



**PALADIN**  
BLOCKCHAIN SECURITY

# Smart Contract Security Assessment

Final Report

For IceSlush Finance

06 October 2021



[paladinsec.co](http://paladinsec.co)



[info@paladinsec.co](mailto:info@paladinsec.co)

# Table of Contents

Table of Contents	2
Disclaimer	3
1 Overview	4
1.1 Summary	4
1.2 Contracts Assessed	4
1.3 Findings Summary	5
1.3.1 Token	6
1.3.2 MasterChef	6
2 Findings	7
2.1 Token	7
2.1.1 Token Overview	7
2.1.2 Privileged Roles	7
2.1.3 Issues & Recommendations	8
2.2 MasterChef	10
2.2.1 Privileged Roles	10
2.2.2 Issues & Recommendations	11



# Disclaimer

Paladin Blockchain Security ("Paladin") has conducted an independent audit to verify the integrity of and highlight any vulnerabilities or errors, intentional or unintentional, that may be present in the codes that were provided for the scope of this audit. This audit report does not constitute agreement, acceptance or advocacy for the Project that was audited, and users relying on this audit report should not consider this as having any merit for financial advice in any shape, form or nature. The contracts audited do not account for any economic developments that may be pursued by the Project in question, and that the veracity of the findings thus presented in this report relate solely to the proficiency, competence, aptitude and discretion of our independent auditors, who make no guarantees nor assurance that the contracts are completely free of exploits, bugs, vulnerabilities or deprecation of technologies. Further, this audit report shall not be disclosed nor transmitted to any persons or parties on any objective, goal or justification without due written assent, acquiescence or approval by Paladin.

All information provided in this report does not constitute financial or investment advice, nor should it be used to signal that any persons reading this report should invest their funds without sufficient individual due diligence regardless of the findings presented in this report. Information is provided 'as is', and Paladin is under no covenant to the completeness, accuracy or solidity of the contracts audited. In no event will Paladin or its partners, employees, agents or parties related to the provision of this audit report be liable to any parties for, or lack thereof, decisions and/or actions with regards to the information provided in this audit report.

Cryptocurrencies and any technologies by extension directly or indirectly related to cryptocurrencies are highly volatile and speculative by nature. All reasonable due diligence and safeguards may yet be insufficient, and users should exercise considerable caution when participating in any shape or form in this nascent industry.

The audit report has made all reasonable attempts to provide clear and articulate recommendations to the Project team with respect to the rectification, amendment and/or revision of any highlighted issues, vulnerabilities or exploits within the contracts provided. It is the sole responsibility of the Project team to sufficiently test and perform checks, ensuring that the contracts are functioning as intended, specifically that the functions therein contained within said contracts have the desired intended effects, functionalities and outcomes of the Project team.

# 1 Overview

This report has been prepared for IceSlush Finance on the Avalanche network. Paladin provides a user-centred examination of the smart contracts to look for vulnerabilities, logic errors or other issues from both an internal and external perspective.

## 1.1 Summary

<b>Project Name</b>	IceSlush Finance
<b>URL</b>	<a href="https://iceslush.finance/">https://iceslush.finance/</a>
<b>Platform</b>	Avalanche
<b>Language</b>	Solidity

## 1.2 Contracts Assessed

Name	Contract	Live Code Match
Token	0x28bf9cb0a8c0a6fb01680daaae9d6ae76234491b	✓ MATCH
MasterChefV2	0x5BFfE9747303A0144e240951f7460A61d0343467	✓ MATCH

## 1.3 Findings Summary

Severity	Found	Resolved	Partially Resolved	Acknowledged (no change made)
● High	1	1	-	-
● Medium	2	2	-	-
● Low	4	4	-	-
● Informational	10	7	-	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>3</b>

### Classification of Issues

Severity	Description
● High	Exploits, vulnerabilities or errors that will certainly or probabilistically lead towards loss of funds, control, or impairment of the contract and its functions. Issues under this classification are recommended to be fixed with utmost urgency.
● Medium	Bugs or issues with that may be subject to exploit, though their impact is somewhat limited. Issues under this classification are recommended to be fixed as soon as possible.
● Low	Effects are minimal in isolation and do not pose a significant danger to the project or its users. Issues under this classification are recommended to be fixed nonetheless.
● Informational	Consistency, syntax or style best practices. Generally pose a negligible level of risk, if any.

## 1.3.1 Token

ID	Severity	Summary	Status
01	LOW	mint function can be used to pre-mint large amounts of tokens before ownership is transferred to the Masterchef	RESOLVED
02	INFO	Operator modifier and functions, Uniswap interfaces, and other unused functions can be removed	ACKNOWLEDGED

## 1.3.2 MasterChef

ID	Severity	Summary	Status
03	HIGH	Withdrawal fees not charged in emergencyWithdraw	RESOLVED
04	MEDIUM	Rewards per block may result in unintended side effects	RESOLVED
05	MEDIUM	Setting devaddr and feeAddress to the zero address will break most functionality	RESOLVED
06	LOW	Adding EOA or non-token contract as a pool will break updatePool and massUpdatePools	RESOLVED
07	LOW	updateEmissionRate has no maximum safeguard	RESOLVED
08	LOW	The pendingToken function will revert if totalAllocPoint is zero	RESOLVED
09	INFO	BONUS_MULTIPLIER is redundant	RESOLVED
10	INFO	Pools use the contract balance to figure out the total deposits	ACKNOWLEDGED
11	INFO	updatePool does not use SafeERC20	RESOLVED
12	INFO	Rounding vulnerability to tokens with a very large supply can cause large supply tokens to receive zero emissions	ACKNOWLEDGED
13	INFO	dev function can be renamed	RESOLVED
14	INFO	startBlock can be set to a time in the past	RESOLVED
15	INFO	add, set, deposit, withdraw, emergencyWithdraw, dev, setFeeAddress and updateEmissionRate functions can be made external	RESOLVED
16	INFO	Lack of events for add, set and setStartBlock	RESOLVED
17	INFO	There is a difference in the withdraw fee basis points between add and set functions	RESOLVED

# 2 Findings

---

## 2.1 Token

The contract allows for tokens to be minted when the `mint` function is called by the Owner, who at the time of deployment would be the deployer. However, ownership is generally transferred to the Masterchef via the `transferOwnership` function for emission rewards to be minted and distributed to users staking in the Masterchef. The `mint` function can be used to pre-mint tokens for various uses including injection of initial liquidity, token presale, airdrops, and others.

### 2.1.1 Token Overview

<b>Address</b>	0x28bf9cb0a8c0a6fb01680daaae9d6ae76234491b
<b>Token Supply</b>	Unlimited
<b>Decimal Places</b>	18
<b>Transfer Max Size</b>	None
<b>Transfer Min Size</b>	None
<b>Transfer Fees</b>	None
<b>Pre-mints</b>	6,000

### 2.1.2 Privileged Roles

The following functions can be called by the owner of the contract:

- `mint`
- `transferOperator`

## 2.1.3 Issues & Recommendations

<b>Issue #01</b>	<b>mint function can be used to pre-mint large amounts of tokens before ownership is transferred to the Masterchef</b>
<b>Severity</b>	 LOW SEVERITY
<b>Description</b>	The <code>mint</code> function could be used to pre-mint tokens for legitimate uses including, but not limited to, the injection of initial liquidity, token presale, or airdrops; however, this function may also be used to pre-mint tokens for dumping.
<b>Recommendation</b>	Consider being forthright if this <code>mint</code> function has been used by letting your community know how much was minted, where they are currently stored, if a vesting contract was used for token unlocking, and finally the purpose of the mints.
<b>Resolution</b>	 RESOLVED 6,000 tokens have been pre-minted to <code>0xac664711285643DE163C593CE378A7129ca2dde9</code> , and token ownership has been transferred to the Masterchef.



**Issue #02****Operator modifier and functions, Uniswap interfaces, and other unused functions can be removed****Severity** INFORMATIONAL**Description**

The `onlyOperator` and `transferOperator` functions do not seem to serve any purpose in the token contract, and can therefore be removed to reduce the length of the contract for third-party reviewers.

This can be extended to the Uniswap-related interfaces (`IUniswapV2Router02`, `IUniswapV2Router01`, `IUniswapV2Pair`, `IUniswapV2Factory`) since they too do not seem to be used in any capacity in the token contract.

Finally, the `safe32` and `getChainID` functions can be removed as they too are not used.

**Recommendation**

Consider removing these to reduce the length of the contract.

**Resolution** ACKNOWLEDGED

---

## 2.2 MasterChef

The IceSlush Masterchef is a fork of Goose Finance's Masterchef. A notable feature of forking the latter is the removal of the `migrator` function from Pancakeswap, which has been used maliciously to steal user's tokens. We commend IceSlush Finance on their decision to fork a relatively safer version of the Masterchef.

Withdrawal fees have an upper limit of 4% (which is also payable on emergency withdrawals), and transfer tax tokens have been properly accounted for using the before-after method put forth by Uniswap. Finally, token emissions have an upper limit of 1 token per block.

### 2.2.1 Privileged Roles

The following functions can be called by the owner of the contract:

- `add`
- `set`
- `dev`
- `setFeeAddress`
- `updateEmissionRate`
- `setStartBlock`



## 2.2.2 Issues & Recommendations

Issue #03

Withdrawal fees not charged in emergencyWithdraw

Severity

 HIGH SEVERITY

Location

Lines 228-242

```
function emergencyWithdraw(uint256 _pid) public nonReentrant {
    PoolInfo storage pool = poolInfo[_pid];
    UserInfo storage user = userInfo[_pid][msg.sender];
    uint256 fee = 0;
    uint256 amount = user.amount;
    user.amount = 0;
    user.rewardDebt = 0;
    if (pool.withdrawFeeBP > 0) {
        fee = user.amount.mul(pool.withdrawFeeBP).div(10000);
        amount = amount.sub(fee);
        pool.lpToken.safeTransfer(feeAddress, fee);
    }
    pool.lpToken.safeTransfer(address(msg.sender), amount);
    emit EmergencyWithdraw(msg.sender, _pid, amount);
}
```

Description

The withdrawal fee calculation in the emergencyWithdraw function is calculated on user.amount, which in previous lines had already been zeroed out. As such, when users call emergencyWithdraw, there are no withdrawal fees payable, and the user is thus able to receive their full deposited amount back. This can be gamed by users who would first harvest their pending rewards then call emergencyWithdraw to get all their funds back.

Recommendation

The withdrawal fees should instead be calculated on amount rather than user.amount, like so:

```
fee = amount.mul(pool.withdrawFeeBP).div(10000);
```

Resolution

 RESOLVED

**Issue #04****Rewards per block may result in unintended side effects****Severity** MEDIUM SEVERITY**Description**

The Masterchef calculates rewards per block which is an anti-pattern on the Avalanche network as it may pose unintended side effects with token emissions and APR displays given that Avalanche has variable block times. The issue is [detailed here](#). Emissions may thus be erratic and potentially gamed, per this [tweet by Yield Yak](#).

**Recommendation**

Consider replacing all reward calculations from `block.number` to be based on `block.timestamp`.

**Resolution** RESOLVED**Issue #05****Setting devaddr and feeAddress to the zero address will break most functionality****Severity** MEDIUM SEVERITY**Description**

Within the token contract, minting or transferring tokens to the zero address will revert the transaction. Withdrawals and emergency withdrawals will break if the `feeAddress` is ever set to the zero address. Harvesting will fail as well.

**Recommendation**

To prevent this from ever happening by accident and to limit governance risks, consider adding a requirement like:

```
require(devaddr != address(0), "nonzero!");  
require(feeAddress != address(0), "nonzero!");
```

to the configuration functions.

**Resolution** RESOLVED

**Issue #06****Adding EOA or non-token contract as a pool will break updatePool and massUpdatePools****Severity** LOW SEVERITY**Description**

updatePool will always call `balanceOf(address(this))` on the token of this pool, and will fail to do so if it is not a token contract.

**Recommendation**

Consider simply adding a test line in the add function. If the token does not exist, this will make sure the add function fails.

```
_lpToken.balanceOf(address(this));
```

**Resolution** RESOLVED**Issue #07****updateEmissionRate has no maximum safeguard****Severity** LOW SEVERITY**Description**

Projects sometimes accidentally update their emission rate to a severely high number either by accident or with malicious intent. Although there is the `maxEmissionRate` variable, it is not currently used in the function.

**Recommendation**

Consider using the `maxEmissionRate` variable to place an upper limit on the setting of emission rates, like so:

```
require(_tokenPerBlock <= maxEmissionRate, "Too high");
```

**Resolution** RESOLVED

There is now an upper limit of 1 token per second.

**Issue #08****The pendingToken function will revert if totalAllocPoint is zero****Severity** LOW SEVERITY**Description**

In the pendingToken function, at some point a division is made by the totalAllocPoint variable. If all pools have their rewards set to zero, this variable will be zero as well. The requests will then revert with a division by zero error.

**Recommendation**

Consider only calculating the accumulated rewards since the lastRewardBlock if the totalAllocPoint variable is greater than zero.

This check can simply be added to the existing check that verifies the block.number and lpSupply, like so:

```
if (block.number > pool.lastRewardBlock && lpSupply != 0
&& totalAllocPoint > 0) { ... }
```

**Resolution** RESOLVED

The client has opted to use `if (lpSupply == 0 || totalAllocPoint == 0) return 0;`

**Issue #09****BONUS\_MULTIPLIER is redundant****Severity** INFORMATIONAL**Description**

The constant variable BONUS\_MULTIPLIER does not look to be used in the Masterchef contract and can thus be removed.

**Recommendation**

Consider removing BONUS\_MULTIPLIER and associated comments.

**Resolution** RESOLVED

**Issue #10****Pools use the contract balance to figure out the total deposits****Severity**

● INFORMATIONAL

**Description**

As with pretty much all Masterchefs, the total number of tokens in the Masterchef contract is used to determine the total number of deposits. This can cause dilution of rewards when people accidentally send tokens to the Masterchef. More severely, because the native token is constantly minted, this will cause severe dilution on the native token pool.

**Recommendation**

Consider adding an `lpSupply` variable to the `PoolInfo` that keeps track of the total deposits.

**Resolution**

● ACKNOWLEDGED

**Issue #11****updatePool does not use SafeERC20****Severity**

● INFORMATIONAL

**Location**

Line 176  
`token.transfer(0x00000000000000000000000000000000dEaD,  
burnAmount);`

**Description**

It is considered best practice to use OpenZeppelin's SafeERC20 for any token transfer operations. Alternatively, tokens can just be minted to the burn address for the same effect.

**Recommendation**

Consider using [safeTransfer](#) instead of `transfer` in the function.

**Resolution**

✓ RESOLVED

**Issue #12****Rounding vulnerability to tokens with a very large supply can cause large supply tokens to receive zero emissions****Severity** INFORMATIONAL**Description**

Within `updatePool`, `accTokenPerShare` is based on the `lpSupply` variable.

```
pool.accTokenPerShare =  
pool.accTokenPerShare.add(tokenReward.mul(1e12).div(lpSupply));
```

However, if this `lpSupply` becomes a severely large value, precision errors may occur due to rounding. This is famously seen when pools decide to add meme-tokens which usually have huge supplies and no decimals.

**Recommendation**

Consider increasing precision to `1e18` across the entire contract.

**Resolution** ACKNOWLEDGED**Issue #13****dev function can be renamed****Severity** INFORMATIONAL**Description**

Users may be confused on what the `dev` function does.

**Recommendation**

Consider renaming to `setDevAddress`.

**Resolution** RESOLVED

**Issue #14****startBlock can be set to a time in the past****Severity** INFORMATIONAL**Description**

The setStartBlock function can be called to set startBlock and lastRewardBlock to a point in the past, which may have unintended side effects.

**Recommendation**

Consider revamping the setStartBlock function to ensure that the startBlock can only be moved to a future period, like so:

```
function setStartBlock(uint256 _startBlock) external onlyOwner
{
    require(block.number < startBlock, "It's too late to
postpone mining. It has already started");
    require(block.number < _startBlock, "cannot set start block
in the past");
    uint256 length = poolInfo.length;
    for (uint256 pid = 0; pid < length; ++pid) {
        PoolInfo storage pool = poolInfo[pid];
        pool.lastRewardBlock = _startBlock;
    }
    startBlock = _startBlock;
    emit UpdateStartBlock(startBlock);
}
```

**Resolution** RESOLVED

**Issue #15**

**add, set, deposit, withdraw, emergencyWithdraw, dev, setFeeAddress and updateEmissionRate functions can be made external**

**Severity**

 INFORMATIONAL

**Description**

The above functions can be changed from public to external. Apart from being a best practice when the function is not used within the contract, this can lead to a lower gas usage in certain cases.

**Recommendation**

Consider making these functions external.

**Resolution**

 RESOLVED

**Issue #16**

**Lack of events for add, set and setStartBlock**

**Severity**

 INFORMATIONAL

**Description**

Functions that affect the status of sensitive variables should emit events as notifications.

**Recommendation**

Add events for the above variables.

**Resolution**

 RESOLVED



**Issue #17****There is a difference in the withdraw fee basis points between add and set functions****Severity** INFORMATIONAL**Description**

The add function allows deposit fees to be set to a maximum value of 4%, while set only allows changes to the deposit fees to a maximum value of 3%.

**Recommendation**

Consider aligning the two functions to avoid setting at an unintended value because of the restriction.

**Resolution** RESOLVED

Both add and set have a 4% withdrawal fee limit.





**PALADIN**  
BLOCKCHAIN SECURITY