// HALBORN

Horizen Labs -Grapes Staking Smart Contract Security Audit

Prepared by: Halborn Date of Engagement: August 15th, 2022 - September 30th, 2022 Visit: Halborn.com

DOCI	JMENT REVISION HISTORY	5
CON	TACTS	6
1	EXECUTIVE OVERVIEW	7
1.1	INTRODUCTION	8
1.2	AUDIT SUMMARY	8
1.3	TEST APPROACH & METHODOLOGY	8
	RISK METHODOLOGY	9
1.4	SCOPE	11
2	ASSESSMENT SUMMARY & FINDINGS OVERVIEW	12
3	FINDINGS & TECH DETAILS	14
3.1	(HAL-01) UNDERFLOW MAY OCCUR DURING CLAIMS DUE TO LOSS OF CISION: REWARDS WILL BE LOCKED PERMANENTLY FOR SOME USER CRITICAL	PRE- RS - 15
	Description	15
	Proof of Concept	15
	Recommendation	17
	Remediation Plan	18
3.2	(HAL-02) ALL THE APE COINS STAKED IN THE BAKC POOL CAN BE DRA BY ANY BAYC/MAYC HOLDER - CRITICAL	INED 19
	Description	19
	Proof of Concept	22
	Risk Level	23
	Recommendation	23
	Remediation Plan	24

3.3	(HAL-03) APE COINS STAKED AND ACCRUED REWARDS CAN BE STOLEN F THE BAKC POOL AFTER THE BAKC COMMITTED IS TRANSFERRED TO A OWNER - CRITICAL	FROM NEW 25
	Description	25
	Proof of Concept	26
	Risk Level	27
	Recommendation	27
	Remediation Plan	27
3.4	(HAL-04) APE COINS STAKED AND ACCRUED REWARDS CAN BE STOLEN F THE BAKC POOL IF THE BAKC ID 0 IS TRANSFERRED - CRITICAL	ROM 28
	Description	28
	Proof of Concept	29
	Risk Level	30
	Recommendation	30
	Remediation Plan	30
3.5	(HAL-05) APE COINS STAKED AND ACCRUED REWARDS CAN BE STOLEN F THE BAKC POOL IF THE BAKC ID 0 IS PAIRED WITH THE BAYC/MAYC W ID 0 - CRITICAL	FROM WITH 31
	Description	31
	Proof of Concept	33
	Risk Level	33
	Recommendation	33
	Remediation Plan	34
3.6	(HAL-06) NFT HOLDERS CAN ALLOW ANYONE TO STAKE INTO THE POOLS THROUGH THE USE OF A SMART CONTRACT - HIGH	NFT 35
	Description	35
	Risk Level	36

	Recommendation	36
	Remediation Plan	36
3.7	(HAL-07) POOLS MAY GET LOCKED AFTER AN EMPTY CLAIM - MEDIUM	37
	Description	37
	Recommendation	38
	Remediation Plan	38
3.8	(HAL-08) UNSAFE TYPE CASTINGS - LOW	39
	Description	39
	Recommendation	41
	Remediation Plan	41
3.9	(HAL-09) CONTRACT DOES NOT ENFORCE THAT SETREWARDSPERTIMERAL IS CALLED IN A CORRECT ORDER - LOW	NGE 42
	Description	42
	Recommendation	43
	Remediation Plan	43
3.10	(HAL-10) WITHDRAWAPECOIN FUNCTION DOES NOT AUTOMATICALLY CLA THE ACCRUED REWARDS - INFORMATIONAL	AIM 44
	Description	44
	Recommendation	44
	Remediation Plan	44
3.11	(HAL-11) MINIMUM DEPOSIT AMOUNT CAN BE BYPASSED - INFORMATION	NAL 45
	Description	45
	Proof of Concept	45
	Recommendation	46
	Remediation Plan	46
3.12	(HAL-12) LACK OF AN EMERGENCYWITHDRAW FUNCTION - INFORMATION	NAL 47

	Description	47
	Recommendation	47
	Remediation Plan	47
3.13	(HAL-13) MISSING REQUIRE STATEMENT IN WITHDRAW FUNCTION - 3 FORMATIONAL	IN- 48
	Description	48
	Recommendation	48
	Remediation Plan	48
4	AUTOMATED TESTING	49
4.1	STATIC ANALYSIS REPORT	50
	Description	50
	Slither results	50
4.2	AUTOMATED SECURITY SCAN	54
	Description	54
	MythX results	54

DOCUMENT REVISION HISTORY

VERSION	MODIFICATION	DATE	AUTHOR
0.1	Document Creation	08/15/2022	Roberto Reigada
0.2	Document Updates	09/23/2022	Roberto Reigada
0.3	Draft Review	09/23/2022	Gabi Urrutia
1.0	Remediation Plan	10/03/2022	Roberto Reigada
1.1	Remediation Plan Review	10/04/2022	Gabi Urrutia
1.2	Document Updates	11/28/2022	Roberto Reigada
1.3	Document Updates Review	11/29/2022	Piotr Cielas
1.4	Document Updates Review	11/29/2022	Gabi Urrutia

CONTA	CTS	
CONTACT	COMPANY	EMAIL
Rob Behnke	Halborn	Rob.Behnke@halborn.com
Steven Walbroehl	Halborn	Steven.Walbroehl@halborn.com
Gabi Urrutia	Halborn	Gabi.Urrutia@halborn.com
Piotr Cielas	Halborn	Piotr.Cielas@halborn.com
Roberto Reigada	Halborn	Roberto.Reigada@halborn.com

EXECUTIVE OVERVIEW

1.1 INTRODUCTION

Horizen Labs engaged Halborn to conduct a security audit on their smart contracts beginning on August 15th, 2022 and ending on October 4th, 2022. The security assessment was scoped to the smart contracts provided in the GitHub repository HorizenLabs/grapes-staking/.

1.2 AUDIT SUMMARY

The team at Halborn was provided 6 weeks for the engagement and assigned a full-time security engineer to audit the security of the smart contracts. 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 audit 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 mostly addressed by the Horizen Labs team.

1.3 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 audit. While manual testing is recommended to uncover flaws in logic, process, and implementation; automated testing techniques help enhance coverage of the code and can quickly identify items that do not follow the security best practices. The following phases and associated tools were used during the audit:

- 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 hot-spots or bugs. (MythX)
- Static Analysis of security for scoped contract, and imported functions. (Slither)
- Testnet deployment (Brownie, Remix IDE)

RISK METHODOLOGY:

Vulnerabilities or issues observed by Halborn are ranked based on the risk assessment methodology by measuring the **LIKELIHOOD** of a security incident and the **IMPACT** should an incident occur. This framework works for communicating the characteristics and impacts of technology vulnerabilities. The quantitative model ensures repeatable and accurate measurement while enabling users to see the underlying vulnerability characteristics that were used to generate the Risk scores. For every vulnerability, a risk level will be calculated on a scale of 5 to 1 with 5 being the highest likelihood or impact.

RISK SCALE - LIKELIHOOD

- 5 Almost certain an incident will occur.
- 4 High probability of an incident occurring.
- 3 Potential of a security incident in the long term.
- 2 Low probability of an incident occurring.
- 1 Very unlikely issue will cause an incident.

RISK SCALE - IMPACT

- 5 May cause devastating and unrecoverable impact or loss.
- 4 May cause a significant level of impact or loss.

- 3 May cause a partial impact or loss to many.
- 2 May cause temporary impact or loss.
- 1 May cause minimal or un-noticeable impact.

The risk level is then calculated using a sum of these two values, creating a value of 10 to 1 with 10 being the highest level of security risk.

CRITICAL	HIGH	MEDIUM	LOW	INFORMATIONAL
10 - CRITICAL 9 - 8 - HIGH 7 - 6 - MEDIUM 5 - 4 - LOW 3 - 1 - VERY LO	DW AND INFORMAT	ΓIONAL		

1.4 SCOPE

IN-SCOPE:

The security assessment was scoped to the following smart contract:

- ApeCoinStaking.sol
- ApeCoinStakedVoting.sol

Initial Commit ID:

- 5d995f273ebd684c22ded70a66728d51936d5379

Fixed Commit ID:

- 80631eec49802396c8e4384dba46e4662a36516b

2. ASSESSMENT SUMMARY & FINDINGS OVERVIEW

CRITICAL	HIGH	MEDIUM	LOW	INFORMATIONAL
5	1	1	2	4

LIKELIHOOD

	(HAL-07)		(HAL-01) (HAL-02) (HAL-03) (HAL-04) (HAL-05)
MPACT	(HAL-08) (HAL-09)		
Π			(HAL-06)
	(HAL-10) (HAL-11) (HAL-12) (HAL-13)		

EXECUTIVE OVERVIEW

SECURITY ANALYSIS	RISK LEVEL	REMEDIATION DATE
HAL01 - UNDERFLOW MAY OCCUR DURING CLAIMS DUE TO LOSS OF PRECISION: REWARDS WILL BE LOCKED PERMANENTLY FOR SOME USERS	Critical	SOLVED - 09/28/2022
HAL02 - ALL THE APE COINS STAKED IN THE BAKC POOL CAN BE DRAINED BY ANY BAYC/MAYC HOLDER	Critical	SOLVED - 09/28/2022
HAL03 - APE COINS STAKED AND ACCRUED REWARDS CAN BE STOLEN FROM THE BAKC POOL AFTER THE BAKC COMMITTED IS TRANSFERRED TO A NEW OWNER	Critical	SOLVED - 09/28/2022
HAL04 - APE COINS STAKED AND ACCRUED REWARDS CAN BE STOLEN FROM THE BAKC POOL IF THE BAKC ID 0 IS TRANSFERRED	Critical	SOLVED - 09/28/2022
HAL05 - APE COINS STAKED AND ACCRUED REWARDS CAN BE STOLEN FROM THE BAKC POOL IF THE BAKC ID 0 IS PAIRED WITH THE BAYC/MAYC WITH ID 0	Critical	SOLVED - 09/28/2022
HAL06 – NFT HOLDERS CAN ALLOW ANYONE TO STAKE INTO THE NFT POOLS THROUGH THE USE OF A SMART CONTRACT	High	RISK ACCEPTED
HAL07 – POOLS MAY GET LOCKED AFTER AN EMPTY CLAIM	Medium	SOLVED - 09/28/2022
HALØ8 – UNSAFE TYPE CASTINGS	Low	SOLVED - 09/28/2022
HAL09 – CONTRACT DOES NOT ENFORCE THAT SETREWARDSPERTIMERANGE IS		
CALLED IN A CORRECT ORDER	Low	SOLVED - 09/28/2022
CALLED IN A CORRECT ORDER HAL10 - WITHDRAWAPECOIN FUNCTION DOES NOT AUTOMATICALLY CLAIM THE ACCRUED REWARDS	Low Informational	SOLVED - 09/28/2022 SOLVED - 09/28/2022
CALLED IN A CORRECT ORDER HAL10 - WITHDRAWAPECOIN FUNCTION DOES NOT AUTOMATICALLY CLAIM THE ACCRUED REWARDS HAL11 - MINIMUM DEPOSIT AMOUNT CAN BE BYPASSED	Low Informational Informational	SOLVED - 09/28/2022 SOLVED - 09/28/2022 ACKNOWLEDGED
CALLED IN A CORRECT ORDER HAL10 - WITHDRAWAPECOIN FUNCTION DOES NOT AUTOMATICALLY CLAIM THE ACCRUED REWARDS HAL11 - MINIMUM DEPOSIT AMOUNT CAN BE BYPASSED HAL12 - LACK OF AN EMERGENCYWITHDRAW FUNCTION	Low Informational Informational Informational	SOLVED - 09/28/2022 SOLVED - 09/28/2022 ACKNOWLEDGED ACKNOWLEDGED

FINDINGS & TECH DETAILS

3.1 (HAL-01) UNDERFLOW MAY OCCUR DURING CLAIMS DUE TO LOSS OF PRECISION: REWARDS WILL BE LOCKED PERMANENTLY FOR SOME USERS -CRITICAL

Description:

Currently, there is a known issue related to SushiSwap MasterChefV2 forks where user's transactions may revert when withdrawing & claiming.

The rewardDebt calculation logic may cause an integer underflow. rewardDebt gets updated in the _deposit(), _claim() and _withdraw() functions. It gets updated based on the change in the amount of Ape Coins staked in the pool.

Although, the update logic is not "path-independent". Each rewardDebt subtraction in _withdraw() always gets rounded down.

Multiple withdrawals can end up causing the actual rewardDebt to be "higher" than it should be. This could cause the pendingRewards() call to overflow and users to not be able to claim their rewards from the staking pools as the contract would not have enough balance of Ape Coins.

Using the SafeCast library, as it is recommended in the HAL06 finding, would prevent the overflow but the claim() would still revert.

Proof of Concept:

In order to achieve the result in the screenshot, some fuzzing was performed. Basically, the rewards for the Ape Coin pool were configured this way:

```
contract_ApeCoinStaking.setRewardsPerTimeRange(0, 1_00000000000000000,
1672639200, 1672675200, 0, {'from': owner})
```

User1 staked 100_123456789012345678 Ape Coins into the Ape pool before the first quarter started.

User2 staked 100_123456789012345678 Ape Coins into the Ape pool before the first quarter started.

Created the following loop with 40 iterations (10 hours per quarter, 4 quarters):

```
Listing 1: Fuzzing script
```

```
1 for i in range(40):
      print()
      output.greenn("Calling -> chain.sleep(3601)")
      chain.sleep(3601)
      output.greenn("Calling -> chain.sleep(1)")
      chain.mine(1)
      print("\n")
      value1 = randint(1, 10)
      \downarrow _000000000000000000)
      if (value1 > 5):
          output.yelloww("Calling -> contract_ApeCoinStaking.

↓ withdrawApeCoin(" + str(valueToWithdraw) + ", user1, {'from':
└ user1})")
          contract_ApeCoinStaking.withdrawApeCoin(valueToWithdraw,

    user1, {'from': user1})

          output.yelloww("Calling -> contract_ApeCoinStaking.
Ly claimApeCoin(user1.address, {'from': user1})")
          contract_ApeCoinStaking.claimApeCoin(user1.address, {'from
\downarrow ': user1})
      value2 = randint(1, 10)
      if (value2 > 5):
          output.yelloww("Calling -> contract_ApeCoinStaking.
→ withdrawApeCoin(" + str(valueToWithdraw) + ", user2, { 'from':
```



```
Gas price: 0.0 gwei Gas limit: 600000000 Nonce: 36
ApeCoinStaking.withdrawApeCoin confirmed Block: 15434490 Gas used: 94807 (0.02%)
Calling -> contract_ApeCoinStaking.claimApeCoin(user2.address, {'from': user2})
   ranaction sent: 0x99a69cc70479b042c399c219f6c85c06da5225fclecle8593blc7ec22b530
Gas price: 0.0 gwei Gas limit: 600000000 Nonce: 37
ApeCoinStaking.claimApeCoin confirmed <u>(ERC20: transfer amount exceeds balance)</u> Block: 15434491 Gas used: 68671 (0.01%)
   ontract ApeCoinStaking.pendingRewards(0, user1, 0) -> 0
ontract_ApeCoinStaking.pendingRewards(0, user2, 0) -> 115792089237316195423570985008687907853269984665640564039457584007913129639935
Calling -> chain.sleep(3601)
Calling -> chain.sleep(1)
Calling -> contract_ApeCoinStaking.withdrawApeCoin(1450176693174492652, user1, {'from': user1}))
Transaction sent: 0x5810f65d6ec93d510850aa08550f2938edf11aca60c7dedb647ce7cdbe25602b
   ransaction sent: 0x5810f65d6cc93d510850aa08550f2938edf11aca60c7dedb647ce7cdbe25602b
Gas price: 0.0 gwei Gas limit: 600000000 Nonce: 44
ApeCoin5taking.withdrawApeCoin confirmed Block: 15434493 Gas used: 94819 (0.02%)
Calling -> contract_ApeCoinStaking.claimApeCoin(user1.address, {'from': user1})
Transaction sent: 0x3664e7ec51b427670428c8f756eb4dc8766c91182112ccccbb543b82bbf50152
           price: 0.0 gwei Gas limit: 600000000 Nonce: 45
pinStaking.claimApeCoin confirmed (ERC20: transfer amount exceeds balance) Block: 15434494 Gas used: 68671 (0.01%)
    Gas price: 0.0 gwei
Calling -> contract_ApeCoinStaking.withdrawApeCoin(1450176693174492652, user2, {'from': user2})
Transaction sent: 0x54f9abbca6ced7619b434db1803768789eb2f5d86555ca09233ef64ae01238a5
Gas price: 0.0 gwei Gas limit: 600000000 Nonce: 38
ApeCoinStaking.withdrawApeCoin confirmed Block: 15434495 Gas used: 94819 (0.02%)
Calling -> contract_ApeCoinStaking.claimApeCoin(user2.address, {'from': user2})
Transaction sent: 0x322470fa224e2815f978b42750alb1d4a739a76bcd2bc27bcb18b3f89015aad7
                      0.0 gwei Gas limit: 6000
   Gas price: 0.0 gwei Gas limit: 600000000 Nonce: 39
ApeCoinStaking.claimApeCoin confirmed (ERC20: transfer amount exceeds balance) Block: 15434496 Gas used: 68671 (0.01%)
                         n.balanceOf(userl) -> 535548
n.balanceOf(user2) -> 533962
Calling -> contract_ApeCoinStaking.withdrawApeCoin(68620522265685006490, userl, {'from': userl})
 Transaction sent: 0x
   ransaction sent: 0x73434D40aef38481092c0925f1ca9f1531574eba84e595ec0747982c8287ae39
Gas price: 0.0 gwei Gas limit: 600000000 Nonce: 46
ApeCoinStaking.withdrawApeCoin confirmed Block: 15434497 Gas used: 79831 (0.01%)
Calling -> contract ApeCoinStaking.withdrawApeCoin(73114932880221025707, user2, {'from': user2})
    Gas price: 0.0 gwei Gas limit: 60
                                                                            Nonce: 40
   Gas price: 0.0 gwei Gas limit: 600000000 Nonce: 40
ApeCoinStaking.withdrawApeCoin confirmed Block: 15434498 Gas used: 64831 (0.01%)
 contract_ApeCoin.balanceOf(user1) -> 60416925019131708820
contract_ApeCoin.balanceOf(user2) -> 60707766338670760088
```

Recommendation:

It is recommended to use the NomiChef's original MasterChef's rewardDebt logic.

Remediation Plan:

SOLVED: The Horizen Labs team solved the issue. Precision is not lost now each time a withdraw() is performed, since the division was removed from the rewardsDebt calculation.

3.2 (HAL-02) ALL THE APE COINS STAKED IN THE BAKC POOL CAN BE DRAINED BY ANY BAYC/MAYC HOLDER -CRITICAL

Description:

The ApeCoinStaking contract implements 4 different pools:

- ApeCoin pool
- BAYC pool
- MAYC pool
- Pair pool (BAKC)

In order to stake in the Pair pool, users should first commit a BAYC/BAKC or a MAYC/BAKC pair.

A paired BAKC NFT may change ownership before uncommitting from the ApeCoinStaking contract. In this edge case of a split pair, the following rules were implemented:

- Both owners (the current owner of one NFT and the new owner of the other NFT) can uncommit.
- Upon uncommitting the amount of Ape Coins staked is given to the BAYC/MAYC owner and the accrued rewards are given to the BAKC owner.
- The user that performs the uncommitting will obviously pay the gas costs.

A pair is committed through the depositBAKC() function:

```
Listing 2: ApeCoinStaking.sol (Lines 205,206)
197 /**
198 * @dev Commits/Deposits $APE to pairs in the BAKC pool.
199 * Expects an input array of pair Token IDs/amount of $APE to
L, deposit for each pair.
200 * - `_baycPairs`: Array for BAYC/BAKC pairs
```

Listing 3: ApeCoinStaking.sol (Lines 640,641)

```
628 function _depositPairNft(uint256 mainTypePoolId, PairNftWithAmount
└→ [] calldata _nfts) private {
       for(uint i; i < _nfts.length; ++i) {</pre>
           uint256 mainTokenId = _nfts[i].mainTokenId;
           uint256 bakcTokenId = _nfts[i].bakcTokenId;
           uint256 amount = _nfts[i].amount;
           Position storage position = nftPosition[BAKC_POOL_ID][
↓ bakcTokenId];
           if(position.stakedAmount == 0) {
                require(nftContracts[mainTypePoolId].ownerOf(

    mainTokenId) == msg.sender && !mainToBakc[mainTypePoolId][

    mainTokenId].isPaired

                , "Main Token not owned by caller or already paired");
               require(nftContracts[BAKC_POOL_ID].ownerOf(bakcTokenId
└, ) == msg.sender && !bakcToMain[bakcTokenId][mainTypePoolId].
               ,"BAKC Token not owned by caller or already paired");
               mainToBakc[mainTypePoolId][mainTokenId] =
   PairingStatus(bakcTokenId, true);
               bakcToMain[bakcTokenId][mainTypePoolId] =
  PairingStatus(mainTokenId, true);
           } else {
               require(mainTokenId == bakcToMain[bakcTokenId][

    mainTypePoolId].tokenId, "BAKC Token already paired");

           }
           _depositNftGuard(BAKC_POOL_ID, position, amount);
           emit DepositPairNft(msg.sender, amount, mainTypePoolId,

    mainTokenId, bakcTokenId);

       }
649 }
```

As we can see, the contract stores in the mainToBakc and bakcToMain mappings the respective pair of each of the NFTs.

Although, these mappings are not properly validated during the withdrawal:

```
Listing 4: ApeCoinStaking.sol (Lines 344,345)
339 /**
340 * @dev Uncommits/Withdraws given amount of staked $APE from NFTs
L, in BAKC Pool.
341 */
342 function withdrawBAKC(PairNftWithAmount[] calldata _baycPairs,
L, PairNftWithAmount[] calldata _maycPairs) external {
343 updatePool(BAKC_POOL_ID);
344 __withdrawPairNft(BAYC_POOL_ID, _baycPairs);
345 __withdrawPairNft(MAYC_POOL_ID, _maycPairs);
346 }
```

Listing 5: ApeCoinStaking.sol

```
require(mainTokenOwner == msg.sender || bakcOwner == msg.

    sender, "At least one token in pair must be owned by caller");

          Position storage position = nftPosition[BAKC_POOL_ID][
   bakcTokenId]:
           require(mainTokenOwner == bakcOwner || amount == position.
   stakedAmount, "Split pair can't partially withdraw");
           if (amount == position.stakedAmount) {
              uint256 rewardsToBeClaimed = _claim(BAKC_POOL_ID,
mainToBakc[mainTypePoolId][mainTokenId].isPaired =
 bakcToMain[bakcTokenId][mainTypePoolId].isPaired =
emit ClaimRewardsPairNft(msg.sender,
→ rewardsToBeClaimed, mainTypePoolId, mainTokenId, bakcTokenId);
           }
           _withdraw(BAKC_POOL_ID, position, amount, mainTokenOwner);
           emit WithdrawPairNft(msg.sender, amount, mainTypePoolId,

    mainTokenId, bakcTokenId);

748 }
```

FINDINGS & TECH DETAILS

Proof of Concept:

- User1 commits BAYC #7337 and BAKC #851 and stakes 100 Ape Coins in the BAKC pool through the depositBAKC() function.
- 2. User2 calls withdrawBAKC([(8523, 851, 100_00000000000000000)], []) . He only owns the BAYC #8523 but as the smart contract just checks the ownership of one of the NFTs of the pair and also does not check if that BAKC is actually paired to the BAYC passed, user2 can unstake the Ape Coins previously staked by user1.
- 3. This could be repeated with any BAKC pair staked in the pool.

```
Calling -> contract_ApeCoin.approve(contract_ApeCoinStaking.address, 100_000000000000000000, {'from': userl})
 Gas price: 0.0 gwei Gas limit: 600000000 Nonce: 0
APECOIN.approve confirmed Block: 15408367 Gas used: 44163 (0.01%)
Calling -> contract_ApeCoinStaking.depositBAKC([(7337, 851, 100_000000000000000000)], [], {'from': userl})
Transaction sent: 0xe9a9de39b5ddd9c437256e46ca5a2936fd38042dc1f0e875c73452d6e40422cc
 Gas price: 0.0 gwei Gas limit: 600000000 Nonce: 1
 ApeCoinStaking.depositBAKC confirmed Block: 15408368 Gas used: 164998 (0.03%)
contract_ApeCoinStaking.stakedTotal(user1) -> 10000000000000000000
contract ApeCoin.balanceOf(user2) -> 10000000000000000000
Calling -> contract ApeCoinStaking.withdrawBAKC([(8523, 851, 100_0000000000000000)], [], {'from': user2})
Transaction sent: 0x45519a097bf580d35fd0b00474aa41dec0044778f687a50377bb5fb91c71b7e5
Gas price: 0.0 gwei Gas limit: 600000000 Nonce: 0
 ApeCoinStaking.withdrawBAKC confirmed Block: 15408369 Gas used: 46130 (0.01%)
>>> calltrace(tx2)
Call trace for '0x45519a097bf580d35fd0b00474aa41dec0044778f687a50377bb5fb91c71b7e5':
Initial call cost [-24002 gas]
ApeCoinStaking.withdrawBAKC 0:2490 [-41367 / -19868 gas]
  - BAYC.ownerOf [STATICCALL] 414:653 [3984 gas]
ddress: 0xBC4CA0EdA7647A8aB7C2061c2E118A18a936f13D
           input arguments:
              - tokenId: 8523
 input arguments:
 - APECOIN.transfer [CALL] 1932:2227 [15153 gas]

- address: 0x4d224452801ACEd8B2F0aebE155379bb5D594381
            input arguments:
              - recipient: user2.address
```

Risk Level:

Likelihood - 5 Impact - 5

Recommendation:

It is recommended to validate that the NFTs passed to the withdrawBAKC() function call are paired.

Remediation Plan:

SOLVED: The Horizen Labs team solved the issue. The ApeCoinStaking smart contract now verifies that the NFT IDs passed to withdrawBAKC() are correctly paired.

3.3 (HAL-03) APE COINS STAKED AND ACCRUED REWARDS CAN BE STOLEN FROM THE BAKC POOL AFTER THE BAKC COMMITTED IS TRANSFERRED TO A NEW OWNER - CRITICAL

Description:

Related to the BAKC pool and according to the documentation provided, when a BAYC/BAKC or MAYC/BAKC pair is split (e.g. the BAKC is sold to another user) the only functions available are uncommitting and depositing. Other functions (such as withdrawing and claiming) will be disabled in the smart contract. If a user stores one pair in a different wallet, that user will not be able to claim rewards and must uncommit first.

To implement this, the ApeCoinStaking contract has the following require statements in the claimPairNft() function:

Listing 6: ApeCoinStaking.sol (Lines 691,692)

```
684 function _claimPairNft(uint256 mainTypePoolId, PairNft[] calldata
L, _pairs, address _recipient) private {
685 for(uint i; i < _pairs.length; ++i) {
686 uint256 mainTokenId = _pairs[i].mainTokenId;
687 uint256 bakcTokenID = _pairs[i].bakcTokenId;
688
689 Position storage position = nftPosition[BAKC_POOL_ID][
L, bakcTokenID];
690
691 require(nftContracts[mainTypePoolId].ownerOf(mainTokenId)
L, == msg.sender, "Main Token not owned by caller");
692 require(nftContracts[BAKC_POOL_ID].ownerOf(bakcTokenID) ==
L, msg.sender, "BAKC Token not owned by caller");
693
694 uint256 rewardsToBeClaimed = _claim(BAKC_POOL_ID, position
L, _recipient);
695 emit ClaimRewardsPairNft(msg.sender, rewardsToBeClaimed,
L, mainTypePoolId, mainTokenId, bakcTokenID);
</pre>
```

As happened already in the HAL-01 issue, the mainToBakc and bakcToMain mappings are not validated during the claimBAKC() call.

Proof of Concept:

- 1. User1 commits BAYC #7337 and BAKC #851 and stakes 100 Ape Coins in the BAKC pool through the depositBAKC() function: contract_ApeCoinStaking.depositBAKC([(7337, 851, 100_0000000000000000))], [], {'from': user1})
- 2. Some time passes, user1 has accrued a lot of Ape Coin rewards.
- 3. User1 sells his BAKC #851 to user2.
- 4. User2 which already owned BAYC #8523, claims the Ape Coin rewards of the BAKC #851 by calling the claimBAKC() but using his own BAYC #8523 as its pair. contract_ApeCoinStaking.claimBAKC([(8523, 851)], [], user2.address , {'from': user2})
- 5. User2 has stolen the Ape Coin staked by user1 plus the rewards (rewards are intended as user2 now owns the BAKC NFT).

```
Calling -> contract ApeCoinStaking.depositBAKC([(7337, 851, 100 000000000000000)], [], {'from': userl})
Transaction sent: 0x5bdf03404dc4af68f6257dacc4a570cf04ealf170cbc98099c4e6de575ce8f4f
Gas price: 0.0 gwei Gas limit: 60000000 Nonce: 1
  ApeCoinStaking.depositBAKC confirmed Block: 15408428
                                                         Gas used: 164998 (0.03%)
Calling -> chain.sleep(11088902)
SLEEPING UNTIL THE FIRST Q1 STARTS
Calling -> chain.mine(1)
contract ApeCoinStaking.pendingRewards(0, user1, 0) -> 0
Calling -> chain.sleep(86400*90)
SLEEPING 3 MONTHS
Calling -> contract_KEN.transferFrom(user1.address, user2.address , 851, {'from': user1})
Transaction sent: 0x974b9a9497c4271a57d0e53efb4f1f6a9aff405d3dbbe57ee2ded128caf81498
Gas price: 0.0 gwei Gas limit: 60000000 Nonce: 2
KEN.transferFrom confirmed Block: 15408431 Gas used: 46831 (0.01%)
Calling -> contract ApeCoinStaking.claimBAKC([(8523, 851)], [], user2.address, {'from': user2})
Transaction sent: 0x2acabal5e590ed45f436caf5fb5e02f5c9568b9fa865077ce9c79836e3b6b73e
  Gas price: 0.0 gwei Gas limit: 600000000 Nonce: 0
  ApeCoinStaking.claimBAKC confirmed Block: 15408432 Gas used: 132878 (0.02%)
```

Risk Level:

Likelihood - 5 Impact - 5

Recommendation:

It is recommended to validate that the NFTs passed to the claimBAKC() function call are paired.

Remediation Plan:

SOLVED: The Horizen Labs team solved the issue. The ApeCoinStaking smart contract now verifies that the NFT IDs passed to claimBAKC() are correctly paired.

3.4 (HAL-04) APE COINS STAKED AND ACCRUED REWARDS CAN BE STOLEN FROM THE BAKC POOL IF THE BAKC ID 0 IS TRANSFERRED - CRITICAL

Description:

As a fix to the HAL-02 issue, the following update was done in the _claimPairNft() function:

Listing 7: ApeCoinStaking.sol (Line 708)

```
699 function _claimPairNft(uint256 mainTypePoolId, PairNft[] calldata
└→ _pairs, address _recipient) private {
       for(uint i; i < _pairs.length; ++i) {</pre>
           uint256 mainTokenId = _pairs[i].mainTokenId;
           uint256 bakcTokenId = _pairs[i].bakcTokenId;
           Position storage position = nftPosition[BAKC_POOL_ID][

    bakcTokenId];

           require(nftContracts[mainTypePoolId].ownerOf(mainTokenId)
\vdash == msg.sender, "Main Token not owned by caller");
            require(nftContracts[BAKC_POOL_ID].ownerOf(bakcTokenId) ==
    msg.sender, "BAKC Token not owned by caller");
            require(mainToBakc[mainTypePoolId][mainTokenId].tokenId ==
\rightarrow NFT");
           uint256 rewardsToBeClaimed = _claim(BAKC_POOL_ID, position
 \downarrow , \_recipient);
           emit ClaimRewardsPairNft(msg.sender, rewardsToBeClaimed,

    mainTypePoolId, mainTokenId, bakcTokenId);
```

This is also exploitable but only with the BAKC #0 (BAKC collection, unluckily, starts on this ID). The exploit is possible because the mainToBakc[mainTypePoolId][mainTokenId].tokenId mapping will be

initialized with 0 by the Solidity compiler.

On the other hand, note that initially it can only be exploited with BAKC #0. But later on, after some NFT uncommitments, it may happen with any NFT ID, as the smart contract does not "reset/delete" the mainToBakc [mainTypePoolId][mainTokenId] mapping after an NFT uncommitment, the contract just sets mainToBakc[mainTypePoolId][mainTokenId].isPaired to false.

Proof of Concept:

- 1. User1 commits BAYC #7337 and BAKC #0 and stakes 100 Ape Coins in the BAKC pool through the depositBAKC() function: contract_ApeCoinStaking.depositBAKC([(7337, 0, 100_0000000000000000))], [], {'from': user1})
- 2. Some time passes, user1 has accrued a lot of Ape Coin rewards.
- 3. User1 sells his BAKC #0 to user2.
- 4. User2 which already owned BAYC #8523, claims the Ape Coin rewards of the BAKC #0 by calling the claimBAKC() but using his own BAYC #8523 as its pair.

contract_ApeCoinStaking.claimBAKC([(8523, 0)], [], user2.address,
{'from': user2})

5. User2 has stolen the Ape Coin staked by user1 plus the rewards (rewards are intended as user2 now owns the BAKC NFT).

Risk Level:

Likelihood - 5 Impact - 5

Recommendation:

It is recommended to validate that the NFTs passed to the claimBAKC() function call are paired. On the other hand, special care should be taken with the BAKC #0 as the mainToBakc[mainTypePoolId][mainTokenId] mapping will be initialized with that value.

Remediation Plan:

SOLVED: The Horizen Labs team solved the issue. The ApeCoinStaking smart contract checks now that the NFT IDs passed to the claimBAKC() are correctly paired.

3.5 (HAL-05) APE COINS STAKED AND ACCRUED REWARDS CAN BE STOLEN FROM THE BAKC POOL IF THE BAKC ID 0 IS PAIRED WITH THE BAYC/MAYC WITH ID 0 - CRITICAL

Description:

In the case that a user pairs the BAYC/MAYC #0 with the BAKC #0 these
mappings will take the following values:
mainToBakc[1][0].tokenId == 0
bakcToMain[0][1].tokenId == 0

In order to perform a withdrawal or a claim the following require statements should be passed:

```
Listing 8: ApeCoinStaking.sol (Lines 800,801,802,805)
       function _withdrawPairNft(uint256 mainTypePoolId,
→ PairNftWithAmount[] calldata _nfts) private {
           for(uint i; i < _nfts.length; ++i) {</pre>
               uint256 mainTokenId = _nfts[i].mainTokenId;
               uint256 bakcTokenId = _nfts[i].bakcTokenId;
               uint256 amount = _nfts[i].amount;
               address mainTokenOwner = nftContracts[mainTypePoolId].
 ↓ ownerOf(mainTokenId);
               address bakcOwner = nftContracts[BAKC_POOL_ID].ownerOf
   (bakcTokenId);
               require(mainTokenOwner == msg.sender || bakcOwner ==
→ msg.sender, "At least one token in pair must be owned by caller");
               require(mainToBakc[mainTypePoolId][mainTokenId].
 ↓ tokenId == bakcTokenId
                   && bakcToMain[bakcTokenId][mainTypePoolId].tokenId
   == mainTokenId, "The provided Token IDs are not paired");
               Position storage position = nftPosition[BAKC_POOL_ID][
 ↓ bakcTokenId]:
```

```
→ position.stakedAmount, "Split pair can't partially withdraw");
               if (amount == position.stakedAmount) {
                   uint256 rewardsToBeClaimed = _claim(BAKC_POOL_ID,
→ position, bakcOwner);
                   mainToBakc[mainTypePoolId][mainTokenId] =
↓ PairingStatus(0, false);
                   bakcToMain[bakcTokenId][mainTypePoolId] =
└→ PairingStatus(0, false);
                   emit ClaimRewardsPairNft(msg.sender,
⊢ rewardsToBeClaimed, mainTypePoolId, mainTokenId, bakcTokenId);
               }
               _withdraw(BAKC_POOL_ID, position, amount,

    mainTokenOwner);

              emit WithdrawPairNft(msg.sender, amount,

    mainTypePoolId, mainTokenId, bakcTokenId);

           }
```

```
Listing 9: ApeCoinStaking.sol (Lines 755-758)
```

```
function _claimPairNft(uint256 mainTypePoolId, PairNft[]
└→ calldata _pairs, address _recipient) private {
          for(uint i; i < _pairs.length; ++i) {</pre>
              uint256 mainTokenId = _pairs[i].mainTokenId;
              uint256 bakcTokenId = _pairs[i].bakcTokenId;
              Position storage position = nftPosition[BAKC_POOL_ID][

    bakcTokenId];

              require(nftContracts[mainTypePoolId].ownerOf(
L, mainTokenId) == msg.sender, "Main Token not owned by caller");
              require(nftContracts[BAKC_POOL_ID].ownerOf(bakcTokenId
↓ ) == msg.sender, "BAKC Token not owned by caller");
              require(mainToBakc[mainTypePoolId][mainTokenId].
                  && bakcToMain[bakcTokenId][mainTypePoolId].tokenId
   == mainTokenId, "The provided Token IDs are not paired");
              uint256 rewardsToBeClaimed = _claim(BAKC_POOL_ID,
emit ClaimRewardsPairNft(msg.sender,
i→ rewardsToBeClaimed, mainTypePoolId, mainTokenId, bakcTokenId);
```

```
762 }
763 }
```

Considering that all the mappings are initially set to 0 by the compiler: mainToBakc[2][0].tokenId == 0 bakcToMain[0][2].tokenId == 0

This means that if the BAYC #0 is paired with the BAKC #0 the user with the MAYC #0 would be able to steal the staked Ape Coins and the accrued rewards.

Proof of Concept:

Risk Level:

Likelihood - 5 Impact - 5

Recommendation:

It is recommended to add an extra check that checks the PairingStatus of the mainToBakc and bakcToMain mappings.

Remediation Plan:

SOLVED: The Horizen Labs team solved the issue by adding the suggested check.

3.6 (HAL-06) NFT HOLDERS CAN ALLOW ANYONE TO STAKE INTO THE NFT POOLS THROUGH THE USE OF A SMART CONTRACT - HIGH

Description:

There are 3 different pools where only holders of an NFT can stake. These are the Bored Ape Yatch Club pool, the Mutant Ape Yatch Club pool and the Bored Ape Kennel Club pool.

These	are	the	Аре	Coin	al	locat	cions	for	those	poo	ls:	

BAYC Pool	MAYC Pool	BAKC Pool
47.105 мм	19.06 мм	3.835 мм
\$аре	\$аре	\$аре

These staking pools are designed to benefit the NFT holders as they get access to a restricted staking pool.

In the ApeCoinStaking contract, the deposit and withdraw functions can be called by another smart contract. This means that someone could create a "ApeCoin delegator" smart contract where users can lend their BAYC, MAYC and BAKC NFTs. These NFTs then could be used by the ApeCoin delegator contract to stake in the ApeCoinStaking restricted pools. Users would delegate their Ape Coins into the ApeCoin delegator contract, and this contract would place the Ape Coins in the different restricted pools.

The ApeCoin delegator smart contract would keep a fee as the protocol fee,

the lenders could get another fee for lending their NFTs and the ApeCoin delegator users would get Ape Coins as rewards from the restricted pools.

This scenario would not really benefit NFT holders, as this would provide access to those restricted pools to a higher number of users. The higher number of users, the lower the shares, hence, lower rewards for the legit NFT holders.

Risk Level:

Likelihood - 5 Impact - 3

Recommendation:

It is recommended to restrict smart contracts from interacting with the ApeCoinStaking contract.

Remediation Plan:

RISK ACCEPTED: The Horizen Labs team accepts this risk, as this approach would also block multi-signature wallets.

3.7 (HAL-07) POOLS MAY GET LOCKED AFTER AN EMPTY CLAIM - MEDIUM

Description:

An edge case has been found in the ApeCoinStaking contract where if no ApeCoins are staked during a whole quarter or if pool.stakedAmount == 0 at the end of a quarter, and a user performs an empty claim() call in the first hour of the next quarter, the pool will get locked.

Users will still be able to deposit in the pool, but they will never be able to withdraw their stake or claim their accrued rewards from that pool.

```
Calling -> chain.sleep(3601)
Calling -> chain.sleep(1)
Calling -> contract_ApeCoinStaking.claimApeCoin(userl.address, {'from': userl})
Transaction sent: 0xbc6e4dfelddea70e6e9c9be4ff98b03la2bl420546l984a5dd30lf3fc2889941
  Gas price: 0.0 gwei Gas limit: 600000000 Nonce: 3
 ApeCoinStaking.claimApeCoin confirmed Block: 15596899 Gas used: 28127 (0.00%)
  File "<console>", line 550, in <module>
  File "/usr/local/lib/python3.8/dist-packages/brownie/network/contract.py", line 1665, in __call__
   return self.call(*args, block_identifier=block_identifier)
  File "/usr/local/lib/python3.8/dist-packages/brownie/network/contract.py", line 1461, in call
    raise VirtualMachineError(e) from None
VirtualMachineError: revert
```

Recommendation:

It is recommended to disallow claiming a zero amount, for example:

```
Listing 10: ApeCoinStaking.sol (Line 229)
224 function claimApeCoin(address _recipient) public {
225 updatePool(APECOIN_POOL_ID);
226
227 Position storage position = addressPosition[msg.sender];
228 uint rewardsToBeClaimed = _claim(APECOIN_POOL_ID, position,
L _recipient);
229 require(rewardsToBeClaimed > 0, "Nothing to claim");
230
231 emit ClaimRewards(msg.sender, rewardsToBeClaimed, _recipient);
232 }
```

Remediation Plan:

SOLVED: The Horizen Labs team solved the issue in the Commit ID #6

3.8 (HAL-08) UNSAFE TYPE CASTINGS -LOW

Description:

Solidity 0.8 is introducing type checking for arithmetic operations, but not for type castings. Although very unlikely, the following type castings can overflow in the ApeCoinStaking contract:

```
Listing 11: ApeCoinStaking.sol (Line 593)
```

```
583 function pendingRewards(uint256 _poolId, address _address, uint256

    _ tokenId) external view returns (uint256) {

584 Pool memory pool = pools[_poolId];

585 Position memory position = _poolId == 0 ? addressPosition[

    ___address]: nftPosition[_poolId][_tokenId];

586

587 (uint256 rewardsSinceLastCalculated,) = rewardsBy(_poolId,

    _ pool.lastRewardedTimestampHour, getPreviousTimestampHour(block.

    __ timestamp));

588 uint256 accumulatedRewardsPerShare = pool.

    __ accumulatedRewardsPerShare;

589

590 if (block.timestamp > pool.lastRewardedTimestampHour +

    __ SECONDS_PER_HOUR && pool.stakedAmount != 0) {

591 accumulatedRewardsPerShare = accumulatedRewardsPerShare +

    __ rewardsSinceLastCalculated * APE_COIN_PRECISION / pool.

    __ stakedAmount;

592 }

593 return uint256(int256((position.stakedAmount *

    __ accumulatedRewardsPerShare / APE_COIN_PRECISION)) - position.

    __ rewardsDebt);

594 }
```

Listing 12: ApeCoinStaking.sol (Line 628)

Listing 13: ApeCoinStaking.sol (Lines 677,678)

Listing 14: ApeCoinStaking.sol (Line 720)

Recommendation:

It is recommended to use the SafeCast library in the lines mentioned:

```
Listing 15: SafeCast.sol
1 function toUint256(int256 value) internal pure returns (uint256) {
2 require(value >= 0, "SafeCast: value must be positive");
3 return uint256(value);
4 }
```

Listing 16: SafeCast.sol

```
1 function toInt256(uint256 value) internal pure returns (int256) {
2    // Note: Unsafe cast below is okay because `type(int256).max`
L, is guaranteed to be positive
3    require(value <= uint256(type(int256).max), "SafeCast: value
L, doesn't fit in an int256");
4    return int256(value);
5 }</pre>
```

Remediation Plan:

SOLVED: The Horizen Labs team solved the issue and now uses the SafeCast library to perform all the type castings.

3.9 (HAL-09) CONTRACT DOES NOT ENFORCE THAT SETREWARDSPERTIMERANGE IS CALLED IN A CORRECT ORDER - LOW

Description:

The function setRewardsPerTimeRange() sets time ranges with given rewards per hour for a given pool:

Listing 17: ApeCoinStaking.sol

```
361 function setRewardsPerTimeRange(
      uint256 _poolId.
      uint256 _amount,
      uint256 _startTimestamp,
      uint256 _endTimeStamp,
      uint256 _capPerPosition) external onlyOwner
      require (_poolId < 4, "Invalid poolId");</pre>
      require (_startTimestamp < _endTimeStamp, "_startTimestamp</pre>
 \downarrow  should be less than _endTimeStamp");
      require(getMinute(_startTimestamp) == 0 && getSecond(
require(getMinute(_endTimeStamp) == 0 && getSecond(
└→ _endTimeStamp) == 0, "_endTimeStamp is not a whole hour");
      Pool storage pool = pools[_poolId];
      uint256 hoursInSeconds = _endTimeStamp - _startTimestamp;
      uint256 rewardsPerHour = _amount * SECONDS_PER_HOUR /
\vdash hoursInSeconds;
      RewardsPerHourInRange memory next = RewardsPerHourInRange(
pool.rewardsPerHourInRanges.push(next);
379 }
```

This onlyOwner function should be called in a correct order meaning that first, for example, the rewards for the first quarter for the ApeCoin pool should be set, then the second quarter etc.

The ApeCoinStaking contract should enforce that the initial timestamp of the new range is equal to the end timestamp of the previous range. This check is currently missing in the smart contract and is prone to human errors.

Recommendation:

It is recommended to enforce in the setRewardsPerTimeRange() function that the initial timestamp of the new range is equal to the end timestamp of the previous range.

Remediation Plan:

SOLVED: The Horizen Labs team solved the issue and the setRewardsPerTimeRange () function now checks that the _startTimestamp of the new range is equal to the last endTimestampHour of the previous range.

3.10 (HAL-10) WITHDRAWAPECOIN FUNCTION DOES NOT AUTOMATICALLY CLAIM THE ACCRUED REWARDS -INFORMATIONAL

Description:

In the ApeCoinStaking contract, the following functions claim the rewards and withdraw the staked Ape Coins:

- withdrawBAYC()
- withdrawSelfBAYC()
- withdrawMAYC()
- withdrawSelfMAYC()
- withdrawBAKC()

The same logic is not implemented in the withdrawApeCoin() and withdrawSelfApeCoin() functions. Users would withdraw their staked Ape Coins, but to claim the accrued Ape Coin rewards, they would need an extra call to the claimApeCoin() or claimSelfApeCoin() functions.

Recommendation:

It is recommended to also claim the accrued rewards when withdrawApeCoin() and withdrawSelfApeCoin() functions are called.

Remediation Plan:

SOLVED: The Horizen Labs team solved the issue and now also claims the accrued rewards when the withdrawApeCoin() and withdrawSelfApeCoin() functions are called.

3.11 (HAL-11) MINIMUM DEPOSIT AMOUNT CAN BE BYPASSED - INFORMATIONAL

Description:

In the ApeCoinStaking contract, there is a minimum amount of Ape Coins that users can deposit into any of the pools. This amount is equal to 1 Ape Coin:

```
Listing 18: ApeCoinStaking.sol (Line 171)
```

```
170 function depositApeCoin(uint256 _amount, address _recipient)
L, public {
171 require(_amount >= MIN_DEPOSIT, "Can't deposit less than 1
L, $APE");
172 updatePool(APECOIN_POOL_ID);
173
174 Position storage position = addressPosition[_recipient];
175 _deposit(APECOIN_POOL_ID, position, _amount);
176
177 emit Deposit(msg.sender, _amount, _recipient);
178 }
```

This minimum deposit restriction can be easily bypassed by doing a withdrawal right after the deposit, leaving a small amount staked.

Proof of Concept:

- 1. User1 stakes 1_00000000000000000 Ape Coins into the Ape Coin pool.
- 3. contract_ApeCoinStaking.stakedTotal(user1)-> 1

contract_ApeCoinStaking.stakedTotal(userl) ->

Recommendation:

Consider unstaking all the tokens deposited when the remaining amount of Ape Coins staked is lower than the MIN_DEPOSIT amount.

Remediation Plan:

ACKNOWLEDGED: The Horizen Labs team acknowledged this finding.

3.12 (HAL-12) LACK OF AN EMERGENCYWITHDRAW FUNCTION -INFORMATIONAL

Description:

As some issues found in the ApeCoinStaking contract caused some funds to be locked in the smart contract and also taking into consideration the high reputation of the project, we believe that it may be useful to:

- 1. Keep track offchain of all the deposits/stakes/withdrawals/accrued rewards.
- 2. Add an emergencyWithdraw() function with an onlyOwner modifier that is protected behind a multisignature wallet.

By implementing this, in case of any possible rounding/calculation issue that may cause any funds to be locked, the emergencyWithdraw() function could be used to retrieve the locked funds and assign them accordingly to the affected users.

Recommendation:

It is recommended to:

1. Keep tracking offchain of all the deposits/stakes/withdrawals/accrued rewards.

2. Add an emergencyWithdraw() function with an onlyOwner modifier that is protected behind a multisignature wallet.

Remediation Plan:

ACKNOWLEDGED: The Horizen Labs team acknowledged this finding.

3.13 (HAL-13) MISSING REQUIRE STATEMENT IN WITHDRAW FUNCTION -INFORMATIONAL

Description:

In the ApeCoinStaking contract, the private _withdraw() function is called every time a user wants to withdraw their Ape Coins from a staking pool:

Although, this function does not check if the _amount is actually <= than the _position.stakedAmount. When this _amount is higher, the EVM will revert with an overflow error.

Recommendation:

It is recommended to add a require statement that checks if the _amount is actually <= than the _position.stakedAmount to avoid the overflow error.

Remediation Plan:

SOLVED: The Horizen Labs team solved the issue by adding the suggested require statement.

4.1 STATIC ANALYSIS REPORT

Description:

Halborn used automated testing techniques to enhance the coverage of certain areas of the smart contracts in scope. Among the tools used was Slither, a Solidity static analysis framework. After Halborn verified the smart contracts in the repository and was able to compile them correctly into their ABIS and binary format, Slither was run against the 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:

ApeCoinStaking.sol



	 ApeCoinStakingestimate24NourRewards(uint256,address,uint256) (contracts/ApeCoinStaking.sol#557-563) ApeCoinStaking.pendingRewards(uint256,address,uint256) (contracts/ApeCoinStaking.sol#568-579) 	
	 ApeCoinStakingdepositNft(uint256,ApeCoinStaking.SingleNft[]) (contracts/ApeCoinStaking.sol#616-626) ApeCoinStakingdepositPairNft(uint256,ApeCoinStaking.PairNftWihAmount[]) (contracts/ApeCoinStaking.sol#62 	
	 ApeCoinstaing, claimArt (uint256, uint256), address) (contracts/ApeCoinstaing.sol¥6/3-662) ApeCoinstaking, claimPairNft (uint256, ApeCoinStaking, PairNft[], address) (contracts/ApeCoinStaking.sol\$664-69 DecOinstaking, uitpldx-ubft(uint256, ApeCoinStaking, SinglAMft[], address) (contracts/ApeCoinStaking.sol\$664-69 	
	 - preconstruction,withdrawFairNft(uint256, ApeCoinstaking.SairNftWithAmount[]) (contracts/ApeCoinstaking.sol#7 - ApeCoinstakingwithdrawFairNft(uint256, ApeCoinstaking.SairNftWithAmount[]) (contracts/ApeCoinstaking.sol#7 - https://github.com/grvtig/slither/wiki/Detector-Documentation#uninitialized-state-wariables 	26-740)
ApeCoint	peCoinStaking. estimate24HourRewards(uint256.address.uint256) (contracts/ApeCoinStaking.sol#557-563) performs a mult	iplication on the result of a division:
Referenc	-((position.stakedAmount / pool.stakedAmount) * rewards.rewardsPerHour * 24) (contracts/ApeCoinStaking.sol\$56 leference: https://github.com/crytic/slither/wiki/Detector-Documentation#divide-before-multiply	
ApeCoinS	peCoinStakingdepositPairNft(uint256,ApeCoinStaking.PairNftWithAmount[]).i (contracts/ApeCoinStaking.sol\$629) is a	local variable never initialized
ApeCoin: ApeCoin:	peCoinStakingwithdrawPairNft(uint256,ApeCoinStaking.PairNftWithAmount[]).i (contracts/ApeCoinStaking.sol#727) is a peCoinStakingclaimNft(uint256,uint256[],address).i (contracts/ApeCoinStaking.sol#675) is a local variable never in	local variable never initialized itialized
peCoin: peCoin:	peCoinStaking, _withdrawNft(uint286,ApeCoinStaking.SingleNft[],address).i (contracts/ApeCoinStaking.sol#71]) is a loc peCoinStaking, _clainPairNft(uint256,ApeCoinStaking.PairNft[],address).i (contracts/ApeCoinStaking.sol#685) is a 	al variable never initialized 1 variable never initialized
Referenc	peconnotaring_ueposite()unicse;Ageconnotaring.Singlent()).1 (contracts/Ageconnotaring.Soleto) is a local variab efference: https://github.com/crytic/slither/wiki/Detector-Documentationfuninitialized-local-variables	le hever initialized
RC721. /@opens	RC721checkOnERC721Received(address,address,uint256,bytes) (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts/token/ERC721/ERC72 /@openzeppelin/contracts/token/ERC721/ERC721.so14401-412)	1.sol#394-416) ignores return value by IERC721Receiver(to).onERC721Received(_msgSender(),from,tokenId,dat
Referenc	eference: https://github.com/crytic/slither/wiki/Detector-Documentation#unused-return	
Variable /contrac	ariable 'ERC721checkOnERC721Received(address,address,uint256,bytes).retval (node_modules/&openzeppelin/contracts/t 'contracts/token/ERC721/ERC721.solf394-\$16) potentially used before declaration: retval == IERC721Receiver.onERC721Re	<pre>oken/ERC721/ERC721.sol\$401)' in ERC721checkOnERC721Received(address,address,uint256,bytes) (node_module ceived.selector (node_modules/&openzeppelin/contracts/token/ERC721/ERC721.sol\$402)</pre>
Variable /contrac	<pre>'ariable 'ERC721.checkOnERC721Received(address,address,uint256,bytes).reason (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts/ contracts/coken/ERC721/ERC721.s01#394-416) potentially used before declaration: reason.length == 0 (node_modules/@op interview.com.com.com.com.com.com.com.com.com.com</pre>	<pre>oken/ERC721/ERC721.sol#403)' in ERC721checkOnERC721Received(address,address,uint256,bytes) (node_module enzeppelin/contracts/token/ERC721/ERC721.sol#404)</pre>
/ariable	ariable 'ERC721. checkOnERC721Received(address,address,uint256,bytes).reason (node_modules/&openzeppelin/contracts/ contracts/token/ERC721/ERC721.sol\$394-416) potentially used before declaration: revert(uint256,uint256)[32 + reason,	<pre>oken/ERC721/ERC721.sol#403) in ERC721checkOnERC721Received(address,address,uint256,bytes) (node_module mload(uint256)(reason)) (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts/token/ERC721/ERC721.sol#409)</pre>
Referenc	eference: https://github.com/crytic/slither/wiki/Detector-Documentation#pre-declaration-usage-of-local-variables	
	<pre>terning in ageconnotatingwithorawrainat(unities, Ageconnotating, Fainteriniumnount);) (contrates/ageconnotating.s External calls:</pre>	
	- returndata = address(token).functionCall(data,SafeERC20: low-level call failed) (node_modules/@open - (auccess.returndata) = target.call(value: value)(data) (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts/utils/	zeppelin/contracts/token/ERC20/utils/SafeERC20.sol#110) Address.sol#137)
	 apeCoin.safeTransfer(_recipient, rewardsToBeClaimed) (contracts/ApeCoinStaking.sol#668) External calls sending eth: 	
	 rewardsToBeClaimed =claim(BAKC_EOOL_ID,position,bakcOwner) (contracts/ApeCoinStaking.sol\$740) (success,returndata) = target.call(value: value)(data) (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts/utils/ 	
	<pre>State variables written after the call(s): - bakcToMain[bakcTokenId][mainTypePcolId].isFaired = false (contracts/ApeCoinStaking.sol#742)</pre>	
	 mainToBake[mainTypeFoolId][mainTokenId].imFaired = false (contracts/ApeCoinStaking.solf741) leference: https://github.com/crytic/slither/wiki/Detector-Documentation\$reentrancy-vulnerabilities-2 	
	<pre>eentrancy in ApeCoinStaking.claimNft(uint256,uint256[],address) (contracts/ApeCoinStaking.sol\$673-682): Entrance == == == == == == == == == == == == ==</pre>	
	<pre></pre>	zeppelin/contracts/token/ERC20/utils/SafeERC20.sol#1101
	 (success,returndata) = target.call(value:value)(data) (node_mohiles/@openreppelin/contracts/utils/ apeCoin.safeTransfer(recipient,rewardsToBeClaimed) (contracts/ApeCoinStaking.sol\$669) 	Address.sol#137)
	<pre>External calls sending eth: - rewardsToBeClaimed = _claim(_poolId,position, recipient) (contracts/ApeCoinStaking.sol#679)</pre>	
	 (success,returndata) = target.call(value: value)(data) (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts/utils/ Event emitted after the call(s): 	
	 - LiaimmewardsNft(msg.sender,_poolid,rewardsToBeClaimed,tokenId) (contracts/ApeCoinStaking.sol\$680) entrancy in ApeCoinStakingclaimPairNft(uint256,ApeCoinStaking.PairNft[],address) (contracts/ApeCoinStaking.sol\$68 	
	External calls: - rewardsToBeClaimed = _claim(BAKC_POOL_ID,position,_recipient) (contracts/ApeCoinStaking.sol#694)	
	- returndata = address(token).functionCall(data,SafeERC20: low-level call failed) (node modules/@open - (success.returndata) = target.call(value: value)(data) (node modules/@openzeppelin/contracts/utils/ amo(bit ast@transfer(vacitities)); value(value)(data) (node modules/@openzeppelin/contracts/utils/	zeppelih/contracts/token/ZRCZ0/utils/SafeERCZ0.sol#110) Address.sol#137)
	 apeconnessierranster(_recupient, rewardstodeclaimed) (contracts/ApeCoinStaking.sol#668) External calls sending eth: a reservationed laimed a claimedBMC_BOOL_ID_position_reservations). (contracts/ApeCoinStaking.sol#668) 	
	<pre>- (success,returndata) = target.call(value: value)(data) (node_modules/@penzeppelin/contracts/utils/ Event emitted after the call(s):</pre>	
	 ClaimRewardsPairNft (msg.sender, rewardsToBeClaimed, mainTypePoolId, mainTokenId, bakoTokenID) (contracts/ApeCoi rentrancy in ApeCoinStaking, depositNft (uint256, ApeCoinStaking, SingleNft()) (contracts/ApeCoinStaking, apl\$616-6261) 	
	External calls: - depositMftGuard(poolId, position, amount) (contracts/ApeCoinStaking.sol#623)	
	 returndata = address(token).functionCall(data,SafeERC20: low-level call failed) (node_modules/@open apeCoin.safeTransferFrom(msg.sender,address(this),_amount) (contracts/kpeCoinStaking.solf613) 	zeppelin/contracts/token/ERC20/utils/SafeERC20.sol#110)
	- (success,returndata) = target.call(value: value)(data) (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts/utils/ External calls sending eth: - descellWFEBWidt replif and then the sended of the sended to the sended the sended to the sended to the sended of the se	AUGLESS.SOI+137)
	 depositar:Guard_position, amount; (contracts/ApcCoinStating.solf623) duccess.teturndata) = target.call(value: value)(data) (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts/utils/ Event emitted after the call(a); 	
	 DepositNft(msg.sender,_poold,amount,tokenId) (contracts/ApeCoinStaking.sol#624) eentraccy in ApeCoinStaking, depositParMft(int256,ApeCoinStaking.PairMftH)thAmount(1) (contracts/ApaCoinStaking activation) 	3#628-649):
	External calls: depositNftGuard(BAKC_POOL_ID, position, amount) (contracts/ApeConistaking.sol#646)	
	- returndata = address(token).functionCall(data,SafeERC20: lox-level call failed) (node modules/@open - apeCoin.safeTransferFrom(msg.sender,address(this),_amount) (contracts/ApeCoinStaking.sol\$613)	
	 - (success,returndata) = target.call(value: value)(data) (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts/utils/ External calls sending eth: 	
	 oepositartGuard(BAKC_POOL_ID,position,amount) (Contracts/ApeCoinStaking.sol#646) ouccess,returndata) = target.call(value: value)(data) (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts/utils/ Trans_entted_strac_tbc_call(s); 	
entra	 DepositPairNft(msg.sender,amount,mainTypePoolId,mainTokenId,bakcTokenId) (contracts/ApeCoinStaking.sol#647) rentrancvin,ApeCoinStaking,withdrawNft(uint256,ApeCoinStaking,SindiaMft(1,addreas) (contracts/ApeCoinStaking,sol#647) 	
	External calls: - rewardsToBeClaimed = claim(poolId,position, recipient) (contracts/AmeCoinStaking.sol#7)8)	
	- returndata = address(token).functionCall(data,SafeESC20: low-level call failed) (node modules/@open - (success,returndata) = target.call(value: value)(data) (node modules/@openzeppelin/contracts/utils/	<pre>zeppelin/contracts/token/ERC20/utils/SafeERC20.sol#110) Address.sol#137)</pre>
	 - apeCoin.safeTransfer(_recipient,rewardsToBeClaimed) (contracts/ApeCoinStaking.sol\$668) External calls sending eth: 	
	- rewardsToBeClaimed = _claim(_poolId,position, recipient) (contracts/ApeCoinStaking.sol\$718) - (success,returndata) = target.call(value: value)(data) (node_modules/@openreppelin/contracts/utils/ Enume interfacts/for the call(value) (data) (node_modules/@openreppelin/contracts/utils/	
	zvens emissed after the Gali(#): - ClaimRewardsNft(mg.sender, poolid,rewardsToBeClaimed,tokenid) (contracts/ApeCoinStaking.sol#719) herranger in BancleinRewing withdrawWff(uin256 AngCoinStaking SingleMattacture) (contracts/ApeCoinStaking.sol#719)	10-7221 -
	erniamey an apecomotazingMitokrawstiuunijo, apecoinotazing.SingleNft[],addresa) (contracts/ApeCoinStaking.sol∲7 External calls: - rewsrdfol@claimed = glaim(poolid.position, recimiant) (contracts/InsCoinStaking sol∲708)	V3*(23) -
	 returndata = address(token).functionCall(data,SafeERC20: low-level call failed) (node_modules/8open - (success,secturndata) = target.call(value: value)/data) (node_modules/8openreture)/a/comtracts/utils/ 	<pre>zeppelin/contracts/token/ERC20/utils/SafeERC20.sol#110) Address.sol#137)</pre>
	 apeCoin.safeTransfer(_recipient, rewardsToBeClaimed) (contracts/ApeCoinStaking.sol#668) withdraw(_poolId,position, amount, recipient) (contracts/ApeCoinStaking.sol#721) 	
	 returndata = address(token].functionCall(data,SafeERC20: low-level call failed) (node_modules/@open apeCoin.safeTransfer(_recipient,_amount) (contracts/ApeCoinStaking.sol#706) 	zeppelin/contracts/token/ERC20/utils/SafeERC20.sol#110)
	 - (success,returndata) = target.call(value: value)(data) (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts/utils/ External calls sending eth: 	
	- rewardsroseclaimed = _claim(_poolid,position, recipient) (contracts/ApeCoinStaking.sol\$718) - (success,returndata) = target.cali(ralue: value)(data) (node_modules/&openzeppelin/contracts/utils/ - utilianu/ nodi targetica nouver_recoincest/ incompension (node_modules/&openzeppelin/contracts/utils/	
	 	
entra	 WithdrawNft [msg.sender, pool1d, amount, recipient, tokenId] (contracts/ApeCoinStaking.sol#722) rentrancy in ApeCoinStaking, withdrawFainNft [uin236, ApeCoinStaking, FairNftWithAmount[1]] (contracts/AmeCoinStaking, sol#722) 	01\$726-748):
	External calls: - rewardsToBeClaimed = _claim(BAKC_FOOL_ID,position,bakcOwner) (contracts/ApeCoinStaking.sol#740)	
	- returndata = address(token).functionCall(data,SafeERC20: low-level call failed) (node modules/Sopen - (success.returndata) = target.call(value: value)(data) (node modules/Sopenreturnet)	<pre>zeppelin/contracts/token/ERC20/utils/SafeERC20.sol#110) Address.sol#137)</pre>
	 - apeCoin.safeTransfer(_recipient,rewardsToBeClaimed) (contracts/ApeCoinStaking.sol\$660) External calls sending eth: 	
	 rewardsToBeClaimed = claim(BARC FOOL ID, position, bakeOwner) (contracts/ApeCoinStaking.sol\$740) (success, returndata) = target.call(value: value)(data) (node modules/@openreppelin/contracts/utils/ 	
	Event emitted after the call(s): - ClaimRewardsPairNft(msg.sender,rewardsToBeClaimed,mainTypeFoolId,mainTokenId,bakcTokenId) {contracts/ApeCoi	
	<pre>entrancy in ApeCoinStaking. withdrawPairNft (uint256, ApeCoinStaking.PairNftWithAmount[]) (contracts/ApeCoinStaking.s External calls:</pre>	
	- rewardsToBeClaimed = _claim(BAKC_FOOL_ID,position,bakcOwner) (contracts/ApeCoinStaking.sol\$740) - returndata = address(token).functionCal)(data,SafeERC20: low-level call failed) (node_modules/@open (contracts_state_st	zeppelin/contracts/token/ERC20/utils/SafeERC20.sol#110)
	 - (aucuess),securimana; - carget.cdii(Value) Value) (uora; - [mode_modules/Wopenzeppelin/Contracts/utils/ - apeCoin.safeTransfer(_recipient,rewardsToBeClaimed) (contracts/ApeCoinStaking.sol#668) - withdraw(BAC FOOL ID.cogition,amount,mainTokenOwmer) (contracts/InerCoinStaking.sol#668) 	MMM20000222211
		zeppelin/contracts/token/ERC20/utils/SafeERC20.sol\$110)
	 (success, returndata) = target.call(value: value)(data) (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts/utils/ External calls sending etb: 	
	 rewardsToBeClaimed = _claim(BAKC_FOOL_ID,position,bakcOwner) (contracts/ApeCoinStaking.sol\$740) - (success,returndats) = target.call(value: value)(data) (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts/utils/ 	
	 withdraw(BAKC_FOOL_ID, position, amount, mainTokenOwner) (contracts/ApeCoinStaking.sol#745) (success, returndata) = target.call(value: value)(data) (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts/utils/ 	
	Event emitted after the call(s): - WithdrawPairNft(msg.sender,amount,mainTypePoolId,mainTokenId,bakcTokenId) (contracts/ApsCoinStaking.sol‡746	
	entFanoy in apeconStaking.claimApeCoin(address) (contracts/ApeCoinStaking.sol\$215-222); External calls: rowsetsTabellingd =claim/DEFCOIN_DOOL_ID_post	
	 rewardsrossetlaimses = claim(Arsculm FCGL Hyposition, recipient) (contracts/ApeCoimStaking.so1\$219) - returndata = address(token), functionCall(data,SafeERC20: low-level call failed) (node modules/@open (mucreas)) 	zeppelin/contracts/token/ERC20/utils/SafeERC20.sol#110)
	<pre>- apeCoin.safeTransfer(_recipient,rewardsToBeClaimed) (contracts/ApeCoinStaking.sol\$668) External calls sending eth:</pre>	
	 rewardsToBeClaimed = _claim(AFECOIN POOL ID, position, recipient) (contracts/ApeCoinStaking.sol#219) - (success,returndata) = target.coll(value: value)(data) (node modules/@openreppelin/contracts/utils/ 	
	Event emitted after the call(s): - ClaimRewards(msg.sender,rewardsToBeClaimed,_recipient) (contracts/ApeCoinStaking.sol‡221)	
	eentrancy in ApeCoinStaking.claimBAKC(ApeCoinStaking.PairNft[],ApeCoinStaking.PairNft[],address) (contracts/ApeCoinSt	
	External calls:	
	External calls: claimEinHfr(MROC_FOOL_ID_, baycRairs, _rccipient) (contracts/ApcCoinStaking.sol4272) - returndats = address(token).functionCall(date, SafeER202: iow-level call failed) (node_modules/&open - (cuccess voltmodes) = router call(mains) index	<pre>xeppelin/contracts/token/ERC20/utils/SafeERC20.sol#110) Iddress col#1200</pre>
	<pre>Determil call()</pre>	<pre>sepsiln/contracts/token/EBC20/utils/SefeEBC20.solF110) Address.solF137)</pre>
	<pre>Decempil calls: - calandarite Canto (polo, EU, payrefrate, resolutions) (constraint/pacSonthaling.scill273) - (calandarite Canto (polo, EU, payrefrate, resolutions) (constraint/pacSonthaling.scill273) - (soccess, resumdate) = target.callfoliation (data) (polo, polarite/fugetargetpil/contract/still - (soccess, resumdate) = target.callfoliation (data) (polarite/fugetargetpil/contract/still273) - (soccess, resumdate) = target.callfoliation (data) (polarite/fugetargetpil/contract/still273) - (soccess, restormate) = target.callfoliation (data) (polarite/fugetargetpil/contract/still273) - (soccess, restormate) = target.callfoliation (data) (polarite/fugetargetpil/contract/still273) - (soccess, restormate) = target.callfoliation (data) (polarite/fugetargetpil/contracts/still273) - (soccess, restormate) = target.callfoliation (data) (societargetpil/contracts/still273) - (soccess, restormate) = target.callfoliation (data) (societargetpil/contracts/still273) - (soccess, restormate) = target.callfoliation (data) (societargetpil/contracts/still273) - (soccess, restormate) = target.callfoliation (targetpil/contracts/still273) - (soccess, restormate) = target.callfoliation(targetpil/contracts/still273) - (soccess, restormate) = target.callfoliation(targetpil/contracts/still273) - (soccess, restormate) = target.callfoliation(targetp</pre>	<pre>sepsiin/contracts/cokm/EEC20/cills/SafeEEC20.sol#110) Address.sol#137) acgrptilicontacts/cokm/EEC20/cills/SafeEEC20.sol#110) Address.sol#137)</pre>





ApeCoinStakedVoting.sol

No issues found by Slither.

- All the reentrancies flagged are false positives. All the NFT contracts and the Ape Coin ERC20 contract are trusted contracts. The code flow is never transferred to any other contract.
- The weak PRNG flagged by Slither is a false positive, as the contract does not use any random number.
- No major issues found by Slither.

4.2 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 the smart contracts and sent the compiled results to the analyzers to locate any vulnerabilities.

MythX results:

ApeCoinStaking.sol

Report for contracts/ApeCoinStaking.sol https://dashboard.mythx.io/#/console/analyses/29ce4258-96dc-4cfb-ac81-b82973168830

Line	SWC Title	Severity	Short Description
511	(SWC-110) Assert Violation	Low	A user-provided assertion failed.

ApeCoinStakedVoting.sol

Report for contracts/ApeCoinStakedVoting.sol

Line	SWC Title	Severity	Short Description
11	(SWC-108) State Variable Default Visibility	Low	State variable visibility is not set.

- The assert violation is a false positive.
- There is a state variable called apeCoinStaking in the ApeCoinStakedVoting which visibility is not declared; hence it will be declared as private by default when compiled.
- No major issues found by MythX.



THANK YOU FOR CHOOSING