CFG NINJA AUDITS

Security Assessment

MPEPE Token

May 21, 2023

Audit Status: Fail

Audit Edition: Advance

POWERED BY BLADE POOL

Table of Contents

Assessment Summary

This report has been prepared for MPEPE Token on the Binance Smart Chain network. CFGNINJA provides both client-centered and user-centered examination of the smart contracts and their current status when applicable. This report represents the security assessment made to find issues and vulnerabilities on the source code along with the current liquidity and token holder statistics of the protocol.

A comprehensive examination has been performed, utilizing Cross Referencing, Static Analysis, In-House Security Tools, and line-by-line Manual Review.

The auditing process pays special attention to the following considerations:

- Testing the smart contracts against both common and uncommon attack vectors.
- Inspecting liquidity and holders statistics to inform the current status to both users and client when applicable.
- Assessing the codebase to ensure compliance with current best practices and industry standards.
- Verifying contract functions that allow trusted and/or untrusted actors to mint, lock, pause, and transfer assets.
- Cross referencing contract structure and implementation against similar smart contracts produced by industry leaders
- Thorough line-by-line manual review of the entire codebase by industry experts.

Project Overview

Token Summary

Parameter	Result
Address	0x5cE1C3F5F153f3CBAbF1A3188896c1161c34D1De
Name	MPEPE
Token Tracker	MPEPE (MPEPE)
Decimals	9
Supply	42,000,000,000,000,000
Platform	Binance Smart Chain
compiler	v0.8.18+commit.87f61d96
Contract Name	MPEPE
Optimization	Yes with 200 runs
LicenseType	MIT
Language	Solidity
Codebase	https://bscscan.com/address/0x5cE1C3F5F153f3CBAbF1A3188896c1161c34D1De#code
Payment Tx	0x287e208790947a09a026c97de14aebb174756433cee1409b56393cf4bb52f66d

Project Overview

Risk Analysis Summary

Parameter	Result
Buy Tax	5
Sale Tax	5
Is honeypot?	Clean
Trading Cooldown	No
Transfer Pausable	No
Modify Fees	Yes
Is anti whale?	Yes
Is blacklisted?	Yes
Is whitelisted?	Yes
Holders	1
Confidence Level	Medium

The following quick summary it's added to the project overview; however, there are more details about the audit and its results. Please read every detail.

Project Overview

Simulation Summary

Parameter	Result
Transfer From Owner	Pass
Transfer From Holder	Pass
Add Liquidity	Pass
RemoveLiquidity	Pass
Buy from Owner	Pass
Buy from Holder	Pass
Sale from Owner	Pass
Sale from Holder	Pass
Remove Liquidity	Pass
SwapAndLiquify	Pass
SwapAndSale w/Fee	Pass
SwapAndSale TX	
SwapAndSaleNoFee	Pass
SwapAndSale No/Fee TX	
ExcludeFromFees	Pass
LaunchPad	PinkSale

Parameter	Result
Pool Creation	Pass
Pool Creation TX	
Pool Finalize	Pass
Pool Finalize TX	
Enable	Pass

The following quick summary it's added to the project overview; however, there are more details about the audit and its results. Please read every detail.

Main Contract Assessed Contract Name

Name	Contract	Live
MPEPE	0x5cE1C3F5F153f3CBAbF1A3188896c1161c34D1De	Yes

TestNet Contract Assessed Contract Name

Name	Contract	Live
MPEPE	0xcB4dFc9e2b6BFc4B9B8Aa26DDa591cDA8Af3FeAf	Yes

Solidity Code Provided

SolID	File Sha-1	FileName
MPEPE	98385b374263de2fe3f6148de6aae28b734b4b8b	mpepe.sol
MPEPE		
MPEPE		
MPEPE		

Mint Check

The project owners of MPEPE do not have a mint function in the contract, owner cannot mint tokens after initial deploy.

The Project has a Total Supply of 42,000,000,000,000,000 and cannot mint any more than the Max Supply.

Mint Notes:

Auditor Notes:

Project Owner Notes:

Fees Check

The project owners of MPEPE have the ability to set up to 100
We Recommend the team to review contract and set it with fees restrictions to avoid any problems, as alternative the team can use multi signature wallet to ensure the project is safe from a potential fee increase.

Tax Fee Notes:

Auditor Notes: The contract currently has 5% buy and 5% sale taxes.

Project Owner Notes:

Blacklist Check

The project owners of MPEPE have the ability to Blacklist holders from transferring their tokens.

We recommend the Team be careful with a blacklist function as this can prevent a holder from buying/ selling/transferring their assets. Malicious or compromised owners can trap contracts relying on tokens with a blacklist

Blacklist Notes:

Auditor Notes: .

Project Owner Notes:

MaxTx Check

The Project Owners of MPEPE can set max tx amount.

The ability to set MaxTx can be used as bad actor, this can limit the ability of investors to sale their tokens at any given time if is set too low..

We recommend the project to set MaxTx to Total Supply or simiar to avoid swap or transfer from failures

MaxTX Notes:

Auditor Notes:

Project Owner Notes:

Pause Trade Check

The Project Owners of MPEPE don't have the ability to stop or pause trading.

The Team has done a great job to avoid stop trading, and investors has the ability to trade at any given time without any problems

Pause Trade Notes:

Auditor Notes:

Project Owner Notes: .

Owner can't pause trading

Contract Ownership

The contract ownership of MPEPE is not currently renounced. The ownership of the contract grants special powers to the protocol creators, making them the sole addresses that can call sensible ownable functions that may alter the state of the protocol.

The current owner is the address 0x653ee0e738df34748dd3dbd2aeefea3146b98ad9 which can be viewed:
HERE

The owner wallet has the power to call the functions displayed on the privileged functions chart below, if the owner's wallet is compromised, they could exploit these privileges.

We recommend the team renounce ownership at the right time, if possible, or gradually migrate to a timelock with governing functionalities regarding transparency and safety considerations.

We recommend the team use a Multisignature Wallet if the contract is not going to be renounced; this will give the team more control over the contract.

Liquidity Ownership

The token does not have liquidity at the moment of the audit, block 28340346

If liquidity is unlocked, then the token developers can do what is infamously known as 'rugpull'. Once investors start buying token from the exchange, the liquidity pool will accumulate more and more coins of established value (e.g., ETH or BNB or Tether). This is because investors are basically sending these tokens of value to the exchange, to get the new token. Developers can withdraw this liquidity from the exchange, cash in all the value and run off with it. Liquidity is locked by renouncing the ownership of liquidity pool (LP) tokens for a fixed time period, by sending them to a time-lock smart contract. Without ownership of LP tokens, developers cannot get liquidity pool funds back. This provides confidence to the investors that the token developers will not run away with the liquidity money. It is now a standard practice that all token developers follow, and this is what really differentiates a scam coin from a real one.

Read More

Call Graph

The contract for MPEPE has the following call graph structure.



KYC Information

The Project Owners of MPEPE is not KYC.

KYC Information Notes:

Auditor Notes: KYC to be completed by PinkSale, project will be a SAFU Project.

Project Owner Notes:

Smart Contract Vulnerability Checks

The Smart Contract Weakness Classification Registry (SWC Registry) is an implementation of the weakness classification scheme proposed in EIP-1470. It is loosely aligned to the terminologies and structure used in the Common Weakness Enumeration (CWE) while overlaying a wide range of weakness variants that are specific to smart contracts.

ID	Severity	Name	File	location
SWC-100	Pass	Function Default Visibility	mpepe.sol	L: 0 C: 0
SWC-101	Pass	Integer Overflow and Underflow.	mpepe.sol	L: 0 C: 0
SWC-102	Pass	Outdated Compiler Version file.	mpepe.sol	L: 0 C: 0
SWC-103	Low	A floating pragma is set.	mpepe.sol	L: 3 C: 0
SWC-104	Pass	Unchecked Call Return Value.	mpepe.sol	L: 0 C: 0
SWC-105	Pass	Unprotected Ether Withdrawal.	mpepe.sol	L: 0 C: 0
SWC-106	Pass	Unprotected SELFDESTRUCT Instruction	mpepe.sol	L: 0 C: 0
SWC-107	Pass	Read of persistent state following external call.	mpepe.sol	L: 0 C: 0
SWC-108	Pass	State variable visibility is not set..	mpepe.sol	L: 0 C: 0
SWC-109	Pass	Uninitialized Storage Pointer.	mpepe.sol	L: 0 C: 0
SWC-110	Pass	Assert Violation.	mpepe.sol	L: 0 C: 0

ID	Severity	Name	File	location
SWC-111	Pass	Use of Deprecated Solidity Functions.	mpepe.sol	L: 0 C: 0
SWC-112	Pass	Delegate Call to Untrusted Callee.	mpepe.sol	L: 0 C: 0
SWC-113	Pass	Multiple calls are executed in the same transaction.	mpepe.sol	L: 0 C: 0
SWC-114	Pass	Transaction Order Dependence.	mpepe.sol	L: 0 C: 0
SWC-115	Pass	Authorization through tx.origin.	mpepe.sol	L: 0 C: 0
SWC-116	Pass	A control flow decision is made based on The block.timestamp environment variable.	mpepe.sol	L: 0 C: 0
SWC-117	Pass	Signature Malleability.	mpepe.sol	L: 0 C: 0
SWC-118	Pass	Incorrect Constructor Name.	mpepe.sol	L: 0 C: 0
SWC-119	Pass	Shadowing State Variables.	mpepe.sol	L: 0 C: 0
SWC-120	Low	Potential use of block.number as source of randonmness.	mpepe.sol	L: 471 C: 30
SWC-121	Pass	Missing Protection against Signature Replay Attacks.	mpepe.sol	L: 0 C: 0
SWC-122	Pass	Lack of Proper Signature Verification.	mpepe.sol	L: 0 C: 0
SWC-123	Pass	Requirement Violation.	mpepe.sol	L: 0 C: 0
SWC-124	Pass	Write to Arbitrary Storage Location.	mpepe.sol	L: 0 C: 0
SWC-125	Pass	Incorrect Inheritance Order.	mpepe.sol	L: 0 C: 0

ID	Severity	Name	File	location
SWC-126	Pass	Insufficient Gas Griefing.	mpepe.sol	L: 0 C: 0
SWC-127	Pass	Arbitrary Jump with Function Type Variable.	mpepe.sol	L: 0 C: 0
SWC-128	Pass	DoS With Block Gas Limit.	mpepe.sol	L: 0 C: 0
SWC-129	Pass	Typographical Error.	mpepe.sol	L: 0 C: 0
SWC-130	Pass	Right-To-Left-Override control character (U +202E).	mpepe.sol	L: 0 C: 0
SWC-131	Pass	Presence of unused variables.	mpepe.sol	L: 0 C: 0
SWC-132	Pass	Unexpected Ether balance.	mpepe.sol	L: 0 C: 0
SWC-133	Pass	Hash Collisions with Multiple Variable Length Arguments.	mpepe.sol	L: 0 C: 0
SWC-134	Pass	Message call with hardcoded gas amount.	mpepe.sol	L: 0 C: 0
SWC-135	Pass	Code With No Effects (Irrelevant/Dead Code).	mpepe.sol	L: 0 C: 0
SWC-136	Pass	Unencrypted Private Data On-Chain.	mpepe.sol	L: 0 C: 0

We scan the contract for additional security issues using MYTHX and industry-standard security scanning tools.

Smart Contract Vulnerability Details

SWC-103 - Floating Pragma.

CWE-664: Improper Control of a Resource Through its Lifetime.

References:

Description:

Contracts should be deployed with the same compiler version and flags that they have been tested with thoroughly. Locking the pragma helps to ensure that contracts do not accidentally get deployed using, for example, an outdated compiler version that might introduce bugs that affect the contract system negatively.

Remediation:

Lock the pragma version and also consider known bugs (https://github.com/ethereum/solidity/releases) for the compiler version that is chosen.

Pragma statements can be allowed to float when a contract is intended for consumption by other developers, as in the case with contracts in a library or EthPM package. Otherwise, the developer would need to manually update the pragma in order to compile locally.

References:

Ethereum Smart Contract Best Practices - Lock pragmas to specific compiler version.

Smart Contract Vulnerability Details

SWC-120 - Weak Sources of Randomness from Chain Attributes

CWE-330: Use of Insufficiently Random Values

Description:

Solidity allows for ambiguous naming of state variables when inheritance is used. Contract A with a variable x could inherit contract B that also has a state variable x defined. This would result in two separate versions of x, one of them being accessed from contract A and the other one from contract B. In more complex contract systems this condition could go unnoticed and subsequently lead to security issues.

Shadowing state variables can also occur within a single contract when there are multiple definitions on the contract and function level.

Remediation:

Using commitment scheme, e.g. RANDAO. Using external sources of randomness via oracles, e.g. Oraclize. Note that this approach requires trusting in oracle, thus it may be reasonable to use multiple oracles. Using Bitcoin block hashes, as they are more expensive to mine.

References:

How can I securely generate a random number in my smart contract?)

When can BLOCKHASH be safely used for a random number? When would it be unsafe?

The Run smart contract.

Inheritance

The contract for MPEPE has the following inheritance structure.



Privileged Functions (onlyOwner)

Please Note if the contract is Renounced none of this functions can be executed.

Function Name	Parameters	Visibility
renounceOwnership		Public
transferOwnership	address newOwner	Public
claimToken		External
claimBalance		External
setSwapPairList		External
setFeeWhiteList		External
setLPWhiteList		External
setblackList		External
setstartTradeBlock		External
setMinimumTokensBeforeSwap		External
setMaxWalletAmount		External
setMaxTxAmount		External

Function Name	Parameters	Visibility
setSellFee		External
setBuyFee		External

Smart Contract Advance Checks

ID	Severity	Name	Result	Status
MPEPE-01	Minor	Potential Sandwich Attacks.	Pass	Not-Found
MPEPE-02	Minor	Function Visibility Optimization	Pass	Not-Found
MPEPE-03	Minor	Lack of Input Validation.	Fail	Pending
MPEPE-04	Major	Centralized Risk In addLiquidity.	Fail	Pending
MPEPE-05	Minor	Missing Event Emission.	Fail	Pending
MPEPE-06	Minor	Conformance with Solidity Naming Conventions.	Fail	Pending
MPEPE-07	Minor	State Variables could be Declared Constant.	Pass	Not-Found
MPEPE-08	Minor	Dead Code Elimination.	Pass	Not-Found
MPEPE-09	Major	Third Party Dependencies.	Pass	Not-Found
MPEPE-10	Major	Initial Token Distribution.	Pass	Not-Found
MPEPE-11	Major	Complexity on the tax calculations.	Pass	Not-Found
MPEPE-12	Major	Centralization Risks In The X Role	Pass	Not-Found
MPEPE-13	Informational	Extra Gas Cost For User..	Pass	Not-found
MPEPE-14	Medium	Unnecessary Use Of SafeMath	Fail	Pending
MPEPE-15	Medium	Symbol Length Limitation due to Solidity Naming Standards.	Pass	Not-Found

ID	Severity	Name	Result	Status
MPEPE-16	Medium	Invalid collection of Taxes during Transfer.	Pass	Not-Found
MPEPE-17	Informational	Conformance to numeric notation best practice.	Pass	Not-Found
MPEPE-18	Informational	Enable Trade and Exclude Exist to create a whitelist.	Pass	Not-found

MPEPE-03 | Lack of Input Validation.

Category	Severity	Location	Status
Volatile Code	Minor	mpepe.sol: 671,14	Pending

Description

The given input is missing the check for the non-zero address.

The given input is missing the check for the claimToken and all onlyOwnersare missing required function.

Remediation

We advise the client to add the check for the passed-in values to prevent unexpected errors as below:

```
...
 require(receiver != address(0), "Receiver is the zero address");
...
...
require(value X limitation, "Your not able to do this function");
...
```

We also recommend customer to review the following function that is missing a required validation. claimToken and all onlyOwnersare missing required function.

MPEPE-04 | Centralized Risk In addLiquidity.

Category	Severity	Location	Status
Coding Style	Major	mpepe.sol: 587,13	Pending

Description

uniswapV2Router.addLiquidityETH{value: ethAmount}(address(this), tokenAmount, 0, 0, owner(), block.timestamp);

The addLiquidity function calls the uniswapV2Router.addLiquidityETH function with the to address specified as owner() for acquiring the generated LP tokens from the MPEPE-WBNB pool.

As a result, over time the _owner address will accumulate a significant portion of LP tokens.If the _owner is an EOA (Externally Owned Account), mishandling of its private key can have devastating consequences to the project as a whole.

Remediation

We advise the to address of the uniswapV2Router.addLiquidityETH function call to be replaced by the contract itself, i.e. address(this) , and to restrict the management of the LP tokens within the scope of the contract's business logic. This will also protect the LP tokens from being stolen if the _owner account is compromised. In general, we strongly recommend centralized privileges or roles in the protocol to be improved via a decentralized mechanism or via smart-contract based accounts with enhanced security practices, f.e. Multisignature wallets.

1. Indicatively, here are some feasible solutions that would also mitigate the potential risk:
2. Time-lock with reasonable latency, i.e. 48 hours, for awareness on privileged operations;
3. Assignment of privileged roles to multi-signature wallets to prevent single point of failure due to the private key;

Introduction of a DAO / governance / voting module to increase transparency and user involvement

Project Action

liquidity is set to Owner();

MPEPE-05 | Missing Event Emission.

Category	Severity	Location	Status
Volatile Code	Minor	mpepe.sol: 554, 14	Pending

Description

Detected missing events for critical arithmetic parameters. There are functions that have no event emitted, so it is difficult to track off-chain changes.The linked code does not create an event for the transfer.

Remediation

Emit an event for critical parameter changes. It is recommended emitting events for the sensitive functions that are controlled by centralization roles.

MPEPE-06 | Conformance with Solidity Naming Conventions.

Category	Severity	Location	Status
Coding Style	Minor	mpepe.sol: 642,13	Pending

Description

Solidity defines a naming convention that should be followed. Rule exceptions: Allow constant variable name/symbol/decimals to be lowercase. Allow _ at the beginning of the mixed_case match for private variables and unused parameters.

```
setstartTradeBlock
```

Remediation

Follow the Solidity naming convention.

https://docs.soliditylang.org/en/v0.4.25/style-guide.html#naming-convention

MPEPE-14 | Unnecessary Use Of SafeMath

Category	Severity	Location	Status
Logical Issue	Medium	mpepe.sol: 106,9	Pending

Description

The SafeMath library is used unnecessarily. With Solidity compiler versions 0.8.0 or newer, arithmetic operations
will automatically revert in case of integer overflow or underflow.
library SafeMath {
An implementation of SafeMath library is found.
using SafeMath for uint256;
SafeMath library is used for uint256 type in contract.

Remediation

We advise removing the usage of SafeMath library and using the built-in arithmetic operations provided by the
Solidity programming language

Project Action

Technical Findings Summary

Classification of Risk

Severity	Description
Critical	Risks are those that impact the safe functioning of a platform and must be addressed before launch. Users should not invest in any project with outstanding critical risks.
Major	Risks can include centralization issues and logical errors. Under specific circumstances, these major risks can lead to loss of funds and/or control of the project.
Medium	Risks may not pose a direct risk to users' funds, but they can affect the overall functioning of a platform
Minor	Risks can be any of the above but on a smaller scale. They generally do not compromise the overall integrity of the Project, but they may be less efficient than other solutions.
Informational	Errors are often recommended to improve the code's style or certain operations to fall within industry best practices. They usually do not affect the overall functioning of the code.

Findings

Severity	Found	Pending	Resolved
Critical	0	0	0
Major	2	0	0
Medium	0	0	0
Minor	3	0	0
Informational	0	0	0
Total	5	0	0

Social Media Checks

Social Media	URL	Result
Twitter	http://twitter.com/Mpepe_global	Pass
Other		Fail
Website	http://mpepe.io	Pass
Telegram	https://t.me/MPEPE_Global	Pass

We recommend to have 3 or more social media sources including a completed working websites.

Social Media Information Notes:

Auditor Notes: undefined

Project Owner Notes:

Assessment Results

Score Results

Review	Score
Overall Score	67/100
Auditor Score	60/100
Review by Section	**Score**
Manual Scan Score	23/53
SWC Scan Score	35 /37
Advance Check Score	9 /19

The Following Score System Has been Added to this page to help understand the value of the audit, the maximun score is 100, however to attain that value the project most pass and provide all the data needed for the assessment. Our Passing Score has been changed to 80 Points, if a project does not attain 80% is an automatic failure. Read our notes and final assessment below.

Audit Fail

Assessment Results

Important Notes:

- No issues or vulnerabilities were found.
- several items need to be revisited
- fees are unlimited
- there are no limits for maxTx.

Auditor Score =60
Audit Fail

Appendix

Finding Categories

Centralization / Privilege

Centralization / Privilege findings refer to either feature logic or implementation of components that actagainst the nature of decentralization, such as explicit ownership or specialized access roles incombination with a mechanism to relocate funds.

Gas Optimization

Gas Optimization findings do not affect the functionality of the code but generate different, more optimalEVM opcodes resulting in a reduction on the total gas cost of a transaction.

Logical Issue

Logical Issue findings detail a fault in the logic of the linked code, such as an incorrect notion on howblock.timestamp works.

Control Flow

Control Flow findings concern the access control imposed on functions, such as owner-only functionsbeing invoke-able by anyone under certain circumstances.

Volatile Code

Volatile Code findings refer to segments of code that behave unexpectedly on certain edge cases that mayresult in a vulnerability.

Coding Style

Coding Style findings usually do not affect the generated byte-code but rather comment on how to makethe codebase more legible and, as a result, easily maintainable.

Inconsistency

Inconsistency findings refer to functions that should seemingly behave similarly yet contain different code,such as a constructor assignment imposing different require statements on the input variables than a setterfunction.

Coding Best Practices

ERC 20 Conding Standards are a set of rules that each developer should follow to ensure the code meet a set of creterias and is readable by all the developers.

Disclaimer

CFGNINJA has conducted an independent security assessment to verify the integrity of and highlight any vulnerabilities or errors, intentional or unintentional, that may be present in the reviewed code for the scope of this assessment. This report does not constitute agreement, acceptance, or advocation for the Project, and users relying on this report should not consider this as having any merit for financial advice in any shape, form, or nature. The contracts audited do not account for any economic developments that the Project in question may pursue, and the veracity of the findings thus presented in this report relate solely to the proficiency, competence, aptitude, and discretion of our independent auditors, who make no guarantees nor assurance that the contracts are entirely free of exploits, bugs, vulnerabilities or deprecation of technologies.

All information provided in this report does not constitute financial or investment advice, nor should it be used to signal that any persons reading this report should invest their funds without sufficient individual due diligence, regardless of the findings presented. Information is provided 'as is, and CFGNINJA is under no covenant to audited completeness, accuracy, or solidity of the contracts. In no event will CFGNINJA or its partners, employees, agents, or parties related to the provision of this audit report be liable to any parties for, or lack thereof, decisions or actions with regards to the information provided in this audit report.

The assessment services provided by CFGNINJA are subject to dependencies and are under continuing development. You agree that your access or use, including but not limited to any services, reports, and materials, will be at your sole risk on an as-is, where-is, and as-available basis. Cryptographic tokens are emergent technologies with high levels of technical risk and uncertainty. The assessment reports could include false positives, negatives, and unpredictable results. The services may access, and depend upon, multiple layers of third parties.