Smart Contract Audit Report for Funtico

Testers

1. Or Duan
2. Avigdor Sason Cohen

Table of Contents

Management Summary

Funtico contacted Sayfer to perform a security audit on their smart contracts in July 2024.

This report documents the research carried out by Sayfer targeting the selected resources defined under the research scope. Particularly, this report displays the security posture review for Funtico's smart contracts.

Over the research period of 20 research hours, we discovered 8 vulnerabilities in the contract.

Several fixes should be implemented following the report, to ensure the system's security posture is competent.

After a review by the Sayfer team, we certify that all the security issues mentioned in this report have been addressed by the Funtico team.

Risk Methodology

At Sayfer, we are committed to delivering the highest quality smart contract audits to our clients. That's why we have implemented a comprehensive risk assessment model to evaluate the severity of our findings and provide our clients with the best possible recommendations for mitigation.

Our risk assessment model is based on two key factors: **IMPACT** and **LIKELIHOOD**. Impact refers to the potential harm that could result from an issue, such as financial loss, reputational damage, or a non-operational system. Likelihood refers to the probability that an issue will occur, taking into account factors such as the complexity of the contract and the number of potential attackers.

By combining these two factors, we can create a comprehensive understanding of the risk posed by a particular issue and provide our clients with a clear and actionable assessment of the severity of the issue. This approach allows us to prioritize our recommendations and ensure that our clients receive the best possible advice on how to protect their smart contracts.

Risk is defined as follows:



Vulnerabilities by Risk



Risk	Low	Medium	High	Critical	Informational
# of issues	1	0	1	0	6

Approach

Introduction

Funtico contacted Sayfer to perform a security audit on their smart contracts.

This report documents the research carried out by Sayfer targeting the selected resources defined under the research scope. Particularly, this report displays the security posture review for the aforementioned contracts.

Scope Overview

Together with the client team we defined the following contract as the scope of the project.

Contract	SHA-256
`Bridge.sol`	`b073449320b361f0ccb230f822fd0b6a33065ebcec713798565a4248556a3489`
`LockReleaseBridge.sol`	`92de9fd648473559eb9b491bfa54c5d74af4b82fff4550b1117e7c1c3c95ede2`
`MintBurnBridge.sol`	`16f5d05eb2564cce8e9800aeb0a70ffb4f450a59a5a55794301559ab595ec8cd`
`utils/BridgeErrors.sol`	`910cfc4dd0d713a9cef9930b4a89f34484d8b96f0839f0d7ca0fc4834587f090`
`utils/BridgeEvents.sol`	`2b297e6232835da85e44da7e85ef4c49d8a8b2a2a31ea7904b2840b8946392f2`
`utils/BridgeTypes.sol`	`1db96ca7acec20a95a7493347aa922f5b58183df0139521ae08a973604c72776`
`utils/BridgeUtils.sol`	`1d66927281b969ef31c54850ccbc8e655c9a80585bd60905fb5fb9f117503b5b`

Our tests were performed from 31/7/2024 to 7/8/2024.

Scope Validation

We began by ensuring that the scope defined to us by the client was technically logical. Deciding what scope is right for a given system is part of the initial discussion.

Threat Model

We defined that the largest current threat to the system is the ability of malicious users to steal funds from the contract.

Security Evaluation

The following test cases were the guideline while auditing the system. This checklist is a modified version of the SCSVS v1.2, with improved grammar, clarity, conciseness, and additional criteria. Where there is a gap in the numbering, an original criterion was removed. Criteria that are marked with an asterisk were added by us.

Architecture, Design and Threat Modeling	Test Name
G1.2	Every introduced design change is preceded by threat modeling.
G1.3	The documentation clearly and precisely defines all trust boundaries in the contract (trusted relations with other contracts and significant data flows).
G1.4	The SCSVS, security requirements or policy is available to all developers and testers.
G1.5	The events for the (state changing/crucial for business) operations are defined.
G1.6	The project includes a mechanism that can temporarily stop sensitive functionalities in case of an attack. This mechanism should not block users' access to their assets (e.g. tokens).
G1.7	The amount of unused cryptocurrencies kept on the contract is controlled and at the minimum acceptable level so as not to become a potential target of an attack.
G1.8	If the fallback function can be called by anyone, it is included in the threat model.
G1.9	Business logic is consistent. Important changes in the logic should be applied in all contracts.
G1.10	Automatic code analysis tools are employed to detect vulnerabilities.
G1.11	The latest major release of Solidity is used.
G1.12	When using an external implementation of a contract, the most recent version is used.
G1.13	When functions are overridden to extend functionality, the super keyword is used to maintain previous functionality.
G1.14	The order of inheritance is carefully specified.
G1.15	There is a component that monitors contract activity using events.
G1.16	The threat model includes whale transactions.
G1.17	The leakage of one private key does not compromise the security of the entire project.

Policies and Procedures	Test Name

G2.2	The system's security is under constant monitoring (e.g. the expected level of funds).
G2.3	There is a policy to track new security vulnerabilities and to update libraries to the latest secure version.
G2.4	The security department can be publicly contacted and that the procedure for handling reported bugs (e.g., thorough bug bounty) is well-defined.
G2.5	The process of adding new components to the system is well defined.
G2.6	The process of major system changes involves threat modeling by an external company.
G2.7	The process of adding and updating components to the system includes a security audit by an external company.
G2.8	In the event of a hack, there's a clear and well known mitigation procedure in place.
G2.9	The procedure in the event of a hack clearly defines which persons are to execute the required actions.
G2.10	The procedure includes alarming other projects about the hack through trusted channels.
G2.11	A private key leak mitigation procedure is defined.

Upgradability	**Test Name**
G2.2	Before upgrading, an emulation is made in a fork of the main network and everything works as expected on the local copy.
G2.3	The upgrade process is executed by a multisig contract where more than one person must approve the operation.
G2.4	Timelocks are used for important operations so that the users have time to observe upcoming changes (please note that removing potential vulnerabilities in this case may be more difficult).
G2.5	*initialize()* can only be called once.
G2.6	*initialize()* can only be called by an authorized role through appropriate modifiers (e.g. *initializer*, *onlyOwner*).
G2.7	The update process is done in a single transaction so that no one can front-run it.
G2.8	Upgradeable contracts have reserved gap on slots to prevent overwriting.
G2.9	The number of reserved (as a gap) slots has been reduced appropriately if new variables have been added.
G2.10	There are no changes in the order in which the contract state variables are declared, nor their types.
G2.11	New values returned by the functions are the same as in previous versions of the contract (e.g. *owner()*, *balanceOf(address)*).
G2.12	The implementation is initialized.
G2.13	The implementation can't be destroyed.

Business Logic	Test Name
G4.2	The contract logic and protocol parameters implementation corresponds to the documentation.
G4.3	The business logic proceeds in a sequential step order and it is not possible to skip steps or to do it in a different order than designed.
G4.4	The contract has correctly enforced business limits.
G4.5	The business logic does not rely on the values retrieved from untrusted contracts (especially when there are multiple calls to the same contract in a single flow).
G4.6	The business logic does not rely on the contract's balance (e.g., *balance == 0*).
G4.7	Sensitive operations do not depend on block data (e.g., *block hash*, *timestamp*).
G4.8	The contract uses mechanisms that mitigate transaction-ordering (front-running) attacks (e.g. pre-commit schemes).
G4.9	The contract does not send funds automatically, but lets users withdraw funds in separate transactions instead.

Access Control	Test Name
G5.2	The principle of the least privilege is upheld. Other contracts should only be able to access functions and data for which they possess specific authorization.
G5.3	New contracts with access to the audited contract adhere to the principle of minimum rights by default. Contracts should have a minimal or no permissions until access to the new features is explicitly granted.
G5.4	The creator of the contract complies with the principle of the least privilege and their rights strictly follow those outlined in the documentation.
G5.5	The contract enforces the access control rules specified in a trusted contract, especially if the dApp client-side access control is present and could be bypassed.
G5.6	Calls to external contracts are only allowed if necessary.
G5.7	Modifier code is clear and simple. The logic should not contain external calls to untrusted contracts.
G5.8	All user and data attributes used by access controls are kept in trusted contracts and cannot be manipulated by other contracts unless specifically authorized.
G5.9	the access controls fail securely, including when a revert occurs.
G5.10	If the input (function parameters) is validated, the positive validation approach (whitelisting) is used where possible.

Communication	Test Name
G6.2	Libraries that are not part of the application (but the smart contract relies on to operate) are identified.

G6.3	Delegate call is not used with untrusted contracts.
G6.4	Third party contracts do not shadow special functions (e.g. revert).
G6.5	The contract does not check whether the address is a contract using *extcodesize* opcode.
G6.6	Re-entrancy attacks are mitigated by blocking recursive calls from other contracts and following the Check-Effects-Interactions pattern. Do not use the *send* function unless it is a must.
G6.7	The result of low-level function calls (e.g. *send*, *delegatecall*, *call*) from other contracts is checked.
G6.8	Contract relies on the data provided by the right sender and does not rely on tx.origin value.

Arithmetic	Test Name
G7.2	The values and math operations are resistant to integer overflows. Use SafeMath library for arithmetic operations before solidity 0.8.*.
G7.3	the unchecked code snippets from Solidity ≥ 0.8.* do not introduce integer under/overflows.
G7.4	Extreme values (e.g. maximum and minimum values of the variable type) are considered and do not change the logic flow of the contract.
G7.5	Non-strict inequality is used for balance equality.
G7.6	Correct orders of magnitude are used in the calculations.
G7.7	In calculations, multiplication is performed before division for accuracy.
G7.8	The contract does not assume fixed-point precision and uses a multiplier or store both the numerator and denominator.

Denial of Service	Test Name
G8.2	The contract does not iterate over unbound loops.
G8.3	Self-destruct functionality is used only if necessary. If it is included in the contract, it should be clearly described in the documentation.
G8.4	The business logic isn't blocked if an actor (e.g. contract, account, oracle) is absent.
G8.5	The business logic does not disincentivize users to use contracts (e.g. the cost of transaction is higher than the profit).
G8.6	Expressions of functions assert or require have a passing variant.
G8.7	If the fallback function is not callable by anyone, it is not blocking contract functionalities.
G8.8	There are no costly operations in a loop.
G8.9	There are no calls to untrusted contracts in a loop.
G8.10	If there is a possibility of suspending the operation of the contract, it is also

	possible to resume it.
G8.11	If whitelists and blacklists are used, they do not interfere with normal operation of the system.
G8.12	There is no DoS caused by overflows and underflows.

Blockchain Data	Test Name
G9.2	Any saved data in contracts is not considered secure or private (even private variables).
G9.3	No confidential data is stored in the blockchain (passwords, personal data, token etc.).
G9.4	Contracts do not use string literals as keys for mappings. Global constants are used instead to prevent Homoglyph attack.
G9.5	Contract does not trivially generate pseudorandom numbers based on the information from blockchain (e.g. seeding with the block number).

Gas Usage and Limitations	Test Name
G10.2	Gas usage is anticipated, defined and has clear limitations that cannot be exceeded. Both code structure and malicious input should not cause gas exhaustion.
G10.3	Function execution and functionality does not depend on hard-coded gas fees (they are bound to vary).

Clarity and Readability	Test Name
G11.2	The logic is clear and modularized in multiple simple contracts and functions.
G11.3	Each contract has a short 1-2 sentence comment that explains its purpose and functionality.
G11.4	Off-the-shelf implementations are used, this is made clear in comment. If these implementations have been modified, the modifications are noted throughout the contract.
G11.5	The inheritance order is taken into account in contracts that use multiple inheritance and shadow functions.
G11.6	Where possible, contracts use existing tested code (e.g. token contracts or mechanisms like *ownable*) instead of implementing their own.
G11.7	Consistent naming patterns are followed throughout the project.
G11.8	Variables have distinctive names.
G11.9	All storage variables are initialized.
G11.10	Functions with specified return type return a value of that type.

G11.11	All functions and variables are used.
G11.12	*require* is used instead of *revert* in *if* statements.
G11.13	The *assert* function is used to test for internal errors and the *require* function is used to ensure a valid condition in input from users and external contracts.
G11.14	Assembly code is only used if necessary.

Test Coverage	Test Name
G12.2	Abuse narratives detailed in the threat model are covered by unit tests.
G12.3	Sensitive functions in verified contracts are covered with tests in the development phase.
G12.4	Implementation of verified contracts has been checked for security vulnerabilities using both static and dynamic analysis.
G12.5	Contract specification has been formally verified.
G12.6	The specification and results of the formal verification is included in the documentation.

Decentralized Finance	Test Name
G14.1	The lender's contract does not assume its balance (used to confirm loan repayment) to be changed only with its own functions.
G14.2	Functions that change lenders' balance and/or lend cryptocurrency are non-re-entrant if the smart contract allows borrowing the main platform's cryptocurrency (e.g. Ethereum). It blocks the attacks that update the borrower's balance during the flash loan execution.
G14.3	Flash loan functions can only call predefined functions on the receiving contract. If it is possible, define a trusted subset of contracts to be called. Usually, the sending (borrowing) contract is the one to be called back.
G14.4	If it includes potentially dangerous operations (e.g. sending back more ETH/tokens than borrowed), the receiver's function that handles borrowed ETH or tokens can be called only by the pool and within a process initiated by the receiving contract's owner or another trusted source (e.g. multisig).
G14.5	Calculations of liquidity pool share are performed with the highest possible precision (e.g. if the contribution is calculated for ETH it should be done with 18 digit precision - for Wei, not Ether). The dividend must be multiplied by the 10 to the power of the number of decimal digits (e.g. dividend * 10^18 / divisor).
G14.6	Rewards cannot be calculated and distributed within the same function call that deposits tokens (it should also be defined as non-re-entrant). This protects from momentary fluctuations in shares.
G14.7	Governance contracts are protected from flash loan attacks. One possible

	mitigation technique is to require the process of depositing governance tokens and proposing a change to be executed in different transactions included in different blocks.
G14.8	When using on-chain oracles, contracts are able to pause operations based on the oracles' result (in case of a compromised oracle).
G14.9	External contracts (even trusted ones) that are allowed to change the attributes of a project contract (e.g. token price) have the following limitations implemented: thresholds for the change (e.g. no more/less than 5%) and a limit of updates (e.g. one update per day).
G14.10	Contract attributes that can be updated by the external contracts (even trusted ones) are monitored (e.g. using events) and an incident response procedure is implemented (e.g. during an ongoing attack).
G14.11	Complex math operations that consist of both multiplication and division operations first perform multiplications and then division.
G14.12	When calculating exchange prices (e.g. ETH to token or vice versa), the numerator and denominator are multiplied by the reserves (see the *getInputPrice* function in the *UniswapExchange* contract).

Security Assessment Findings

Potential Denial of Service Vector Due to Unbounded Loop

ID	SAY-01
Status	Fixed
Risk	High
Business Impact	This denial of service attack could potentially break the finalization functionality and potentially other services, such as off-chain components that rely on finalization events. However, we decided to rate this vulnerability as high rather than critical because funds won't be locked in the contract, since they are handled in `executeRequest(uint, bytes32, address, uint)`, which would not revert.
Location	- `BridgeUtils.sol:88-94; remove(bytes32[], bytes32)`
Description	When a new request is submitted to the bridge, it is held in `pendingRequests[]`, from which it can later be executed and finalized. On finalization, `pendingRequests.remove()` is called. This function, which iterates over storage to find the requested hash, can be subject to a denial of service due to the unbounded loop defined within it. ``` function remove(bytes32[] storage array, bytes32 elem) internal returns (bool success) { for (uint i = 0; i < array.length; ++i) { if (array[i] == elem) { array[i] = array[array.length - 1]; array.pop(); return true; } } return false; } ``` If the bridge is spammed with new requests, the array will get so large that the loop will run out of gas and revert.

Mitigation	Consider using a more efficient storage type for requests such as `EnumerableSet`. Moreover, it is recommended to add a calldata argument to this function so it is possible to iterate over a portion of the requests rather than the whole array. Another, more radical solution, is to add a localized pause mechanism that removes the ability to submit new requests. A generalized pause that locks funds in the contract is not recommended.

Off-By-One Error When Comparing to Maximum Values

ID	SAY-02
Status	Fixed
Risk	Low
Business Impact	Due to the wrong symbol being used, the maximum values themselves cause reverts.
Location	- `utils/BridgeUtils.sol:65-67, 76-78`
Description	Comparisons to maximum values are made with the greater-than or equal-to symbol in the specified locations. • BridgeUtils.sol:65-67 `if (amount ≥ MAX_AMOUNT) { revert BridgeErrors.AmountOverflow(amount, MAX_AMOUNT - 1); }` • BridgeUtils.sol:76-78 `if (config.baseFee ≥ MAX_FEE) { revert BridgeErrors.BaseFeeOverflow(config.baseFee, MAX_FEE - 1); }` This means that the maximum values are themselves forbidden, probably unintentionally.
Mitigation	Replace the greater-than or equal-to symbol (≥) with the greater-to symbol (>) in these cases.

Unreasonable MAX_AMOUNT

ID	SAY-03
Status	Fixed
Risk	Informational
Business Impact	The current MAX_AMOUNT is unlikely to ever be reached, and is therefore redundant.
Location	- utils/BridgeUtils.sol:24
Description	In line 24, MAX_AMOUNT is defined as `uint constant public MAX_AMOUNT = type(uint).max / MAX_FEE;` Where MAX_FEE is 10000. Since type(uint).max is 2^{256}-1 = 1.1579209*10^{77}, this calculation yields an extraordinarily large amount, 1.1579209*10^{73}, that will likely never be reached or surpassed, rendering the whole limit unnecessary.
Mitigation	Consider setting a more modest MAX_AMOUNT, or perhaps scrapping this value altogether.

Replace `transfer()` with `safeTransfer()`

ID	SAY-04
Status	Fixed
Risk	Informational
Business Impact	Usage of `transfer()` and `transferFrom()`, rather than their safe variants, may lead to malfunction in certain (unlikely) edge cases as explained below, and is therefore disencouraged.
Location	- `MintBurnBridge.sol:26` - `LockReleaseBridge.sol:24, 33, 42`
Description	The bridge uses `transfer()` and `transferFrom()` to move tokens along by casting them into IERC20 (which requires it to be IERC20 compliant). If the bridged token is already known to be fully compliant with ERC20 standard and reverts on a transfer failure, then there is no impact. However, if during development non-compliant tokens are added, then the following issues may arise: ● Some tokens do not revert on failure, and instead return `false`. These could be wrongly accounted as sent when they in fact failed to transfer. ● Other tokens, such as USDT, do not return anything on transfer. Since casting to IERC20 causes the token to be required to comply with that standard and return a bool on transfer, any USDT transfer attempts will result in a revert.
Mitigation	If at any point in the future a token not compliant with ERC20 is used, OpenZepplin's `safeTransfer()` and `safeTransferFrom()` should be used instead.

Lack of Separation of User Roles in Default Configuration

ID	SAY–05
Status	Fixed
Risk	Informational
Business Impact	Assigning all critical roles to a single address by default may easily become a single point of failure, defeating the point of even having role separation. However, we rate this finding as informational because it is implied that the deployer is expected to change the defaults.
Location	- `Bridge.sol:38-41; constructor()`
Description	Bridge.sol's constructor appears to grant both the `OWNER` and the `ADMINISTRATOR` roles to `_msgSender()` by default. This defeats the purpose of having role separation if the configuration is never modified.
Mitigation	Consider requiring deployers to submit their own addresses for role holders. If they still insist on having both roles held by the same addresses, they can still do so.

Unused Role

ID	SAY-06
Status	Fixed
Risk	Informational
Business Impact	This finding is purely informational and has no bearing on security or usability.
Location	- `Bridge.sol:24`
Description	The OWNER role, defined in line 24, appears to go unused for the rest of the contract.
Mitigation	Consider deleting this role.

Missing Event Emission

ID	SAY-07
Status	Fixed
Risk	Informational
Business Impact	Decreased transparency of important state changes, which could impact interested third-parties.
Location	- `Bridge.sol; setChainConfig(uint, BridgeType.ChainConfig)`
Description	`setChainConfig(uint, BridgeType.ChainConfig)` does not emit an event on call. This means that important configuration changes won't be readily visible to third-parties.
Mitigation	Consider emitting an event after changing configuration.

Misleading Underflow/Overflow Checks

ID	SAY-08
Status	Fixed
Risk	Informational
Business Impact	This finding is purely informational and has no bearing on security or usability.
Location	- `BridgeUtils.sol:62; checkAmount(uint)` - `BridgeUtils.sol:66, 77` - `BridgeErrors; AmountUnderFlow(uint, uint)`
Description	Since a `uint` is being compared, `checkAmount(uint)` in fact just checks if the amount is not zero, which is the only possible lower than one. This is not an underflow. The `AmountOverflow(uint, uint)` and `BaseFeeOverflow(uint, uint)` errors are also similarly mislabeled, since `MAX_AMOUNT` is not exactly equal to `type(uint).max` as discussed in finding SAY-03. An underflow would be casting a negative integer into a `uint`, whereas an overflow happens if `type(uint).max` is exceeded. Since solidity 0.8, these situations can no longer occur and require no special checks.
Mitigation	This check can simply be restated as `require(amount > 0, "Zero amount")` The "overflow" errors can simply be renamed to something like `MaxAmountExceeded` and `MaxFeeExceeded` or also converted to require statements.

We are available at security@sayfer.io

If you want to encrypt your message please use our public PGP key:

https://sayfer.io/pgp.asc

Key ID: 9DC858229FC7DD38854AE2D88D81803C0EBFCD88

Website: https://sayfer.io

Public email: info@sayfer.io

Phone: +972-559139416