 3 for evidence)



Conclusion

Smart contracts within the scope were manually reviewed and analyzed with static analysis tools. For the contract, a high-level description of functionality was presented in the report's As-is overview section.

The audit report contains all found security vulnerabilities and other issues in the reviewed code.

The overall quality of the reviewed contracts is secured. Security engineers found two low and one medium vulnerability, which couldn't have any significant security impact. And we can provide best practice for used:

The creation of IDOpool in the body of the contract is costly in our realities. We suggest using a short proxy contract that refers to IDOpool, while the constructor can be moved into the contract's init function where you want to place a check to prevent double execution. We would also recommend using create2 to initialize the proxy contract.



Disclaimers

Disclaimer

The smart contracts given for audit had been analyzed following the best industry practices at the date of this report, concerning: cybersecurity vulnerabilities and issues in smart contract source code, the details of which are disclosed in this report, (Source Code); the Source Code compilation, deployment, and functionality (performing the intended functions).

The audit makes no statements or warranties on the security of the code. It can also not be considered a sufficient assessment regarding the code's utility and safety, bug–free status, or any other contract statements. While we have done our best to conduct the analysis and produce this report, it is important to note that you should not rely on this report only – we recommend proceeding with several independent audits and a public bug bounty program to ensure the security of smart contracts.

Technical Disclaimer

Smart contracts are deployed and executed on the blockchain platform. The platform, programming language, and other software related to the smart contract can have their vulnerabilities leading to hacks. Thus, the audit can't guarantee the explicit security of the audited smart contracts.



Appendix A. Evidences

Pic 1. Dangerous strict equalities:

Pic 2. Different versions:

```
Different versions of Solidity is used in:
- Version used: ['0.7.3', '>=0.6.0<0.8.0', '>=0.6.2<0.8.0']
- >=0.6.0<0.8.0 (ERC20.sol#3)
- 0.7.3 (IDOMaster.sol#2)
- 0.7.3 (IDOPool.sol#1)
- >=0.6.0<0.8.0 (ReentrancyGuard.sol#3)
- >=0.6.0<0.8.0 (interfaces/IERC20.sol#3)
- 0.7.3 (interfaces/IStakingPool.sol#1)
- 0.7.3 (interfaces/IUniswapV2Pair.sol#3)
- 0.7.3 (interfaces/IUniswapV2Pair.sol#3)
- 0.7.3 (interfaces/IidoMaster.sol#1)
- >=0.6.2<0.8.0 (lib/Address.sol#3)
- >=0.6.0<0.8.0 (lib/ERC20Burnable.sol#3)
- >=0.6.0<0.8.0 (lib/ERC20Burnable.sol#3)
- >=0.6.0<0.8.0 (lib/Pausable.sol#1)
- >=0.6.0<0.8.0 (lib/SafeERC20.sol#3)
- >=0.6.0<0.8.0 (lib/SafeERC20.sol#3)
- >=0.6.0<0.8.0 (lib/SafeERC20.sol#3)
- >=0.6.0<0.8.0 (lib/SafeERC20.sol#3)
- >=0.6.0<0.8.0 (lib/SafeEMath.sol#3)
- 0.7.3 (lib/Whitelist.sol#1)
```

Pic 3. Different versions:

```
Different versions of Solidity is used in:
- Version used: ['0.7.3', '>=0.6.0<0.8.0', '>=0.6.2<0.8.0']
- >=0.6.0<0.8.0 (ERC20.sol#3)
- 0.7.3 (IDOPool.sol#1)
- >=0.6.0<0.8.0 (ReentrancyGuard.sol#3)
- >=0.6.0<0.8.0 (interfaces/IERC20.sol#3)
- 0.7.3 (interfaces/IidoMaster.sol#1)
- >=0.6.2<0.8.0 (lib/Address.sol#3)
- >=0.6.0<0.8.0 (lib/Context.sol#3)
- >=0.6.0<0.8.0 (lib/Context.sol#3)
- >=0.6.0<0.8.0 (lib/Pausable.sol#3)
- 0.7.3 (lib/Pausable.sol#1)
- >=0.6.0<0.8.0 (lib/SafeERC20.sol#3)
- >=0.6.0<0.8.0 (lib/SafeMath.sol#3)
- >=0.6.0<0.8.0 (lib/SafeMath.sol#3)
- 0.7.3 (lib/Whitelist.sol#1)
```



Appendix B. Automated tools reports

Pic 1. IDOMaster Slither automated report:

```
| Individual content | Individ
```



```
Pragma version@.7.3 (interfaces/IstakingPool.sol#i) necessitates a version too recent to be trusted. Consider deploying with 0.6.11
Pragma version@.7.3 (interfaces/Isdakster.sol#) necessitates a version too recent to be trusted. Consider deploying with 0.6.11
Pragma version@.7.3 (interfaces/Isdakster.sol#) necessitates a version too recent to be trusted. Consider deploying with 0.6.11
Pragma version@.0.6.06.03.0 (Ilb/Gouter.sol#3) is too complex
Pragma version@.0.6.06.03.0 (Ilb/Gauter.sol#3) is too complex
Pragma version@.0.6.06.00.0 (Ilb/Gauter.sol#3) is too complex
Pragma version@.0.7.3 (Ilb/Mattelist.sol#3) is too complex
Pragma version@.0.7.3 (Ilb/Mattelist.sol#3) is too complex
Pragma version@.0.7.3 (Ilb/Mattelist.sol#3) is too complex
Pragma version@.0.7.3 (Ilb/Gauter.sol#3) is too complex
Pragma version@.0.7.3 (Ilb/Mattelist.sol#3) is too complex
Pragma version@.0.7.3 (Ilb/Gauter.sol#3) is too complex
Pragma version@.0.7.3 (Ilb/Mattelist.sol#3) is not in mixed.sol#3) is not in mixed.sol#3 is not i
```



```
Parameter IDOMaster. setTier(uint256, uint256, u
```

Pic 2. IDOPool Slither automated report:

```
INFO:Detectors:
100Mool.withdrawFunds() (100Mool.sol#145-148) sends eth to arbitrary user
Dangerous calls:
- msg.sender.transfer(address(this).balance) (100Mool.sol#17)
Reference: https://githb.com/cytic/slither/wiki/Detector-Documentation#functions-that-send-ether-to-arbitrary-destinations
1NFO:Detectors:
- rewardOken.sefeTransfer(_receiver_,amount) (100Mool.sol#149)
- External calls:
- rewardOken.sefeTransfer(_receiver_,amount) (100Mool.sol#149)
- Event emitted after the call(s):
- Tokenskithdrawn(_receiver_,amount) (100Mool.sol#141)
Reference: https://githb.com/cytic/slither/wiki/Detector-Documentation#reentrancy-wulnerabilities-3
1NFO:Detectors:
100Mool.constructor(IdoMester_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint256_uint25
```



```
->=0.6.0<0.8.0 (lib/Context.sol#3)
->=0.6.0<0.8.0 (lib/Davable.sol#3)
->=0.6.0<0.8.0 (lib/Davable.sol#3)
->=0.6.0<0.8.0 (lib/SafeRC20.sol#3)
->=0.6.0<0.8.0 (lib/SafeRC20.sol#3)
->=0.6.0<0.8.0 (lib/SafeRC20.sol#3)
->=0.6.0<0.8.0 (lib/SafeRC20.sol#3)
->=0.7.3 (lib/Mhitelist.sol#1)

Reference: https://github.com/crytic/slither/wiki/Detector-Documentation#different-pragma-directives-are-used
IMFO:Detectors:
Pragma version>=0.6.0<0.8.0 (ERC20.sol#3) is too complex
Pragma version>=0.6.0<0.8.0 (Recreates) a version too recent to be trusted. Consider deploying with 0.6.11
Pragma version>=0.6.0<0.8.0 (RentrancyGuard.sol#3) is too complex
Pragma version>=0.6.0<0.8.0 (RentrancyGuard.sol#3) is too complex
Pragma version>=0.6.0<0.8.0 (lib/Address.sol#3) is too complex
Pragma version>=0.6.0<0.8.0 (lib/Address.sol#3) is too complex
Pragma version>=0.6.0<0.8.0 (lib/Momable.sol#3) is too complex
Pragma version>=0.6.0<0.8.0 (lib/SafeRC20.sol#3) is too complex
Pragm
```





Appendix C. Automated tools GAS usage reports

```
0x7904BD25646792Ef8133b12092eA773A3fc680Bd',
Methods
Contract
                                                                              usd (avg)
                                                         1785744
               createID0
               setCompleted
                                                          27288
               approve
               mint
                                                          65687
Deployments
IDOMaster
                                                         3183103
Migrations
                                                         533039
MockERC20
```