



SOLIDProof
Bring trust into your projects

Blockchain Security | Smart Contract Audits | KYC

MADE IN GERMANY

Inxter Finance Audit

Security Assessment
07.November,2022

For



[SolidProof.io](https://solidproof.io)



[@solidproof_io](https://t.me/solidproof_io)

Disclaimer	2
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	24
Source Units in Scope	25
Critical issues	26
High issues	26
Medium issues	26
Low issues	26
Informational issues	27
Audit Comments	27
SWC Attacks	28

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	06.November,2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Layout project• Automated- /Manual-Security Testing• Summary

Network
Binance (BSC)

Website
<https://www.inxterfinance.io/>

Telegram
<https://t.me/InxterfinanceGlobal>

Twitter
<http://twitter.com/InxterFinance>

Facebook
<https://www.facebook.com/inxterfinance>

Medium
<https://medium.com/@inxterfinance>

Instagram
<https://www.instagram.com/inxterfinance/>

YouTube
<https://www.youtube.com/@Inxterfinance>

Discord
<https://discord.gg/K4VNgEZJem>

Description

Inxter Finance offers its community members a wide range of services, enhancing their financial stability. Helps fund advanced technologies like NFTs, gaming engines, and various Defi protocols for the betterment of people worldwide.

We aim to develop blockchain and every application of this technology, like web3.0, Defi, NFT, Metaverse, and Play To Earn. And we always strive to bring tangible development & consolidation to organizations around the world.

Project Engagement

During the 06th of November 2022, **Inxter Finance** team engaged Solidproof.io to audit the smart contracts that they created. The engagement was technical in nature and focused on identifying the security flaws in the design and implementation of the contracts. They provided Solidproof.io with access to their code repository and whitepaper.

Logo



Contract Links

v1.0

Provided as files

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)
Critical	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.
High	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.
Medium	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.
Low	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.
Informational	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 analyzing 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:

- IERC20
- IFactoryV2
- IV2Pair
- IRouter01
- IRouter02
- Protections



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/11-3-2022 Race Genesis.sol	8fe8099ac30764dd81863952931cdd16d8073ab7

Metrics

Source Lines v1.0





Risk Level v1.0



Capabilities

v1.0

Components

 Contracts	 Libraries	 Interfaces	 Abstract
1	0	6	0


Exposed Functions

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





 Public	 Payable
60	5







External	Internal	Private	Pure	View
56	40	0	6	20



StateVariables

Total	 Public
23	7

Capabilities


Solidity Versions observed	 Experimental Features	 Can Receive Funds	 Uses Assembly	 Has Destroyable Contracts
>=0.6.0 <0.9.0		yes		

 Transfers ETH	 Low-Level Calls	 DelegateCall	 Uses Hash Functions	 Ecrecover	 New/Create/Create2
yes					

 TryCatch	 Σ Unchecked
yes	


Inheritance Graph

v1.0



Call Graph

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. Is contract an upgradeable
2. Correct implementation of Token standard
3. Deployer cannot mint any new tokens
4. Deployer cannot burn or lock user funds
5. Deployer cannot pause the contract
6. Deployer can set fees
7. Deployer can blacklist/antisnipe address
8. Overall checkup (Smart Contract Security)

Is contract an upgradeable

Name	
Is contract an upgradeable?	No



Correct implementation of Token standard

ERC20				
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 contracts v1.0

- transferOwner
- renounceOwnership
- setOperator
- renounceOriginalDeployer
- transfer
- approve
- approveContractContingency
- transferFrom
- setInitializer
- setExcludedFromLimits
- setExcludedFromProtection
- removeSniper
- setProtectionSettings
- setMaxTxSellPercent
- excludePresaleAddresses
- sweepContingency
- multiSendTokens

Deployer cannot mint any new tokens

Name	Exist	Tested	Status
Deployer cannot mint			
Max / Total Supply	1.000.000.000		



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			



Deployer can set fees

Name	Exist	Tested	Status
Deployer cannot set fees over 25%			
Deployer cannot set fees to nearly 100% or more			

Comments:

No fees/tax functionality

Deployer cannot blacklist/antisnipe addresses

Name	Exist	Tested	Status
Deployer can blacklist/antisnipe addresses			

Comments:

The owner can set bot protection but cannot blacklist addresses directly



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

transferOwner
onlyOwner
renounceOwnership
onlyOwner
setOperator
renounceOriginalDeployer
transfer
approve
approveContractContingency
onlyOwner
transferFrom
setInitializer
onlyOwner
setExcludedFromLimits
onlyOwner
setExcludedFromProtection
onlyOwner
removeSniper
onlyOwner
setProtectionSettings
onlyOwner
setMaxTxSellPercent
onlyOwner
excludePresaleAddresses
onlyOwner
sweepContingency
onlyOwner
multiSendTokens
onlyOwner

Ownership Privileges:

- Set operator address, excluded from limits address, and initializer address (but not self)
- Set the maximum transaction amount but not lower than 0.5% of total supply
- Exclude presale addresses, multi send tokens, and sweep the contract's balance only till the liquidity is not added

Source Units in Scope

v1.0

File	Logic Contracts	Interfaces	Lines	nLines	nSLOC	Comment Lines	Complex. Score
contracts/11-3-2022 Race Genesis.sol	1	6	391	303	243	13	311
Totals	1	6	391	303	243	13	311

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	Missing zero address validation	252,266,270, 295	We recommend to check that the passed address is not zero
#2	Main	Missing Events	252,266,270, 286	Emit events for critical parameter changes
#3	Main	Floating Pragma	-	The current pragma Solidity directive is ">=0.6.0 <0.9.0". Contracts should be deployed with the same compiler version and flags that they have been tested thoroughly. Locking the pragma helps to ensure that contracts do not accidentally get deployed using other versions.
#4	Main	Contract doesn't import npm packages from source (like OpenZeppelin etc.)	-	We recommend importing all packages from npm directly without flattening the contract. Functions could be modified or can be susceptible to vulnerabilities

Informational issues

Issue	File	Type	Line	Description
#1	Main	NatSpec documentation missing	—	If you started to comment your code, also comment all other functions, variables etc.
#2	Main	Missing Error Message	253,296	We recommend to display an error message in all require statements.
#3	Main	Unused Return Value	374	Make sure to check and take care of all return values
#4	Main	Unused State Variable	102	Remove the unused variables

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.

07. November, 2022:

- There is still an owner (Owner still has not renounced ownership)
- Read the whole report and modifiers section for more information.

SWC Attacks

ID	Title	Relationships	Status
<u>SWC-1136</u>	Unencrypted Private Data On-Chain	<u>CWE-767: Access to Critical Private Variable via Public Method</u>	PASSED
<u>SWC-1135</u>	Code With No Effects	<u>CWE-1164: Irrelevant Code</u>	NOT PASSED
<u>SWC-1134</u>	Message call with hardcoded gas amount	<u>CWE-655: Improper Initialization</u>	PASSED
<u>SWC-1133</u>	Hash Collisions With Multiple Variable Length Arguments	<u>CWE-294: Authentication Bypass by Capture-replay</u>	PASSED
<u>SWC-1132</u>	Unexpected Ether balance	<u>CWE-667: Improper Locking</u>	PASSED
<u>SWC-1131</u>	Presence of unused variables	<u>CWE-1164: Irrelevant Code</u>	PASSED

1 3 1			
S W C : 1 3 0	Right-To-Left- Override control character (U+202E)	CWE-451: User Interface (UI) Misrepresentation of Critical Information	PASSED
S W C : 1 2 9	Typographical Error	CWE-480: Use of Incorrect Operator	PASSED
S W C : 1 2 8	DoS With Block Gas Limit	CWE-400: Uncontrolled Resource Consumption	PASSED
S W C : 1 2 7	Arbitrary Jump with Function Type Variable	CWE-695: Use of Low-Level Functionality	PASSED
S W C : 1 2 5	Incorrect Inheritance Order	CWE-696: Incorrect Behavior Order	PASSED
S W C : :	Write to Arbitrary	CWE-123: Write-what-where Condition	PASSED

<u>1</u> <u>2</u> <u>4</u>	Storage Location		
<u>S</u> <u>W</u> <u>C</u> : <u>1</u> <u>2</u> <u>3</u>	Requirement Violation	CWE-573: Improper Following of Specification by Caller	PASSED
<u>S</u> <u>W</u> <u>C</u> : <u>1</u> <u>2</u> <u>2</u>	Lack of Proper Signature Verification	CWE-345: Insufficient Verification of Data Authenticity	PASSED
<u>S</u> <u>W</u> <u>C</u> : <u>1</u> <u>2</u> <u>1</u>	Missing Protection against Signature Replay Attacks	CWE-347: Improper Verification of Cryptographic Signature	PASSED
<u>S</u> <u>W</u> <u>C</u> : <u>1</u> <u>2</u> <u>0</u>	Weak Sources of Randomness from Chain Attributes	CWE-330: Use of Insufficiently Random Values	PASSED
<u>S</u> <u>W</u> <u>C</u> : <u>1</u> <u>1</u> <u>1</u> <u>9</u>	Shadowing State Variables	CWE-710: Improper Adherence to Coding Standards	PASSED

S W C : 1 1 8	Incorrect Constructor Name	CWE-665: Improper Initialization	PASSED
S W C : 1 1 7	Signature Malleability	CWE-347: Improper Verification of Cryptographic Signature	PASSED
S W C : 1 1 6	Timestamp Dependence	CWE-829: Inclusion of Functionality from Untrusted Control Sphere	PASSED
S W C : 1 1 5	Authorization through tx.origin	CWE-477: Use of Obsolete Function	PASSED
S W C : 1 1 4	Transaction Order Dependence	CWE-362: Concurrent Execution using Shared Resource with Improper Synchronization ('Race Condition')	PASSED
S W C : 1 1 3	DoS with Failed Call	CWE-703: Improper Check or Handling of Exceptional Conditions	PASSED

S W C : 1 1 2	Delegatecall to Untrusted Callee	CWE-829: Inclusion of Functionality from Untrusted Control Sphere	PASSED
S W C : 1 1 1	Use of Deprecated Solidity Functions	CWE-477: Use of Obsolete Function	PASSED
S W C : 1 1 0	Assert Violation	CWE-670: Always-Incorrect Control Flow Implementation	PASSED
S W C : 1 0 9	Uninitialized Storage Pointer	CWE-824: Access of Uninitialized Pointer	PASSED
S W C : 1 0 8	State Variable Default Visibility	CWE-710: Improper Adherence to Coding Standards	PASSED
S W C : 1 0 7	Reentrancy	CWE-841: Improper Enforcement of Behavioral Workflow	PASSED

SWC-1106	Unprotected SELFDESTRUCT Instruction	CWE-284: Improper Access Control	PASSED
SWC-1105	Unprotected Ether Withdrawal	CWE-284: Improper Access Control	PASSED
SWC-1104	Unchecked Call Return Value	CWE-252: Unchecked Return Value	PASSED
SWC-1103	Floating Pragma	CWE-664: Improper Control of a Resource Through its Lifetime	NOT PASSED
SWC-1102	Outdated Compiler Version	CWE-937: Using Components with Known Vulnerabilities	PASSED
SWC-1101	Integer Overflow and Underflow	CWE-682: Incorrect Calculation	PASSED

SWC-10101	Function Default Visibility	CWE-710: Improper Adherence to Coding Standards	PASSED
-----------	-----------------------------------	---	--------





SolidProof.io



[@solidproof_io](https://t.me/solidproof_io)

*Solid
Proofed*

Blockchain Security | Smart Contract Audits | KYC


MADE IN GERMANY