

**HACKEN**

# SMART CONTRACT CODE REVIEW AND SECURITY ANALYSIS REPORT

**Customer:** Leancoin  
**Date:** May 29, 2023



HACKEN

This report may contain confidential information about IT systems and the intellectual property of the Customer, as well as information about potential vulnerabilities and methods of their exploitation.

The report can be disclosed publicly after prior consent by another Party. Any subsequent publication of this report shall be without mandatory consent.

## Document

<b>Name</b>	Smart Contract Code Review and Security Analysis Report for Leancoin
<b>Approved By</b>	Yevheniy Bezuhlyi   SC Audits Head at Hacken OÜ
<b>Type</b>	Fungible token; Vesting; Migration
<b>Platform</b>	Solana
<b>Language</b>	Rust
<b>Methodology</b>	<a href="#">Link</a>
<b>Website</b>	<a href="https://leancoin.io/">https://leancoin.io/</a>
<b>Changelog</b>	31.03.2023 - Initial Review 25.04.2023 - Second Review 22.05.2023 - Third Review 29.05.2023 - Fourth Review

## Table of Contents

<b>Introduction</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Scope</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Severity Definitions</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Executive Summary</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Risks</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>System Overview</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Checked Items</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Findings</b>	<b>15</b>
Critical	15
C01. Denial of Service State	15
C02. Denial of Service	15
C03. Denial of Service State	16
High	16
H01. Requirements Violation	16
H02. Denial of Service State	17
Medium	17
M02. Inconsistent Data	17
M03. Eager Division	18
M04. Documentation Mismatch	18
M05. Immutable Ownership	19
M06. Best Practice Violation	19
Low	19
L02. Redundant Code	19
L03. Usage Of Star Imports	20
L04. Floating Language Version	20
L05. Vulnerable Dependency (Informational)	21
L06. Redundant Architecture	21
L07. Redundant Architecture	21
L08. Redundant Calculations	21
L09. Misleading Architecture	22
L10. Contradiction	22
H03. Documentation Mismatch	22
L11. Redundant Code	23
<b>Disclaimers</b>	<b>24</b>

## Introduction

Hacken OÜ (Consultant) was contracted by Leancoin (Customer) to conduct a Smart Contract Code Review and Security Analysis. This report presents the findings of the security assessment of the Customer's smart contracts.

## Scope

The scope of the project includes review and security analysis of the following smart contracts from the provided repository:

### Initial review scope

<b>Repository</b>	<a href="https://github.com/Leancoin/Leancoin/">https://github.com/Leancoin/Leancoin/</a>
<b>Commit</b>	<a href="https://github.com/Leancoin/Leancoin/commit/7a155aac8da784746962499de1846390b91ab3fb">7a155aac8da784746962499de1846390b91ab3fb</a>
<b>Whitepaper</b>	<a href="https://docs.leancoin.io/leancoin-white-paper/">https://docs.leancoin.io/leancoin-white-paper/</a>
<b>Functional Requirements</b>	<a href="https://docs.leancoin.io/swap-lean/">https://docs.leancoin.io/swap-lean/</a>
<b>Technical Requirements</b>	<a href="#">./README.md</a>
<b>Contracts</b>	<p>File: ./programs/LeanManagementToken/src/account.rs          SHA3: 74d4fac5d659d5216af687cb9e47d40cb0bbb6f2b0da743ff7b8f8b1a6d8361</p> <p>File: ./programs/LeanManagementToken/src/context.rs          SHA3: c470d636727c093941479005e6fb13471e3b03194e7b7409e31ae50deaa790c1</p> <p>File: ./programs/LeanManagementToken/src/error.rs          SHA3: 89e7875d373ae70f1eed8620f7ff0296a1344371c72fd22343fec1a38440a621</p> <p>File: ./programs/LeanManagementToken/src/lib.rs          SHA3: 8d6d6c153f43c29959719e08ee8cb2185f4029d0a7738aa54a4fbde29bd31473</p> <p>File: ./programs/LeanManagementToken/src/utils.rs          SHA3: 9516bdcd6b555c3474a595dcb4ee7a76ad0cd8fe1d0765df4f9cddf53e64e83b</p>

## Second review scope

<b>Repository</b>	<a href="https://github.com/Leancoin/Leancoin/">https://github.com/Leancoin/Leancoin/</a>
<b>Commit</b>	<a href="https://github.com/Leancoin/Leancoin/commit/0e060f54bfd7dacbd01d802a72824bd980b1d346">0e060f54bfd7dacbd01d802a72824bd980b1d346</a>
<b>Whitepaper</b>	<a href="https://docs.leancoin.io/leancoin-white-paper/">https://docs.leancoin.io/leancoin-white-paper/</a>
<b>Functional Requirements</b>	<a href="https://docs.leancoin.io/swap-lean/">https://docs.leancoin.io/swap-lean/</a>
<b>Technical Requirements</b>	<a href="#">./README.md</a>
<b>Contracts</b>	<p>File: ./programs/LeanManagementToken/src/account.rs          SHA3: 87cd8efd48b9738b990f4e76b715648599e4a3861ada23624925bc223e3ffb31</p> <p>File: ./programs/LeanManagementToken/src/context.rs          SHA3: 2c921a5b3b7f69466819ab01e47cfc22ed8883f8cab2630802a637c26d0c2649</p> <p>File: ./programs/LeanManagementToken/src/error_codes.rs          SHA3: 79f71282fb242d001dcfbad2c072bd7674d08db46048231208411be8a7921e4e</p> <p>File: ./programs/LeanManagementToken/src/lib.rs          SHA3: 587f8a2049543fd2a3d6282ccbe2676044c28aa2fe92b978b715fcf16e94aa9c</p> <p>File: ./programs/LeanManagementToken/src/utils.rs          SHA3: ca901abb88aca20d3371851a7b1171dc6643157657eb358d0b2a85c3f98f3aea</p>

### Third review scope

<b>Repository</b>	<a href="https://github.com/Leancoin/Leancoin/">https://github.com/Leancoin/Leancoin/</a>
<b>Commit</b>	<a href="https://github.com/Leancoin/Leancoin/commit/52746b8fee5780e38c93f3ee5b202049cf4e5666">52746b8fee5780e38c93f3ee5b202049cf4e5666</a>
<b>Whitepaper</b>	<a href="https://docs.leancoin.io/leancoin-white-paper/">https://docs.leancoin.io/leancoin-white-paper/</a>
<b>Functional Requirements</b>	<a href="https://docs.leancoin.io/swap-lean/">https://docs.leancoin.io/swap-lean/</a>
<b>Technical Requirements</b>	<a href="#">./README.md</a>
<b>Program Id</b>	CeFVa5iijJASnRmMCvrHep8wVYZ3XxAmgXArNJhpjmx
<b>SPL-token mint address</b>	7297kX7SEZ1do223VsjTAC2MS9gLxPJoxFs9UMwiG4oS
<b>Contracts</b>	<p>File: ./programs/LeanManagementToken/src/account.rs          SHA3: bda0484adf3ca234d3b668d82ca381d2464207f314bf05018a7bdf7b7fc671a0</p> <p>File: ./programs/LeanManagementToken/src/context.rs          SHA3: ce4eab2a24dfb79890f730e17047d22550e02d1d3b260b060c586ab1076f439</p> <p>File: ./programs/LeanManagementToken/src/error_codes.rs          SHA3: 81322272435c5e8b2597b4dbbd53bb30022e20f1716c4642409e101ebce57309</p> <p>File: ./programs/LeanManagementToken/src/lib.rs          SHA3: 4752febf3ca2e8b2f57502eb39dc050edf581fc6f9552ca1ffdd09e2bce37888</p> <p>File: ./programs/LeanManagementToken/src/utills.rs          SHA3: da7daa072b790ac241c0d4bec0c95c501335636295c7d9cb44f00067b1e63a5e</p>

### Fourth review scope

<b>Repository</b>	<a href="https://github.com/Leancoin/Leancoin/">https://github.com/Leancoin/Leancoin/</a>
<b>Commit</b>	<a href="https://github.com/Leancoin/Leancoin/commit/c5102aa2fba7fb9044b7d88dfcea3c026a8f1d8e">c5102aa2fba7fb9044b7d88dfcea3c026a8f1d8e</a>
<b>Whitepaper</b>	<a href="https://docs.leancoin.io/leancoin-white-paper/">https://docs.leancoin.io/leancoin-white-paper/</a>
<b>Functional Requirements</b>	<a href="https://docs.leancoin.io/swap-lean/">https://docs.leancoin.io/swap-lean/</a>
<b>Technical Requirements</b>	<a href="#">./README.md</a>
<b>Program Id</b>	CeFVa5iijJASnRmMCvrHep8wVYZ3XxAmgXArNJhpjmx
<b>SPL-token mint address</b>	7297kX7SEZ1do223VsjTAC2MS9gLxPJoxFs9UMwiG4oS
<b>Contracts</b>	<p>File: ./programs/LeanManagementToken/src/account.rs          SHA3: bda0484adf3ca234d3b668d82ca381d2464207f314bf05018a7bdf7b7fc671a0</p>



	<p>File: ./programs/LeanManagementToken/src/context.rs SHA3: 8fc675d7bf3ef6cdfdb37f368f99634c02f3bf9c4c1a2ef6080a51a867839efc</p> <p>File: ./programs/LeanManagementToken/src/error_codes.rs SHA3: 81322272435c5e8b2597b4dbbd53bb30022e20f1716c4642409e101ebce57309</p> <p>File: ./programs/LeanManagementToken/src/lib.rs SHA3: 24638d8b5a1a007474656ff04bffc0d31d4cc6da14ef87d4002add9f6fabd44</p> <p>File: ./programs/LeanManagementToken/src/utils.rs SHA3: da7daa072b790ac241c0d4bec0c95c501335636295c7d9cb44f00067b1e63a5e</p>
--	--

## Severity Definitions

Risk Level	Description
<b>Critical</b>	Critical vulnerabilities are usually straightforward to exploit and can lead to the loss of user funds or contract state manipulation by external or internal actors.
<b>High</b>	High vulnerabilities are usually harder to exploit, requiring specific conditions, or have a more limited scope, but can still lead to the loss of user funds or contract state manipulation by external or internal actors.
<b>Medium</b>	Medium vulnerabilities are usually limited to state manipulations but cannot lead to asset loss. Major deviations from best practices are also in this category.
<b>Low</b>	Low vulnerabilities are related to outdated and unused code or minor Gas optimization. These issues won't have a significant impact on code execution but affect code quality.



## Executive Summary

The score measurement details can be found in the corresponding section of the [scoring methodology](#).

### Documentation quality

The total Documentation Quality score is **10** out of **10**.

- The technical description is clear and contains all essential commands on how to build/test/deploy the project.
- The functional requirements fully describe the user interaction flow and system-owned functionality.

### Code quality

The total Code Quality score is **10** out of **10**.

- Development environment is configured.
- Architecture and code purpose are clear.
- There is minor duplication of code and redundancy.
- Redundant `version` field in `./rust-toolchain.toml`.

### Test coverage

Code coverage of the project is **~90%**.

- All contract methods are called during testing.
- Comments representing human-readable representation of used timestamps are incorrect.
- The Rust tests for `set_token_metadata(..)` are vacuous. However, the typescript integration tests are satisfactory; yet, an extra effort (the steps are not provided in the docs) is required to make them work.

### Security score

As a result of the audit, the code does not contain security issues. The security score is **10** out of **10**.

All found issues are displayed in the [Findings](#) section of the report.

### Summary

According to the assessment, the Customer's smart contract has the following score: **9.6**.

The system users should acknowledge all the risks summed up in the [Risks](#) section of the report.



*Table. The distribution of issues during the audit*

Review date	Low	Medium	High	Critical
March 31, 2023	9	5	3	1
April 25, 2023	2	0	0	2
May 22, 2023	0	0	0	0
May 29, 2023	0	0	0	0

## Risks

- The deployed code may differ from the one audited.
- Unless the smart contract is deployed with the `--final` parameter, it could be upgraded and its functionality may be changed.
- Anyone is able to initialize the program by calling `initialize` (can be called only once). It is recommended to perform deployment and initialization in one transaction.
- The correctness of migration via `leancoin::import_ethereum_token_state()` cannot be statically verified in the scope of the audit. Therefore, users should ensure that the contract state after the migration meets expectations.
- In case no one called the `leancoin::burn()` function in the first five days of the month, the “burning” wallet balance is not changed.
- It may be impossible to migrate a lot of accounts from Ethereum to Solana using the `leancoin::import_ethereum_token_state()` function.

## System Overview

*Leancoin* is a fungible token that is migrated from Ethereum (ERC20) to Solana (SPL-Token based).

After contract deployment, a special migration function is supposed to be executed (no more than once). Its goal is to reflect the system wallet balances from the token on Ethereum, scaled by a constant factor (which represents the difference between the old and the new token precision/total supply).

Four special wallets are migrated: “community”, “partnership”, “marketing”, and “liquidity”. Each of the special wallet balances is locked according to a corresponding vesting schedule, whereby the contract owner can trigger a transfer of an unlocked vested amount to the designated externally-owned “deposit” wallet.

There is also a “burning” wallet which allows burning 5% of held funds in the first 5 days of each month.

Therefore, the token comes into circulation in two ways:

- By the initial migration. Some migrated accounts may be owned by general market participants.
- By vesting unlocks. The token amounts are moved from the special vesting wallets to the externally-owned deposit wallet, which in turn can distribute its balance to general market participants.

## Privileged roles

Owner (represented by `account::ContractState::authority`) has the exclusive right to execute:

- `leancoin::importn_s_ethereum_toketate(..)` – allows the owner to import balances from implementation on Ethereum (only once)
- `leancoin::withdraw_tokens_from_community_wallet(..)` – allows the owner to withdraw vested funds from the community wallet
- `leancoin::withdraw_tokens_from_partnership_wallet(..)` – allows the owner to withdraw vested funds from the partnership wallet
- `leancoin::withdraw_tokens_from_marketing_wallet(..)` – allows the owner to withdraw vested funds from the marketing wallet
- `leancoin::withdraw_tokens_from_liquidity_wallet(..)` – allows the owner to withdraw vested funds from the liquidity wallet
- `leancoin::change_authority(..)` – allows the owner to transfer ownership
- `set_token_metadata(..)` – allows the owner to change the `name`, `symbol` and `uri` parameters of the token metadata.

## Checked Items

We have audited the Customers' smart contracts for commonly known and specific vulnerabilities. Here are some items considered:

Item	Description	Status
<b>Integer Overflow and Underflow</b>	If unchecked math is used, all math operations should be safe from overflows and underflows.	Passed
<b>Unchecked Call Return Value</b>	The return value of a message call should be checked.	Passed
<b>Access Control &amp; Authorization</b>	Ownership takeover should not be possible. All crucial functions should be protected. Users could not affect data that belongs to other users.	Passed
<b>Assert Violation</b>	Properly functioning code should never reach a failing assert statement.	Passed
<b>Deprecated Rust Functions</b>	Deprecated built-in functions should never be used.	Passed
<b>DoS (Denial of Service)</b>	Execution of the code should never be blocked by a specific contract state unless required.	Passed
<b>Block values as a proxy for time</b>	Block numbers should not be used for time calculations.	Not Relevant
<b>Signature Unique Id</b>	Signed messages should always have a unique id. A transaction hash should not be used as a unique id. Chain identifiers should always be used.	Not Relevant
<b>Weak Sources of Randomness</b>	Random values should never be generated from Chain Attributes or be predictable.	Not Relevant
<b>Race Conditions</b>	Race Conditions and Transactions Order Dependency should not be possible.	Passed
<b>Calls Only to Trusted Addresses</b>	All external calls should be performed only to trusted addresses.	Passed
<b>Presence of Unused Variables</b>	The code should not contain unused variables if this is not justified by design.	Passed
<b>Assets Integrity</b>	Funds are protected and cannot be withdrawn without proper permissions or be locked on the contract.	Passed
<b>User Balances Manipulation</b>	Contract owners or any other third party should not be able to access funds belonging to users.	Passed

<b>Data Consistency</b>	Smart contract data should be consistent all over the data flow.	Passed
<b>Flashloan Attack</b>	When working with exchange rates, they should be received from a trusted source and not be vulnerable to short-term rate changes that can be achieved by using flash loans. Oracles should be used.	Not Relevant
<b>Token Supply Manipulation</b>	Tokens can be minted only according to rules specified in a whitepaper or any other documentation provided by the Customer.	Passed
<b>Gas and Loops</b>	Transaction execution costs should not depend dramatically on the amount of data stored on the contract.	Passed
<b>Compiler Warnings</b>	The code should not force the compiler to throw warnings.	Passed
<b>Requirements Compliance</b>	The code should be compliant with the requirements provided by the Customer.	Passed
<b>Environment Consistency</b>	The project should contain a configured development environment with a comprehensive description of how to compile, build and deploy the code.	Passed
<b>Secure Oracles Usage</b>	The code should have the ability to pause specific data feeds that it relies on. This should be done to protect a contract from compromised oracles.	Not Relevant
<b>Tests Coverage</b>	The code should be covered with unit tests. Test coverage should be sufficient, with both negative and positive cases covered. The usage of contracts by multiple users should be tested.	Passed
<b>Stable Imports</b>	The code should not reference draft contracts, that may be changed in the future.	Passed
<b>Unsafe Rust code</b>	The Rust type system does not check the memory safety of unsafe Rust code. Thus, if a smart contract contains any unsafe Rust code, it may still suffer from memory corruptions such as buffer overflows, use after frees, uninitialized memory, etc.	Passed
<b>Missing rent exemption checks</b>	All Solana accounts holding an Account, Mint, or Multisig must contain enough SOL to be considered rent exempt. Otherwise, the accounts may fail to load.	Passed
<b>Unset or unsettable SPL-token metadata</b>	If a contract defines an SPL-token, it should ensure that the token metadata is set or can be set later. If that is not the case, it would be impossible to properly integrate with blockchain	Passed

	explorers, exchanges, etc.	
<b>Too recent Solana libraries used</b>	Due to Solana release conventions, there may be several latest standard library crate versions that are not ready for mainnet.	Passed

## Findings

### ■■■■ Critical

#### C01. Denial of Service State

In the `calculate_month_difference` function, the `end.month - start.month` action is performed, where `DateTime.month` is `u8`. The case `end.month < start.month` is not processed, so an underflow (or panic, depending on the compiler configuration) may happen.

This may lead to the inability to perform vesting withdrawal if the current month is lower than the month of vesting start (for example, if the start date is in April 2023 and a withdrawal is done in January 2024).

**Path:** `./programs/LeanManagementToken/src/utils.rs: calculate_month_difference()`

**Recommendation:** Convert the values to signed integers to avoid an integer underflow.

**Found in:** `7a155aa`

**Status:** Fixed (Revised commit: `0e060f5`)

#### C02. Denial of Service

The functions perform subtraction of unsigned integers to compute `already_withdrawn_amount` as: `initial_wallet_balance - wallet_account.amount`

For example, for the community wallet, `already_withdrawn_amount` is set as: `vesting_state.initial_community_wallet_balance - ctx.accounts.community_account.amount`

It is possible to increase `wallet_account.amount` by directly transferring tokens there. Once the migration is performed, `initial_wallet_balance` equals to `wallet_account.amount`, so it is enough to send `1` to `wallet_account` to make the computation of `already_withdrawn_amount` cause an integer underflow and panic.

The withdrawal functions attacked this way would be blocked forever, and the vested funds would become stuck.

**Path:** `./programs/LeanManagementToken/src/lib.rs:`

- `withdraw_tokens_from_community_wallet()`
- `withdraw_tokens_from_partnership_wallet()`
- `withdraw_tokens_from_marketing_wallet()`
- `withdraw_tokens_from_liquidity_wallet()`

**Recommendation:** Process the case consciously. Consider making `already_withdrawn_amount` a signed integer. Alternatively - track [www.hacken.io](http://www.hacken.io)

`already_withdrawn_amount` in a separate variable, instead of deriving it from the account balance.

**Found in:** 7a155aa

**Status:** Fixed (Revised commit: b5f7fa1)

### C03. Denial of Service State

It is stated in the official documentation that the total supply of LEAN is 10 billion, and that the community wallet share is 10%; therefore, the initial community wallet balance is 1 billion or  $10^9$ .

According to `InitializeContext` (at `src/context.rs`), 1 LEAN is equal to  $10^9$  base units (note `mint::decimals = 9` at the `mint` field declaration). Therefore, the initial community wallet balance is  $10^{(9 + 9)}$  base units.

Because the computation of `amount_unlocked` is done in `u64`, the overflow in the expression `vesting_start_account_balance * (months_since_vesting_start + 1)` will happen when `months_since_vesting_start` becomes greater than or equal to `ceil(264 / vesting_start_account_balance - 1)`, where `vesting_start_account_balance` is equal to  $10^{18}$ . Therefore, `months_since_vesting_start` needs to be at least 18 for the overflow to happen.

Consequently, after 18 months since the vesting started, the community wallet withdrawal function `withdraw_tokens_from_community_wallet()` will become blocked indefinitely.

Note that the vesting period duration is supposed to be 39 months. Therefore, about 5.5% of the total supply would be blocked.

**Path:** `./programs/LeanManagementToken/src/lib.rs: calculate_unlocked_amount_community_wallet()`

**Recommendation:** Do the computations in `u128`, then map the result back to `u64`.

**Found in:** 0e060f5

**Status:** Fixed (Revised commit: b5f7fa1)

## ■■■ High

### H01. Requirements Violation

According to the vesting requirements, for each vesting wallet, it should not be possible to withdraw more funds than have been unlocked up to this moment.



The functions allow the withdrawal of funds that are not unlocked yet. This is because `unlocked_amount` equals the total unlocked amount of tokens at the moment, and the value is not modified by already withdrawn funds.

Once `unlocked_amount` is greater than zero, the wallet can be fully drained.

**Path:** `./programs/LeanManagementToken/src/lib.rs:`

- `withdraw_tokens_from_community_wallet()`
- `withdraw_tokens_from_partnership_wallet()`
- `withdraw_tokens_from_marketing_wallet()`
- `withdraw_tokens_from_liquidity_wallet()`

**Recommendation:** Consider the amount that has been withdrawn up to the current point in time during the `amount_available_to_withdraw` value calculation.

**Found in:** `7a155aa`

**Status:** `Fixed` (Revised commit: `0e060f5`)

## H02. Denial of Service State

In the function, the loop over the `year` variable may never exit.

This happens when the `days` variable equals `365`, and the `year` variable contains a leap year. In this case, no actions with `days` and `year` variables are performed within the cycle, and the break condition is not reached, so an infinite loop happens.

This may lead to the unavailability of some smart contract methods on December 31 of a leap year.

**Path:** `./programs/LeanManagementToken/src/utils.rs: parse_timestamp()`

**Recommendation:** Add a `break` instruction for this case.

**Found in:** `7a155aa`

**Status:** `Fixed` (Revised commit: `0e060f5`)

## ■ ■ Medium

### M02. Inconsistent Data

In the function, the `match` statement should not process special wallets (“community”, “partnership”, “marketing”, “liquidity”) twice i.e. it should require that a wallet name is not duplicated.

This may lead to the wallets obtaining more funds than their initial balances are assigned, causing an inconsistent state situation.

**Path:** ./programs/LeanManagementToken/src/lib.rs:  
import\_ethereum\_token\_state()

**Recommendation:** Implement the check for wallet duplicates.

**Found in:** 7a155aa

**Status:** Fixed (Revised commit: 0e060f5)

### M03. Eager Division

Division is done too early, which worsens the rounding error.

- In `utils::calculate_unlocked_amount_marketing_wallet(..)`, the division by 100 on lines 330, 331 could be done as

```
let amount_unlocked = (vesting_start_account_balance * 40 +  
    (months_since_vesting_start - 12) *  
    (vesting_start_account_balance * 5)) / 100
```

- In `utils::calculate_unlocked_amount_community_wallet(..)`, line 358 could be written as

```
let amount_unlocked = vesting_start_account_balance *  
    (months_since_vesting_start + 1) / 40
```

This may make it impossible to withdraw a small amount of vested tokens.

**Path:** ./programs/LeanManagementToken/src/utils.rs

**Recommendation:** Defer division as much as possible according to the suggestions in the description.

**Found in:** 7a155aa

**Status:** Fixed (Revised commit: 0e060f5)

### M04. Documentation Mismatch

The functions contain the expression `amount_unlocked.max(1)` which produces a sharp rounding-up that goes against the vesting schedule formula declared in the documentation/comments.

Additionally, the situation hitting this rounding-up should not be possible in practice, because otherwise it means that the initial vesting balance is impractically small.

**Path:** ./programs/LeanManagementToken/src/utils.rs:

- `calculate_unlocked_amount_marketing_wallet()`
- `calculate_unlocked_amount_community_wallet()`

**Recommendation:** Remove `.max(1)` or explicitly document this behavior.

**Found in:** 7a155aa

**Status:** Fixed (Revised commit: 0e060f5)

#### M05. Immutable Ownership

The contract is designed in a way that ownership cannot be transferred.

This may lead to the impossibility to update the owner in critical situations.

**Path:** ./programs/LeanManagementToken/src/lib.rs

**Recommendation:** Implement an ability to transfer contract ownership.

**Status:** Fixed (Revised commit: 0e060f5)

#### M06. Best Practice Violation

The `utils::calculate_month_difference` function fully relies on `start <= end`.

Assuming that this condition is true, the conversion of result value via `unsigned_abs()` may lead to wrong assumptions about which input data is accepted and unexpected hidden bugs during future development.

**Path:** ./programs/LeanManagementToken/src/utils.rs:  
`calculate_month_difference()`

**Recommendation:** Use `try_from` instead of getting absolute value for cases where the value processed is expected to not be a negative number. Implement a `require` check to ensure that `start <= end`.

**Found in:** 7a155aa

**Status:** Fixed (Revised commit: 0e060f5)

### ■ Low

#### L02. Redundant Code

- `./programs/LeanManagementToken/src/utils.rs:338`: needless return
- `./programs/LeanManagementToken/src/utils.rs:231-235`: the `try_from` results can be explicitly unwrapped (the panic is impossible in those cases) to avoid having the verbose `match` statement.
- `./programs/LeanManagementToken/src/utils.rs:267`: `try_from` can be replaced with `from`, and the following `match` statement could be removed.

- `./programs/LeanManagementToken/src/utils.rs:320-321: try_from` can be replaced with `from`, and the `match` statement could be removed.
- `./programs/LeanManagementToken/src/utils.rs:335: the try_from` result can be explicitly unwrapped (the panic is impossible in that case, because the value is at most `vesting_start_account_balance`, which is known to fit `u64`), and the `match` statement could be eliminated.

**Path:** `./programs/LeanManagementToken/src/utils.rs`

**Recommendation:** Eliminate the mentioned redundancies.

**Found in:** 7a155aa

**Status:** Fixed (Revised commit: 0e060f5)

### L03. Usage Of Star Imports

\*-imports are widely considered a bad style.

They complicate tracking dependencies, cause namespace pollution, and may lead to unexpected name clashes.

**Paths:** `./programs/LeanManagementToken/src/*`

**Recommendation:** Import needed objects explicitly.

**Found in:** 7a155aa

**Status:** Mitigated (Star imports are actually dictated by the Anchor framework. Without them, it would be tricky to correctly add explicit member imports.)

### L04. Floating Language Version

It is preferable for a production project, especially a smart contract, to have the programming language version pinned explicitly. This results in a stable build output, and guards against unexpected toolchain differences or bugs present in older versions, which could be used to build the project.

The language version could be pinned in automation/CI scripts, as well as proclaimed in README or other kinds of developer documentation. However, in the Rust ecosystem, it can be achieved more ergonomically via a `rust-toolchain.toml` descriptor (see <https://rust-lang.github.io/rustup/overrides.html#the-toolchain-file>)

**Paths:** `./rust-toolchain.toml`

**Recommendation:** Pin the language version at the project level.

**Found in:** 7a155aa

**Status:** Fixed (Revised commit: b5f7fa1)

#### L05. Vulnerable Dependency (Informational)

Vulnerability info: <https://rustsec.org/advisories/RUSTSEC-2020-0071>

Dependency path:  
time 0.1.45  
<- (...) <- solana-sdk 1.15.2  
<- (...) <- (the project)

**Path:** ./programs/LeanManagementToken/Cargo.toml

**Recommendation:** N/A.

**Found in:** 7a155aa

**Status:** **Mitigated** (The issue does not affect the program code.)

#### L06. Redundant Architecture

The `DateTime` struct contains unused fields (`hours`, `minutes`, `seconds`, `days`). The field values are calculated and assigned in the function.

The code should not contain redundant variables and computations.

**Path:** ./programs/LeanManagementToken/src/utils.rs: `DateTime`, `parse_timestamp()`

**Recommendation:** Use the data or do not compute and store it.

**Found in:** 7a155aa

**Status:** **Fixed** (Revised commit: 0e060f5)

#### L07. Redundant Architecture

The error is never used. It is considered best practice to remove unused statements.

**Path:** ./programs/LeanManagementToken/src/error.rs: `CannotGetBump`

**Recommendation:** Remove the error declaration.

**Found in:** 7a155aa

**Status:** **Fixed** (Revised commit: 0e060f5)

#### L08. Redundant Calculations

The `is_leap` variable is recalculated in the cycle several times. However, it keeps the same value.

**Path:** ./programs/LeanManagementToken/src/utils.rs: `parse_timestamp()`

**Recommendation:** Declare the variable outside of the cycle.

**Found in:** 7a155aa

**Status:** **Fixed** (Revised commit: 0e060f5)

### L09. Misleading Architecture

The `month_days` variable contains 13 values including the first month, which is zero days long. In such a way an additional cycle iteration is performed and month numbers start with `1`.

Similar purpose functionality is implemented in the same function for the `days` variable but in another way: it is increased by `1` at the end of the function.

**Path:** `./programs/LeanManagementToken/src/utils.rs: parse_timestamp()`

**Recommendation:** Avoid usage of hard fixes like adding the 13th zero-length month, and implement code similarly to improve its readability.

**Found in:** `7a155aa`

**Status:** `Fixed` (Revised commit: `0e060f5`)

### L10. Contradiction

The comment to the function contains wrong information:

*So after 2 months: 5% of the initial balance is unlocked, after 3 months: 7.5%, after months: 10% etc.*

However, as 2.5% is unlocked immediately after 2 months 7.5% would be unlocked, etc.

**Path:** `./programs/LeanManagementToken/src/utils.rs: calculate_unlocked_amount_community_wallet()`

**Recommendation:** Provide correct examples to the code.

**Found in:** `7a155aa`

**Status:** `Fixed` (Revised commit: `0e060f5`)

### H03. Documentation Mismatch

According to the comment, the function should return the number of full months between the dates. However, it is implemented in a way to return month differences ignoring `DateTime.day` values.

This may lead to wrong assumptions on the functionality behavior.

**Path:** `./programs/LeanManagementToken/src/utils.rs: calculate_month_difference()`

**Recommendation:** Consider the `DateTime.day` value during the difference calculation or update the comment according to the implementation.

**Found in:** `0e060f5`

**Status:** `Fixed` (Revised commit: `0e060f5`)

## L11. Redundant Code

- `./programs/LeanManagementToken/src/error_codes.rs:338`: the errors `CannotConvertToI64`, `CannotConvertToU8`, `CannotConvertToU128`, `CannotConvertToU64` are unused
- `./programs/LeanManagementToken/src/utils.rs:parse_timestamp()`:
  - The code pattern that determines whether a year is a leap year is repeated twice.
  - The last entry in `month_days` is never used.
  - `month_days` could be `const`.
- `./programs/LeanManagementToken/src/utils.rs:transfer_tokens()`:
  - Redundant lifetime specifier `'b`

**Path:** `./programs/LeanManagementToken/src/`

**Recommendation:** Eliminate the mentioned redundancies.

**Found in:** `0e060f5`

**Status:** `Fixed` (Revised commit: `b5f7fa1`)

## Disclaimers

### Hacken Disclaimer

The smart contracts given for audit have been analyzed based on best industry practices at the time of the writing of this report, with 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 report contains no statements or warranties on the identification of all vulnerabilities and security of the code. The report covers the code submitted and reviewed, so it may not be relevant after any modifications. Do not consider this report as a final and sufficient assessment regarding the utility and safety of the code, bug-free status, or any other contract statements.

While we have done our best in conducting the analysis and producing 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.

English is the original language of the report. The Consultant is not responsible for the correctness of the translated versions.

### Technical Disclaimer

Smart contracts are deployed and executed on a blockchain platform. The platform, its programming language, and other software related to the smart contract can have vulnerabilities that can lead to hacks. Thus, the Consultant cannot guarantee the explicit security of the audited smart contracts.