



**4th05**

vVv

## *Security Review Report*

17 November 2024

# Security Review Report

4th05

November 17, 2024

## Table of Contents

- Table of Contents
- Protocol Summary
- Disclaimer
- Risk Classification
- Overview
- Scope
- Issues found
- Findings
  - [H1] `VVVVCTokenDistributor::claim` replay/front-running/reorg attack

## Protocol Summary

vVv facilitates both seed & launchpad deals. This contest focusses on the contracts required for running these investments and distributing the tokens to the investors.

## Disclaimer

A smart contract security review can never verify the complete absence of vulnerabilities. This is a time, resource and expertise bound effort where I try to find as many vulnerabilities as possible. I can not guarantee 100% security after the review or even if the review will find any problems with your smart contracts. Subsequent security reviews, bug bounty programs and on-chain monitoring are strongly recommended.

## Risk Classification

		Impact		
		High	Medium	Low
Likelihood	High	H	H/M	M
	Medium	H/M	M	M/L
	Low	M	M/L	L

## Overview

Contest platform	Sherlock
LOC	279
Language	Solidity
Commit	1791f41b310489aaa66de349ef1b9e4bd331f14b
Previous audits	n/a

## Scope

- VVVVInvestmentLedger.sol
- VVVVTokenDistributor.sol

## Issues found

Severity	Number of issues found
High	1
Medium	0
Low	0
Info	0

## Findings

### [H1] VVVVTokenDistributor::claim replay/front-running/reorg attack

#### Summary

In `VVVVTokenDistributor.sol` a valid call to the `VVVVTokenDistributor::claim` function can be replayed by a malicious actor to stole the remaining funds from the wallets (the `VVVVTokenDistributor::projectTokenProxyWallets`) of the OG caller bypassing all the requirements.

#### Relevant GitHub Links

<https://github.com/sherlock-audit/2024-11-vvv-exchange-update/blob/main/vvv-platform-smart-contracts/contracts/vc/VVVVTokenDistributor.sol#L42>

<https://github.com/sherlock-audit/2024-11-vvv-exchange-update/blob/main/vvv-platform-smart-contracts/contracts/vc/VVVVTokenDistributor.sol#L51>

#### Root Cause

To prevent replay attack of the `VVVVTokenDistributor::claim` function the `uint256 nonce` has been added to the `VVVVTokenDistributor::ClaimParams struct::ClaimParams`.

```
1 struct ClaimParams {
2     address kycAddress;
3     address projectTokenAddress;
4     address[] projectTokenProxyWallets;
5     uint256[] tokenAmountsToClaim;
6     uint256 nonce;
7     uint256 deadline;
8     bytes signature;
9 }
```

This `nonce` is incremented by one off-chain before calling the `claim` function. However, this value, as of all the other input parameters can be seen in a blockchain explorer, like [etherscan](#) (according to the chain this could be [avascan](#), [bscscan](#), [arbiscan](#), [basescan](#), [statescan](#)) by a malicious actor that can retrieve them by decoding the calldata. Since there are no requirements in place for the actual `msg.sender`, these parameters will satisfy all of them allowing, this way, malicious actors to stole funds by either replay the call function to `VVVVCTokenDistributor::claim` using these data but with a `nonce` value incremented by one (also the `ClaimParams.tokenAmountsToClaim` value could be changed if needed), or by front running the OG caller by paying more fees or by exploiting a [blockchain reorg](#) without the need (in these last 2 cases) to change any data.

```
1 function claim(ClaimParams memory _params) public {
2     if (claimIsPaused) {
3         revert ClaimIsPaused();
4     }
5
6     if (_params.projectTokenProxyWallets.length != _params.
7         tokenAmountsToClaim.length) {
8         revert ArrayLengthMismatch();
9     }
10    if (_params.nonce <= nonces[_params.kycAddress]) {
11        revert InvalidNonce();
12    }
13
14    if (!_isSignatureValid(_params)) {
15        revert InvalidSignature();
16    }
17
18    // update nonce
19    nonces[_params.kycAddress] = _params.nonce;
20
21    // define token to transfer
22    IERC20 projectToken = IERC20(_params.projectTokenAddress);
23
24    // transfer tokens from each wallet to the caller
25    for (uint256 i = 0; i < _params.projectTokenProxyWallets.length
        ; i++) {
```

```
26         projectToken.safeTransferFrom(
27             _params.projectTokenProxyWallets[i],
28             msg.sender,
29             _params.tokenAmountsToClaim[i]
30         );
31     }
32
33     emit VCClaim(
34         _params.kycAddress,
35         _params.projectTokenAddress,
36         _params.projectTokenProxyWallets,
37         _params.tokenAmountsToClaim,
38         _params.nonce
39     );
40 }
```

### Internal pre-conditions

A user has an amount of tokens in the `VVVVCTokenDistributor::projectTokenProxyWallets` and wants to withdraw a part of the funds by calling the `VVVVCTokenDistributor::claim`.

### External pre-conditions

A malicious actor sees the transaction on the block explorer and retrieve all the input data used by the OG caller and use them just changing the `nonce` value (that has to be incremented by one) to claim/steal, in this way, other funds.

### Impact

The user (OG caller) can potentially loose all his funds in `VVVVCTokenDistributor::projectTokenProxyWallets` which will be transfered to the attacker `address` as the new `msg.sender`.

```
1     for (uint256 i = 0; i < _params.projectTokenProxyWallets.length;
2         i++) {
3         projectToken.safeTransferFrom(
4             _params.projectTokenProxyWallets[i],
5             msg.sender,
6             _params.tokenAmountsToClaim[i]
7         );
8     }
```

### Mitigation

Implement a requirement/check based on the `msg.sender` to prevent this kind of attack to happen.