



**SOLIDProof**  
*Bring trust into your projects*

**Blockchain Security | Smart Contract Audits | KYC**

MADE IN GERMANY

# Coinraise Audit

**Security Assessment**  
**02. March, 2022**

**For**



Disclaimer	3
Description	5
Project Engagement	5
Logo	5
Contract Link	5
Methodology	7
Used Code from other Frameworks/Smart Contracts (direct imports)	8
Tested Contract Files	9
Source Lines	10
Risk Level	10
Capabilities	11
Inheritance Graph	12
CallGraph	13
Scope of Work/Verify Claims	14
Modifiers and public functions	20
Source Units in Scope	22
Critical issues	23
High issues	23
Medium issues	23
Low issues	23
Informational issues	24
Audit Comments	25
SWC Attacks	26

# Disclaimer

SolidProof.io reports are not, nor should be considered, an “endorsement” or “disapproval” of any particular project or team. These reports are not, nor should be considered, an indication of the economics or value of any “product” or “asset” created by any team. SolidProof.io do not cover testing or auditing the integration with external contract or services (such as Unicrypt, Uniswap, PancakeSwap etc’...)

**SolidProof.io Audits do not provide any warranty or guarantee regarding the absolute bug- free nature of the technology analyzed, nor do they provide any indication of the technology proprietors. SolidProof Audits should not be used in any way to make decisions around investment or involvement with any particular project. These reports in no way provide investment advice, nor should be leveraged as investment advice of any sort.**

SolidProof.io Reports represent an extensive auditing process intending to help our customers increase the quality of their code while reducing the high level of risk presented by cryptographic tokens and blockchain technology. Blockchain technology and cryptographic assets present a high level of ongoing risk. SolidProof’s position is that each company and individual are responsible for their own due diligence and continuous security. SolidProof in no way claims any guarantee of security or functionality of the technology we agree to analyze.

Version	Date	Description
1.0	01. March 2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Layout project</li><li>• Automated- /Manual-Security Testing</li><li>• Summary</li></ul>

## Network

Binance Smart Chain (BEP20)

## Website

<https://coinraise.me/>

## Twitter

<https://twitter.com/coinraiseme>



## Description

TBA

## Project Engagement

During the 25th of February 2022, **Coinraise Team** engaged Solidproof.io to audit smart contracts that they created. The engagement was technical in nature and focused on identifying security flaws in the design and implementation of the contracts. They provided Solidproof.io with access to their code repository and whitepaper.

## Logo



## Contract Link

**v1.0**

- Github
  - <https://github.com/coinraise/contracts>
  - Commit: 33d346f26caee0caf2af75f92457f0157f9e1168

# Vulnerability & Risk Level

Risk represents the probability that a certain source-threat will exploit vulnerability, and the impact of that event on the organization or system. Risk Level is computed based on CVSS version 3.0.

Level	Value	Vulnerability	Risk (Required Action)
<b>Critical</b>	9 - 10	A vulnerability that can disrupt the contract functioning in a number of scenarios, or creates a risk that the contract may be broken.	Immediate action to reduce risk level.
<b>High</b>	7 – 8.9	A vulnerability that affects the desired outcome when using a contract, or provides the opportunity to use a contract in an unintended way.	Implementation of corrective actions as soon as possible.
<b>Medium</b>	4 – 6.9	A vulnerability that could affect the desired outcome of executing the contract in a specific scenario.	Implementation of corrective actions in a certain period.
<b>Low</b>	2 – 3.9	A vulnerability that does not have a significant impact on possible scenarios for the use of the contract and is probably subjective.	Implementation of certain corrective actions or accepting the risk.
<b>Informational</b>	0 – 1.9	A vulnerability that have informational character but is not effecting any of the code.	An observation that does not determine a level of risk

# Auditing Strategy and Techniques Applied

Throughout the review process, care was taken to evaluate the repository for security-related issues, code quality, and adherence to specification and best practices. To do so, reviewed line-by-line by our team of expert pentesters and smart contract developers, documenting any issues as there were discovered.

## **Methodology**

The auditing process follows a routine series of steps:

1. Code review that includes the following:
  - i) Review of the specifications, sources, and instructions provided to SolidProof to make sure we understand the size, scope, and functionality of the smart contract.
  - ii) Manual review of code, which is the process of reading source code line-by-line in an attempt to identify potential vulnerabilities.
  - iii) Comparison to specification, which is the process of checking whether the code does what the specifications, sources, and instructions provided to SolidProof describe.
2. Testing and automated analysis that includes the following:
  - i) Test coverage analysis, which is the process of determining whether the test cases are actually covering the code and how much code is exercised when we run those test cases.
  - ii) Symbolic execution, which is analysing a program to determine what inputs causes each part of a program to execute.
3. Best practices review, which is a review of the smart contracts to improve efficiency, effectiveness, clarify, maintainability, security, and control based on the established industry and academic practices, recommendations, and research.
4. Specific, itemized, actionable recommendations to help you take steps to secure your smart contracts.

## Used Code from other Frameworks/Smart Contracts (direct imports)

Imported packages:

**CampaignV0.sol**

CampaignV0Factory.sol

Clones.sol

Context.sol

ERC20.sol

IERC20.sol

IERC20Metadata.sol

Transferrer.sol



## Tested Contract Files

This audit covered the following files listed below with a SHA-1 Hash.


*A file with a different Hash has been modified, intentionally or otherwise, after the security review. A different Hash could be (but not necessarily) an indication of a changed condition or potential vulnerability that was not within the scope of this review.*

### v1.0


File Name	SHA-1 Hash
contracts/CampaignV0.sol	463affbbfa9e71155759abc79ea2d50b8b6a8aa9
contracts/Context.sol	6a0b5b8e1b849d1ea73eabcfb1c9cd7e0cdb91b
contracts/IERC20Metadata.sol	527f21f2724a24e1397572f80aeb688a61269b29
contracts/Clones.sol	ce216e47e903bcfcd0043aa6bea15b1fcc1d6ecb
contracts/Transferrer.sol	82f7d9384a97a25ca77773697dfaa10d69890176
contracts/ERC20.sol	758cc50dc3a1d4a811c53211fcf3114c453ed647
contracts/CampaignV0Factory.sol	3c4c387e5f3af7c000144fba162cee2b98259cca
contracts/IERC20.sol	d39c65c2107eb96ddca61b8e77fa6e8887682903

# Metrics

## Source Lines v1.0



## Risk Level v1.0



## Capabilities

### Components

Version	Contracts	Libraries	Interfaces	Abstract
1.0	4	1	2	1

### Exposed Functions

*This section lists functions that are explicitly declared public or payable. Please note that getter methods for public stateVars are not included.*

Version	Public	Payable
1.0	33	0

Version	External	Internal	Private	Pure	View
1.0	9	43	0	1	16

### State Variables


Version	Total	Public
1.0	26	20

### Capabilities

Version	Solidity Versions observed	Experimental Features	Can Receive Funds	Uses Assembly	Has Destroyable Contracts
1.0	<code>^0.8.11</code> <code>^0.8.0</code>			yes (3 asm blocks)	


Version	Transfers ETH	Low-Level Calls	DelegateCall	Uses Hash Functions	EC Recover	New/Create/Create2
1.0	yes					yes → AssemblyCall:Name:create → AssemblyCall:Name:create2

## Inheritance Graph v1.0



# CallGraph

## v1.0



## Scope of Work/Verify Claims

The above token Team provided us with the files that needs to be tested (Github, Bscscan, Etherscan, files, etc.). The scope of the audit is the main contract (usual the same name as team appended with .sol).

We will verify the following claims:

1. Correct implementation of Token standard
2. Deployer cannot mint any new tokens
3. Deployer cannot burn or lock user funds
4. Deployer cannot pause the contract
5. Overall checkup (Smart Contract Security)

### Correct implementation of Token standard

Function	Description	Exist	Tested	Verified
TotalSupply	provides information about the total token supply	✓	✓	✓
BalanceOf	provides account balance of the owner's account	✓	✓	✓
Transfer	executes transfers of a specified number of tokens to a specified address	✓	✓	✓
TransferFrom	executes transfers of a specified number of tokens from a specified address	✓	✓	✓
Approve	allow a spender to withdraw a set number of tokens from a specified account	✓	✓	✓
Allowance	returns a set number of tokens from a spender to the owner	✓	✓	✓

## Write functions of contract v1.0

CampaignV0

- ◆ **init**
- ◆ **donate**
- ◆ **transfer**
- ◆ **withdrawOwner**
- ◆ **withdrawDonor**
- ◆ **withdrawAdmin**

CampaignV0Factory

- ◆ **setFee**
- ◆ **transferAdmin**
- ◆ **transferBenefactor**
- ◆ **<Constructor>**
- ◆ **createCampaign**

ERC20

- ◆ **mint**
- ◆ **transfer**
- ◆ **approve**
- ◆ **transferFrom**
- ◆ **increaseAllowance**
- ◆ **decreaseAllowance**

Transferrer

- ◆ **donate**

## Deployer cannot mint any new tokens

Name	Exist	Tested	Status
Deployer cannot mint	✓	✓	✓
Max / Total Supply			

Comments:

**v1.0**

- Everybody can mint Tokens





## Deployer cannot burn or lock user funds

Name	Exist	Tested	Status
Deployer cannot lock	✓	✓	✓
Deployer cannot burn	✓	✓	✓



## Deployer cannot pause the contract

Name	Exist	Tested	Status
Deployer cannot pause	—	—	—



## Overall checkup (Smart Contract Security)

Tested	Verified
✓	✓

### Legend

Attribute	Symbol
Verified / Checked	✓
Partly Verified	⚠
Unverified / Not checked	✗
Not available	—

# Modifiers and public functions

v1.0

- ◆ **init**
- ▼ ◆ **donate**
  - Ⓜ onlyTransferrer
- ▼ ◆ **transfer**
  - Ⓜ onlyOwner
- ▼ ◆ **withdrawOwner**
  - Ⓜ onlyOwner
- ◆ **withdrawDonor**
- ◆ **withdrawAdmin**

- ▼ ◆ **setFee**
  - Ⓜ onlyAdmin
- ▼ ◆ **transferAdmin**
  - Ⓜ onlyAdmin
- ▼ ◆ **transferBenefactor**
  - Ⓜ onlyAdmin
- ◆ **<Constructor>**
- ◆ **createCampaign**

- ◆ **mint**
- ◆ **transfer**
- ◆ **approve**
- ◆ **transferFrom**
- ◆ **increaseAllowance**
- ◆ **decreaseAllowance**

- ◆ **donate**
















## Comments

- Deployer can set following addresses
  - owner
- OnlyAdmin
  - fee
  - admin
  - feeBenefactor
- Only Transferrer can call following functions
  - donate
- Only Owner can call following functions
  - transfer
  - withdrawOwner
  - transfer

**Please check if an OnlyOwner or similar restrictive modifier has been forgotten.**

# Source Units in Scope

## v1.0

Type	File	Logic Contracts	Interfaces	Lines	nLines	nSLOC	Comment Lines	Complex. Score	Capabilities
	contracts/CampaignV0.sol	1	————	210	210	81	90	66	
	contracts/Context.sol	1	————	24	24	9	12	1	————
	contracts/IERC20Metadata.sol	————	1	28	17	4	16	9	
	contracts/Clones.sol	1	————	84	76	38	33	123	
	contracts/Transferrer.sol	1	————	20	20	13	4	8	————
	contracts/ERC20.sol	1	————	360	340	107	194	84	
	contracts/CampaignV0Factory.sol	1	————	51	51	42	1	27	————
	contracts/IERC20.sol	————	1	82	27	17	58	13	
	<b>Totals</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>859</b>	<b>765</b>	<b>311</b>	<b>408</b>	<b>331</b>	

## Legend

Attribute	Description
Lines	total lines of the source unit
nLines	normalized lines of the source unit (e.g. normalizes functions spanning multiple lines)
nSLOC	normalized source lines of code (only source-code lines; no comments, no blank lines)
Comment Lines	lines containing single or block comments
Complexity Score	a custom complexity score derived from code statements that are known to introduce code complexity (branches, loops, calls, external interfaces, ...)

# Audit Results

## AUDIT PASSED

### Critical issues

No critical issues

### High issues

No high issues

### Medium issues

No medium issues

### Low issues

Issue	File	Type	Line	Description
#1	Main	Contract doesn't import npm packages from source (like OpenZeppelin etc.)	-	We recommend to import all packages from npm directly without flatten the contract. Functions could be modified or can be susceptible to vulnerabilities
#2	All	A floating pragma is set	See description	Different pragma directives are used: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• ^0.8.9 (CampaignV0Factory.sol:L1)</li><li>• ^0.8.9 (Transferrer.sol L1)</li><li>• ^0.8.0 (Clones.sol L4)</li><li>• ^0.8.0 (Context.sol L4)</li><li>• ^0.8.0 (IERC20Metadata.sol L4)</li><li>• ^0.8.0 (ERC20.sol L4)</li><li>• ^0.8.9 (CampaignV0.sol L2)</li><li>• ^0.8.0 (IERC20.sol L4)</li></ul>

#3	CampaignV0	Missing Zero Address Validation (missing-zero-check)	132, 171	Check that the address is not zero
#4	CampaignV0Factory	Missing Zero Address Validation (missing-zero-check)	36, 26, 30	Check that the address is not zero
#5	Transferer	Missing Zero Address Validation (missing-zero-check)	12	Check that the address is not zero
#6	CampaignV0	Missing Events Arithmetic	172	Emit an event for critical parameter changes
#7	CampaignV0Factory	Missing Events Arithmetic	23, 27	Emit an event for critical parameter changes

## Informational issues

Issue	File	Type	Line	Description
#1	Context	Functions that are not used	21	Remove unused functions
#2	ERC20	Functions that are not used	279	Remove unused functions
#3	CampaignV0, CampaignV0Factory, Transferer	SPDX License Identifier is missing	See description	Provide a SPDX License Identifier at the top of the source files



## Audit Comments

We recommend you to use the special form of comments (NatSpec Format, Follow link for more information <https://docs.soliditylang.org/en/v0.5.10/natspec-format.html>) for your contracts to provide rich documentation for functions, return variables and more. This helps investors to make clear what that variables, functions etc. do.

### 01. March 2022:

- Read whole report for more information



## SWC Attacks

ID	Title	Relationships	Status
<a href="#">SW C-1 36</a>	Unencrypted Private Data On-Chain	<a href="#">CWE-767: Access to Critical Private Variable via Public Method</a>	PASSED
<a href="#">SW C-1 35</a>	Code With No Effects	<a href="#">CWE-1164: Irrelevant Code</a>	PASSED
<a href="#">SW C-1 34</a>	Message call with hardcoded gas amount	<a href="#">CWE-655: Improper Initialization</a>	PASSED
<a href="#">SW C-1 33</a>	Hash Collisions With Multiple Variable Length Arguments	<a href="#">CWE-294: Authentication Bypass by Capture-replay</a>	PASSED
<a href="#">SW C-1 32</a>	Unexpected Ether balance	<a href="#">CWE-667: Improper Locking</a>	PASSED
<a href="#">SW C-1 31</a>	Presence of unused variables	<a href="#">CWE-1164: Irrelevant Code</a>	PASSED
<a href="#">SW C-1 30</a>	Right-To-Left-Override control character (U+202E)	<a href="#">CWE-451: User Interface (UI) Misrepresentation of Critical Information</a>	PASSED
<a href="#">SW C-1 29</a>	Typographical Error	<a href="#">CWE-480: Use of Incorrect Operator</a>	PASSED
<a href="#">SW C-1 28</a>	DoS With Block Gas Limit	<a href="#">CWE-400: Uncontrolled Resource Consumption</a>	PASSED

<a href="#">SW C-1 27</a>	Arbitrary Jump with Function Type Variable	<a href="#">CWE-695: Use of Low-Level Functionality</a>	<b>PASSED</b>
<a href="#">SW C-1 25</a>	Incorrect Inheritance Order	<a href="#">CWE-696: Incorrect Behavior Order</a>	<b>PASSED</b>
<a href="#">SW C-1 24</a>	Write to Arbitrary Storage Location	<a href="#">CWE-123: Write-what-where Condition</a>	<b>PASSED</b>
<a href="#">SW C-1 23</a>	Requirement Violation	<a href="#">CWE-573: Improper Following of Specification by Caller</a>	<b>PASSED</b>
<a href="#">SW C-1 22</a>	Lack of Proper Signature Verification	<a href="#">CWE-345: Insufficient Verification of Data Authenticity</a>	<b>PASSED</b>
<a href="#">SW C-1 21</a>	Missing Protection against Signature Replay Attacks	<a href="#">CWE-347: Improper Verification of Cryptographic Signature</a>	<b>PASSED</b>
<a href="#">SW C-1 20</a>	Weak Sources of Randomness from Chain Attributes	<a href="#">CWE-330: Use of Insufficiently Random Values</a>	<b>PASSED</b>
<a href="#">SW C-11 9</a>	Shadowing State Variables	<a href="#">CWE-710: Improper Adherence to Coding Standards</a>	<b>PASSED</b>
<a href="#">SW C-11 8</a>	Incorrect Constructor Name	<a href="#">CWE-665: Improper Initialization</a>	<b>PASSED</b>
<a href="#">SW C-11 7</a>	Signature Malleability	<a href="#">CWE-347: Improper Verification of Cryptographic Signature</a>	<b>PASSED</b>

<a href="#">SW C-11 6</a>	Timestamp Dependence	<a href="#">CWE-829: Inclusion of Functionality from Untrusted Control Sphere</a>	<b>PASSED</b>
<a href="#">SW C-11 5</a>	Authorization through tx.origin	<a href="#">CWE-477: Use of Obsolete Function</a>	<b>PASSED</b>
<a href="#">SW C-11 4</a>	Transaction Order Dependence	<a href="#">CWE-362: Concurrent Execution using Shared Resource with Improper Synchronization ('Race Condition')</a>	<b>PASSED</b>
<a href="#">SW C-11 3</a>	DoS with Failed Call	<a href="#">CWE-703: Improper Check or Handling of Exceptional Conditions</a>	<b>PASSED</b>
<a href="#">SW C-11 2</a>	Delegatecall to Untrusted Callee	<a href="#">CWE-829: Inclusion of Functionality from Untrusted Control Sphere</a>	<b>PASSED</b>
<a href="#">SW C-11 1</a>	Use of Deprecated Solidity Functions	<a href="#">CWE-477: Use of Obsolete Function</a>	<b>PASSED</b>
<a href="#">SW C-11 0</a>	Assert Violation	<a href="#">CWE-670: Always-Incorrect Control Flow Implementation</a>	<b>PASSED</b>
<a href="#">SW C-1 09</a>	Uninitialized Storage Pointer	<a href="#">CWE-824: Access of Uninitialized Pointer</a>	<b>PASSED</b>
<a href="#">SW C-1 08</a>	State Variable Default Visibility	<a href="#">CWE-710: Improper Adherence to Coding Standards</a>	<b>PASSED</b>
<a href="#">SW C-1 07</a>	Reentrancy	<a href="#">CWE-841: Improper Enforcement of Behavioral Workflow</a>	<b>PASSED</b>
<a href="#">SW C-1 06</a>	Unprotected SELFDESTRUCT Instruction	<a href="#">CWE-284: Improper Access Control</a>	<b>PASSED</b>

<a href="#">SW</a> <a href="#">C-1</a> <a href="#">05</a>	Unprotected Ether Withdrawal	<a href="#">CWE-284: Improper Access Control</a>	<b>PASSED</b>
<a href="#">SW</a> <a href="#">C-1</a> <a href="#">04</a>	Unchecked Call Return Value	<a href="#">CWE-252: Unchecked Return Value</a>	<b>PASSED</b>
<a href="#">SW</a> <a href="#">C-1</a> <a href="#">03</a>	Floating Pragma	<a href="#">CWE-664: Improper Control of a Resource Through its Lifetime</a>	<b>NOT PASSED</b>
<a href="#">SW</a> <a href="#">C-1</a> <a href="#">02</a>	Outdated Compiler Version	<a href="#">CWE-937: Using Components with Known Vulnerabilities</a>	<b>PASSED</b>
<a href="#">SW</a> <a href="#">C-1</a> <a href="#">01</a>	Integer Overflow and Underflow	<a href="#">CWE-682: Incorrect Calculation</a>	<b>PASSED</b>
<a href="#">SW</a> <a href="#">C-1</a> <a href="#">00</a>	Function Default Visibility	<a href="#">CWE-710: Improper Adherence to Coding Standards</a>	<b>PASSED</b>

The logo features the words "SolidProof" in a white, handwritten-style script. The "P" is particularly large and stylized, with a long horizontal stroke that extends to the left. The background is a solid blue color with a faint, larger-scale grid pattern. Behind the text, there is a faint, semi-transparent shield shape that also contains a grid pattern, suggesting a digital or cryptographic theme.

SolidProof

**Blockchain Security | Smart Contract Audits | KYC**

A small horizontal bar representing the German flag, with black, red, and gold stripes.

MADE IN GERMANY