SMART CONTRACT AUDIT REPORT

for

SelfCrypto

Prepared By: Xiaomi Huang

PeckShield

October 1, 2023

Document Properties

Client	SelfCrypto
Title	Smart Contract Audit Report
Target	SelfNft
Version	1.0
Author	Xuxian Jiang
Auditors	Patrick Lou, Xuxian Jiang
Reviewed by	Xiaomi Huang
Approved by	Xuxian Jiang
Classification	Public

Version Info

Version	Date	Author(s)	Description
1.0	October 1, 2023	Xuxian Jiang	Final Release
1.0-rc	September 28, 2023	Xuxian Jiang	Release Candidate

Contact

For more information about this document and its contents, please contact PeckShield Inc.

Name	Xiaomi Huang
Phone	+86 183 5897 7782
Email	contact@peckshield.com

Contents

1 Introduction

Given the opportunity to review the source code of the SelfNft smart contract, we outline in the report our systematic method to evaluate potential security issues in the smart contract implementation, expose possible semantic inconsistency between smart contract code and the documentation, and provide additional suggestions or recommendations for improvement. Our results show that the given version of the smart contract exhibits no ERC721 compliance issues or security concerns. This document outlines our audit results.

1.1 About SelfNft

SelfNft is a smart contract that allows users to mint unique Self Identity NFTs (SIN) based on their provided names. It is built on top of OpenZeppelin ERC721 standard implementation with an extension of registering names with the payment of multiple types of tokens. For the registered name, it computes the SHA256 hash and converts it into uint to act as a token id. Once a name is registered by a user, it cannot be registered by anyone however the owner of a name can transfer it to the new owner. The basic information of the audited contracts is as follows:

Table 1.1: Basic Information of SelfNft

Item	Description
Name	SelfCrypto
Type	ERC721 Smart Contract
Platform	Solidity
Audit Method	Whitebox
Audit Completion Date	October 1, 2023

In the following, we show the Git repository of reviewed file and the commit hash value used in this audit.

- https://github.com/ruwaifatahir/self-nft-addon.git (ae39b45)

And this is the commit ID after all fixes for the issues found in the audit have been checked in:

- https://github.com/ruwaifatahir/self-nft-addon.git (33ba550)

1.2 About PeckShield

PeckShield Inc. [9] is a leading blockchain security company with the goal of elevating the security, privacy, and usability of the current blockchain ecosystems by offering top-notch, industry-leading services and products (including the service of smart contract auditing). We are reachable at Telegram (https://t.me/peckshield), Twitter (http://twitter.com/peckshield), or Email (contact@peckshield.com).

Table 1.2: Vulnerability Severity Classification



1.3 Methodology

To standardize the evaluation, we define the following terminology based on the OWASP Risk Rating Methodology [8]:

- Likelihood represents how likely a particular vulnerability is to be uncovered and exploited in the wild;
- Impact measures the technical loss and business damage of a successful attack;
- Severity demonstrates the overall criticality of the risk.

Likelihood and impact are categorized into three ratings: *H*, *M* and *L*, i.e., *high*, *medium* and *low* respectively. Severity is determined by likelihood and impact and can be classified into four categories accordingly, i.e., *Critical*, *High*, *Medium*, *Low* shown in Table 1.2.

To evaluate the risk, we go through a list of check items and each would be labeled with a severity category. For one check item, if our tool or analysis does not identify any issue, the contract is considered safe regarding the check item. For any discovered issue, we might further

Table 1.3: The Full List of Check Items

Category	Check Item
Basic Coding Bugs	Constructor Mismatch
	Ownership Takeover
	Redundant Fallback Function
	Overflows & Underflows
	Reentrancy
	Money-Giving Bug
	Blackhole
	Unauthorized Self-Destruct
	Revert DoS
	Unchecked External Call
	Gasless Send
	Send Instead of Transfer
	Costly Loop
	(Unsafe) Use of Untrusted Libraries
	(Unsafe) Use of Predictable Variables
	Transaction Ordering Dependence
	Deprecated Uses
	Approve / TransferFrom Race Condition
ERC721 Compliance Checks	Compliance Checks (Section 3)
Semantic Consistency Checks	Semantic Consistency Checks
Advanced DeFi Scrutiny	Business Logics Review
	Functionality Checks
	Authentication Management
	Access Control & Authorization
	Oracle Security
	Digital Asset Escrow
	Kill-Switch Mechanism
	Operation Trails & Event Generation
	Frontend-Contract Integration
	Deployment Consistency
	Holistic Risk Management
Additional Recommendations	Avoiding Use of Variadic Byte Array
	Using Fixed Compiler Version
	Making Visibility Level Explicit
	Making Type Inference Explicit
	Adhering To Function Declaration Strictly
	Following Other Best Practices

deploy contracts on our private testnet and run tests to confirm the findings. If necessary, we would additionally build a PoC to demonstrate the possibility of exploitation. The concrete list of check items is shown in Table 1.3.

In particular, we perform the audit according to the following procedure:

- Basic Coding Bugs: We first statically analyze given smart contracts with our proprietary static code analyzer for known coding bugs, and then manually verify (reject or confirm) all the issues found by our tool.
- Semantic Consistency Checks: We then manually check the logic of implemented smart contracts and compare with the description in the white paper.
- ERC721 Compliance Checks: We also validate whether the implementation logic of the audited smart contract(s) follows the standard ERC721 specification and other best practices.
- Advanced DeFi Scrutiny: We further review business logics, examine system operations, and place DeFi-related aspects under scrutiny to uncover possible pitfalls and/or bugs.
- Additional Recommendations: We also provide additional suggestions regarding the coding and development of smart contracts from the perspective of proven programming practices.

To better describe each issue we identified, we categorize the findings with Common Weakness Enumeration (CWE-699) [7], which is a community-developed list of software weakness types to better delineate and organize weaknesses around concepts frequently encountered in software development. Though some categories used in CWE-699 may not be relevant in smart contracts, we use the CWE categories in Table 1.4 to classify our findings.

1.4 Disclaimer

Note that this security audit is not designed to replace functional tests required before any software release, and does not give any warranties on finding all possible security issues of the given smart contract(s) or blockchain software, i.e., the evaluation result does not guarantee the nonexistence of any further findings of security issues. As one audit-based assessment cannot be considered comprehensive, we always recommend proceeding with several independent audits and a public bug bounty program to ensure the security of smart contract(s). Last but not least, this security audit should not be used as investment advice.

Table 1.4: Common Weakness Enumeration (CWE) Classifications Used in This Audit

Category	Summary
Configuration	Weaknesses in this category are typically introduced during the configuration of the software.
Data Processing Issues	Weaknesses in this category are typically found in functionality that processes data.
Numeric Errors	Weaknesses in this category are related to improper calculation or conversion of numbers.
Security Features	Weaknesses in this category are concerned with topics like authentication, access control, confidentiality, cryptography, and privilege management. (Software security is not security software.)
Time and State	Weaknesses in this category are related to the improper management of time and state in an environment that supports simultaneous or near-simultaneous computation by multiple systems, processes, or threads.
Error Conditions, Return Values, Status Codes	Weaknesses in this category include weaknesses that occur if a function does not generate the correct return/status code, or if the application does not handle all possible return/status codes that could be generated by a function.
Resource Management	Weaknesses in this category are related to improper management of system resources.
Behavioral Issues	Weaknesses in this category are related to unexpected behaviors from code that an application uses.
Business Logic	Weaknesses in this category identify some of the underlying problems that commonly allow attackers to manipulate the business logic of an application. Errors in business logic can be devastating to an entire application.
Initialization and Cleanup	Weaknesses in this category occur in behaviors that are used for initialization and breakdown.
Arguments and Parameters	Weaknesses in this category are related to improper use of arguments or parameters within function calls.
Expression Issues	Weaknesses in this category are related to incorrectly written expressions within code.
Coding Practices	Weaknesses in this category are related to coding practices that are deemed unsafe and increase the chances that an exploitable vulnerability will be present in the application. They may not directly introduce a vulnerability, but indicate the product has not been carefully developed or maintained.

2 Findings

2.1 Summary

Here is a summary of our findings after analyzing the `SelfNft` contract design and implementation. During the first phase of our audit, we study the smart contract source code and run our in-house static code analyzer through the codebase. The purpose here is to statically identify known coding bugs, and then manually verify (reject or confirm) issues reported by our tool. We further manually review business logics, examine system operations, and place ERC721-related aspects under scrutiny to uncover possible pitfalls and/or bugs.

Severity	# of Findings	
Critical	0	
High	0	
Medium	1	■
Low	1	■
Informational	1	■
Total	3	

Moreover, we explicitly evaluate whether the given contracts follow the standard ERC721 specification and other known best practices, and validate its compatibility with other similar ERC721 tokens and current DeFi protocols. The detailed ERC721 compliance checks are reported in Section 3. After that, we examine a few identified issues of varying severities that need to be brought up and paid more attention to. (The findings are categorized in the above table.) Additional information can be found in the next subsection, and the detailed discussions are in Section 4.

2.2 Key Findings

Overall, no ERC721 compliance issue was found and our detailed checklist can be found in Section 3. Note that the smart contract implementation can be improved by resolving the identified issues (shown in Table 2.1), including 1 medium-severity vulnerability, 1 low-severity vulnerability, and 1 informational recommendation.

Table 2.1: Key Audit Findings of SelfNft

ID	Severity	Title	Category	Status
PVE-001	Informational	Improved Commission Validation in SelfNft	Coding Practices	Resolved
PVE-002	Low	Revisited Logic to Forward collectedTokens	Business Logic	Resolved
PVE-003	Medium	Trust Issue of Admin Keys	Security Features	Mitigated

In the meantime, we also need to emphasize that it is always important to develop necessary risk-control mechanisms and make contingency plans, which may need to be exercised before the mainnet deployment. The risk-control mechanisms need to kick in at the very moment when the contracts are being deployed in mainnet. Please refer to Section 3 for our detailed compliance checks.

3 | ERC721 Compliance Checks

The ERC721 standard for non-fungible tokens, also known as deeds. Inspired by the ERC-20 token standard, the ERC721 specification defines a list of API functions (and relevant events) that each token contract is expected to implement (and emit). The failure to meet these requirements means the token contract cannot be considered to be ERC721-compliant. Naturally, we examine the list of necessary API functions defined by the ERC721 specification and validate whether there exist any inconsistency or incompatibility in the implementation or the inherent business logic of the audited contract(s).

Table 3.1: Basic `View-Only` Functions Defined in The ERC721 Specification

Item	Description	Status
balanceOf()	Is declared as a public view function	✓
	Anyone can query any address' balance, as all data on the blockchain is public	✓
ownerOf()	Is declared as a public view function	✓
	Returns the address of the owner of the NFT	✓
getApproved()	Is declared as a public view function	✓
	Reverts while '_tokenId' does not exist	✓
	Returns the approved address for this NFT	✓
isApprovedForAll()	Is declared as a public view function	✓
	Returns a boolean value which check '_operator' is an approved operator	✓

Our analysis shows that there is no ERC721 inconsistency or incompatibility issue found in the audited SelfNft. In the surrounding two tables, we outline the respective list of basic `view-only` functions (Table 3.1) and key `state-changing` functions (Table 3.2) according to the widely-adopted ERC721 specification.

Table 3.2: Key `State-Changing` Functions Defined in The ERC721 Specification

Item	Description	Status
safeTransferFrom()	Is declared as a public function	✓
	Reverts while 'to' refers to a smart contract and not implement IERC721Receiver-onERC721Received	✓
	Reverts unless 'msg.sender' is the current owner, an authorized operator, or the approved address for this NFT	✓
	Reverts while '_tokenId' is not a valid NFT	✓
	Reverts while '_from' is not the current owner	✓
	Reverts while transferring to zero address	✓
	Emits Transfer() event when tokens are transferred successfully	✓
transferFrom()	Is declared as a public function	✓
	Reverts unless 'msg.sender' is the current owner, an authorized operator, or the approved address for this NFT	✓
	Reverts while '_tokenId' is not a valid NFT	✓
	Reverts while '_from' is not the current owner	✓
	Reverts while transferring to zero address	✓
	Emits Transfer() event when tokens are transferred successfully	✓
approve()	Is declared as a public function	✓
	Reverts unless 'msg.sender' is the current owner, an authorized operator, or the approved address for this NFT	✓
	Emits Approval() event when tokens are approved successfully	✓
setApprovalForAll()	Is declared as a public function	✓
	Reverts while not approving to caller	✓
	Emits ApprovalForAll() event when tokens are approved successfully	✓
Transfer() event	Is emitted when tokens are transferred	✓
Approval() event	Is emitted on any successful call to approve()	✓
ApprovalForAll() event	Is emitted on any successful call to setApprovalForAll()	✓

4 Detailed Results

4.1 Improved Commission Validation in SelfNft

- ID: PVE-001
- Severity: Informational
- Likelihood: N/A
- Impact: N/A
- Target: `SelfNft`
- Category: Coding Practices [5]
- CWE subcategory: CWE-1126 [1]

Description

The `SelfNft` token contract allows a trusted agent (external service) to register a name for a user on the platform. The agent earns a commission for each successful name registration. While examining the commission management, we notice the commission update logic can be improved.

To elaborate, we show below the implementation of the related `editAgent()` routine. It allows the owner to configure the agent commission rate. We notice the provided commission rate is not validated and the implementation has an implicit assumption that the given commission should be no larger than `1e12`.

```
441     function editAgent(address _agent, uint _commission) external onlyOwner {
442         if (_agent == address(0)) revert InvalidAddressError();
443         if (_commission == 0) revert InvalidCommissionError();
444         if (!agents[_agent].isAgent) revert NotAgentError();
446         agents[_agent].commission = _commission;
448         emit AgentUpdated(_agent, _commission);
449     }
```

Listing 4.1: `SelfNft::editAgent()`

Recommendation Ensure the given commission rate is no larger than `1e12`.

Status This issue has been resolved. Since the contract has been deployed, the team will exercise extra caution in configuring the affected commission rate.

4.2 Revisited Logic to Forward collectedTokens

- ID: PVE-002
- Severity: Low
- Likelihood: Low
- Impact: Low
- Target: `SelfNftAddon`
- Category: Business Logic [6]
- CWE subcategory: CWE-841 [3]

Description

With the `SelfNftMultitokenAddon` extension, `SelfNft` allows users to register names as `Non-Fungible Tokens (NFTs)` using multiple types of tokens, rather than being restricted to a single token. This is made possible through real-time price feeds provided by `Chainlink` oracles, which ensure that the cost of name registration is accurately calculated in the chosen token at the time of purchase. While reviewing the logic of removing a specific `Chainlink` oracle, we notice the implementation can be improved.

To elaborate, we show below the `removeChainlinkPricefeed()` routine. This routine has a rather straightforward logic in validating the given payment token and simply removing it from being supported. However, the current implementation does not properly forward the collected token to the caller.

```
405     function removeChainlinkPricefeed(
406         address _paymentToken
407     ) external onlyOwner {
408         // Validate the payment token address
409         if (_paymentToken == address(0)) revert ZeroAddressError();
410
411         // Check if a price feed already exists for the payment token
412         if (chainlinkPriceFeeds[_paymentToken].paymentToken == address(0))
413             revert NotAPriceFeed();
414
415         // Remove the Chainlink price feed for the payment token
416         chainlinkPriceFeeds[_paymentToken].paymentToken = address(0);
417
418         // Emit an event to log the removal of the Chainlink price feed
419         emit ChainlinkPriceFeedRemoved(_paymentToken);
420     }
```

Listing 4.2: `SelfNftAddon::removeChainlinkPricefeed()`

Recommendation Revise the above logic to properly transfer the collected tokens once the respective payment token is not supported.

Status The issue has been fixed by the following commits: `2420ae7` and `7bdcd47`.

4.3 Trust Issue of Admin Keys

- ID: PVE-003
- Severity: Low
- Likelihood: Low
- Impact: Low
- Target: `Multiple Contracts`
- Category: Security Features [4]
- CWE subcategory: CWE-287 [2]

Description

In the `SelfNft` contract, there exists a privileged `owner` account that plays important roles in governing and regulating the contract-wide operations. In the following, we examine this privileged account and the related privileged accesses in current contracts.

```
441     function editAgent(address _agent, uint _commission) external onlyOwner {
442         if (_agent == address(0)) revert InvalidAddressError();
443         if (_commission == 0) revert InvalidCommissionError();
444         if (!agents[_agent].isAgent) revert NotAgentError();
445
446         agents[_agent].commission = _commission;
447
448         emit AgentUpdated(_agent, _commission);
449     }
450
451     /**
452      * @notice Adds a new agent with the specified address and commission.
453      * @param _agent The address of the agent to add.
454      * @param _commission The commission rate for the agent.
455      * @dev _commision should be in 10**6
456      */
457     function addAgent(address _agent, uint _commission) external onlyOwner {
458         if (_agent == address(0)) revert InvalidAddressError();
459         if (_commission == 0) revert InvalidCommissionError();
460         if (agents[_agent].isAgent) revert AlreadyAgentError();
461
462         agents[_agent] = Agent({isAgent: true, commission: _commission});
463
464         emit AgentAdded(_agent, _commission);
465     }
466
467     /**
468      * @notice Removes the specified agent.
469      * @param _agent The address of the agent to remove
470      */
471     function removeAgent(address _agent) external onlyOwner {
472         if (_agent == address(0)) revert InvalidAddressError();
473         if (!agents[_agent].isAgent) revert NotAgentError();
474
475         agents[_agent].isAgent = false;
```

```
476
477         emit AgentRemoved(_agent);
478     }
479
480     /// @notice Pauses the contract, disabling name registration and other functions.
481     function pause() external onlyOwner {
482         _pause();
483     }
484
485     /// @notice Unpauses the contract, enabling name registration and other functions.
486     function unpause() external onlyOwner {
487         _unpause();
488     }
```

Listing 4.3: Privileged Operations in `SelfNft`

We understand the need of the privileged functions for proper contract operations, but at the same time the extra power to these privileged accounts may also be a counter-party risk to the contract users. Therefore, we list this concern as an issue here from the audit perspective and highly recommend making these privileges explicit or raising necessary awareness among protocol users.

Recommendation Make the list of extra privileges granted to these privileged accounts explicit to the token users.

Status This issue has been confirmed and the team will have a multisig wallet to be the admin.

5 | Conclusion

In this security audit, we have examined the `SelfNft` contract design and implementation. During our audit, we first checked all respects related to the compatibility of the ERC721 specification and other known ERC721 pitfalls/vulnerabilities and found no issue in these areas. We then proceeded to examine other areas such as coding practices and business logics. Overall, we found one low-severity issue and three informational recommendations which are promptly addressed by the team. Meanwhile, as disclaimed in Section 1.4, we appreciate any constructive feedbacks or suggestions about our findings, procedures, audit scope, etc.

References

[1] MITRE. CWE-1126: Declaration of Variable with Unnecessarily Wide Scope. https://cwe.mitre.org/data/definitions/1126.html.

[2] MITRE. CWE-287: Improper Authentication. https://cwe.mitre.org/data/definitions/287.html.

[3] MITRE. CWE-841: Improper Enforcement of Behavioral Workflow. https://cwe.mitre.org/data/definitions/841.html.

[4] MITRE. CWE CATEGORY: 7PK - Security Features. https://cwe.mitre.org/data/definitions/254.html.

[5] MITRE. CWE CATEGORY: Bad Coding Practices. https://cwe.mitre.org/data/definitions/1006.html.

[6] MITRE. CWE CATEGORY: Business Logic Errors. https://cwe.mitre.org/data/definitions/840.html.

[7] MITRE. CWE VIEW: Development Concepts. https://cwe.mitre.org/data/definitions/699.html.

[8] OWASP. Risk Rating Methodology. https://www.owasp.org/index.php/OWASP_Risk_Rating_Methodology.

[9] PeckShield. PeckShield Inc. https://www.peckshield.com.