

Blockchain Security - Smart Contract Audits

Security Assessment

March 07, 2022



Disclaimer	3
Description	5
Engagement	5
Project Engagement	5
Logo	6
Contract Link	6
Risk Level Classification	7
Methodology	8
Used Code from other Frameworks / Smart Contracts (Imports)	9
Description	10
Scope of Work	12
Inheritance Graph	13
Verify Claim	14
Overall Checkup	19
Write Functions of Contract	20
SWC Attack	21
Audit Result	26
Audit Comments	27

Disclaimer

ContractWolf.io audits and reports should not be considered as a form of project's "advertisement" and does not cover any interaction and assessment from "project's contract" to "external contracts" such as Pancakeswap or similar.

ContractWolf does not provide any warranty on its released reports.

ContractWolf should not be used as a <u>decision</u> to invest into an audited project and is not affiliated nor partners to its audited contract projects.

ContractWolf provides transparent report to all its "clients" and to its "clients participants" and will not claim any guarantee of bug-free code within it's SMART CONTRACT.

ContractWolf presence is to analyze, audit and assess the client's smart contract's code.

Each company or projects should be liable to its security flaws and functionalities.

Network

Binance Smart Chain (BEP20)

Website

https://shibaracer.net/

Twitter

https://twitter.com/ShibaRacer

Telegram

https://t.me/Shiba_Racer

Github

https://github.com/ShibaRacer

Description

Shiba Racer is a Play to Earn NFT Metaverse Racing Game on Binance Smart Chain. You can drive alone or build teams and improve your chance to win.

ContractWolf Engagement

7th of March 2022, **Shiba Racer** engaged and agrees to audit their smart contract's code by ContractWolf. The goal of this engagement was to identify if there is a possibility of security flaws in the implementation of the contract or system.

ContractWolf will be focusing on contract issues and functionalities along with the projects claims from smart contract to their website, whitepaper and repository which has been provided by **Shiba Racer.**

Logo



Contract link:

https://bscscan.com/address/0x6C4883332504916721EF8B364d67fBb7a 5e4A99b

Risk Level Classification

Risk Level represents the classification or the probability that a certain function or threat that can exploit vulnerability and have an impact within the system or contract.

Risk Level is computed based on CVSS Version 3.0

Level	Value	Vulnerability
Critical	9 - 10	An exposure that can affect the contract functions in several events that can risk and disrupt the contract
High	7 - 8.9	An exposure that can affect the outcome when using the contract that can serve as an opening in manipulating the contract in an unwanted manner
Medium	4 - 6.9	An opening that could affect the outcome in executing the contract in a specific situation
Low	0.1 - 3.9	An opening but doesn't have an impact on the functionality of the contract
Informational	0	An opening that consists of information's but will not risk or affect the contract

Auditing Approach

Every line of code along with its functionalities will undergo manual review to check its security issues, quality, and contract scope of inheritance. The manual review will be done by our team that will document any issues that there were discovered.

Methodology

The auditing process follows a routine series of steps:

- 1. Code review that includes the following:
 - Review of the specifications, sources, and instructions provided to ContractWolf to make sure we understand the size, scope, and functionality of the smart contract.
 - Manual review of code, our team will have a process of reading the code line-by-line with the intention of identifying potential vulnerabilities and security flaws.
- 2. Testing and automated analysis that includes:
 - Testing the smart contract functions with common test cases and scenarios, to ensure that it returns the expected results.
- 3. Best practices review, the team will review the contract with the aim to improve efficiency, effectiveness, clarifications, maintainability, security, and control within the smart contract.
- 4. Recommendations to help the project take steps to secure the smart contract.

Used Code from other Frameworks/Smart Contracts (Direct Imports)

Imported Packages

- IUniswapV2Factory
- Math
- Strings
- ECDSA
- IERC20
- IERC20Metadata
- Context
- ERC20
- Ownable

Description

Optimization enabled: Yes

Version: v0.8.12

Decimal: 18

Symbol: \$SRC

Capabilities

Components

Version	Contracts	Libraries	Interfaces	Abstract
1.0	2	3	3	2

Exposed Functions

Version	Public	Private
1.0	16	6


Version	External	Internal
1.0	25	28

State Variables

Version	Total	Public
1.0	23	10

Capabilities

Version	Solidity Versions Observed	Experimental Features	Can Receive Funds	Uses Assembly	Has Destroyable Contracts
1.0	^0.8.12			Yes (2 blocks)	No




Scope of Work

Shiba Racer's 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.



Inheritance Graph



Verify Claims

Correct implementation of Token Standard

Tested	Verified
✓	X

Function	Description	Exist	Tested	Verified
TotalSupply	Information about the total coin or token supply	√	√	√
BalanceOf	Details on the account balance from a specified address	√	√	✓
Transfer	An action that transfers a specified amount of coin or token to a specified address	√	√	✓
TransferFrom	An action that transfers a specified amount of coin or token from a specified address	√	√	√
Approve	Provides permission to withdraw specified number of coin or token from a specified address	√	√	√

Optional implementation

Function	Description	Exist	Tested	Verified
renounceOwnership	Owner renounce ownership for more trust	√	√	√



Deployer cannot mint any new tokens after deployment

Statement	Exist	Tested	Verified	File
Deployer can't mint	X	X	X	Main
Deployer can't generate NFT	X	X	X	Main

Max / Total supply: 500,000,000

Deployer cannot burn or lock user funds

Statement	Exist	Tested	Verified
Deployer cannot lock	√	√	✓
Deployer cannot burn	X	X	X

Deployer cannot pause contract

Statement	Exist	Tested	Verified
Deployer cannot pause	_	_	_



Overall Checkup (Smart Contract Security)



Legend

Attribute	Symbol
Verified / Checked	✓
Partly Verified	X
Unverified / Not checked	P
Not Available	_

Write Functions of Contract



SWC Attacks

ID	Title	Relationships	Status
SWC-136	Unencrypted Private Data On-Chain	CWE-767: Access to Critical Private Variable via Public Method	PASSED
<u>SWC-135</u>	Code With No Effects	CWE-1164: Irrelevant Code	PASSED
SWC-134	Message call with hardcoded gas amount	CWE-655: Improper Initialization	PASSED
SWC-133	Hash Collisions with Multiple Variable Length Arguments	CWE-294: Authentication Bypass by Capture-replay	NOT PASSED
SWC-132	Unexpected Ether balance	CWE-667: Improper Locking	PASSED
SWC-131	Presence of unused variables	CWE-1164: Irrelevant Code	PASSED
SWC-130	Right-To Left Override control character (U+202E)	CWE-451: User Interface (UI) Misrepresentation of Critical Information	PASSED
SWC-129	Typographical Error	CWE-480: Use of Incorrect Operator	PASSED

SWC-128	DoS With Block	CWE-400: Uncontrolled	PASSED
3VVC-128	Gas Limit	Resource Consumption	PASSED
	Arbitrary Jump	CWE-695: Use of Low-Level	
<u>SWC-127</u>	with Function	<u>Functionality</u>	PASSED
	Type Variable		
	Incorrect	CWE-696: Incorrect	
SWC-125	Inheritance	Behavior Order	PASSED
	Order		
	Write to	CWE-123: Write-what-	
SWC-124	Arbitrary	where Condition	PASSED
3VVC-124	Storage		PASSED
	Location		
	Requirement	CWE-573: Improper	
SWC-123	Violation	Following of Specification	PASSED
		by Caller	
	Lack of Proper	CWE-345: Insufficient	
SWC-122	Signature	Verification of Data	PASSED
	Verification	<u>Authenticity</u>	
	Missing	CWE-347: Improper	
	Protection	<u>Verification of</u>	
SWC-121	against	Cryptographic	PASSED
	Signature	<u>Signature</u>	
	Replay Attacks		
	Weak Sources	CWE-330: Use of	
	of	Insufficiently	
SWC-120	Randomness	Random Values	NOT PASSED
300-120	from Chain		INOT I ASSED
	Attributes		

SWC-119	Shadowing State Variables	CWE-710: Improper Adherence to Coding Standards	PASSED
SWC-118	Incorrect Constructor Name	CWE-665: Improper Initialization	PASSED
SWC-117	Signature Malleability	CWE-347: Improper Verification of Cryptographic Signature	PASSED
SWC-116	Timestamp Dependence	CWE-829: Inclusion of Functionality from Untrusted Control Sphere	NOT PASSED
SWC-115	Authorization through tx.origin	CWE-477: Use of Obsolete Function	PASSED
SWC-114	Transaction Order Dependence	CWE-362: Concurrent Execution using Shared Resource with Improper Synchronization ('Race Condition')	PASSED
SWC-113	DoS with Failed Call	CWE-703: Improper Check or Handling of Exceptional Conditions	PASSED
SWC-112	Delegate call to Untrusted Callee	CWE-829: Inclusion of Functionality from Untrusted Control Sphere	PASSED

<u>SWC-111</u>	Use of Deprecated Solidity Functions	CWE-477: Use of Obsolete Function	PASSED
SWC-110	Assert Violation	CWE-670: Always-Incorrect Control Flow Implementation	PASSED
SWC-109	Uninitialized Storage Pointer	CWE-824: Access of Uninitialized Pointer	PASSED
<u>SWC-108</u>	State Variable Default Visibility	CWE-710: Improper Adherence to Coding Standards	PASSED
<u>SWC-107</u>	Reentrancy	CWE-841: Improper Enforcement of Behavioral Workflow	PASSED
SWC-106	Unprotected SELFDESTRUCT Instruction	CWE-284: Improper Access Control	PASSED
<u>SWC-105</u>	Unprotected Ether Withdrawal	CWE-284: Improper Access Control	PASSED
<u>SWC-104</u>	Unchecked Call Return Value	CWE-252: Unchecked Return Value	PASSED
<u>SWC-103</u>	Floating Pragma	CWE-664: Improper Control of a Resource Through its Lifetime	PASSED

	Outdated	CWE-937: Using	
SWC-102	Compiler	Components with Known	PASSED
	Version	<u>Vulnerabilities</u>	
	Integer	CWE-682: Incorrect	
SWC-101	Overflow and	<u>Calculation</u>	PASSED
	Underflow		
	Function	CWE-710: Improper	
SWC-100	Default	Adherence to Coding	PASSED
	Visibility	<u>Standards</u>	

AUDIT PASSED

Critical Issues

No critical issues found

High Issues

No high issues found

Medium Issues

No medium issues found

Low Issues

No low issues found

Informational Issues

No informational issues found

Function Issues

No informational issues found

Audit Comments

Owner can't set buy/sell fees more than 25%

Owner can't set max transaction limit.

Owner can mint new tokens.

Read report for more information.