



SMART CONTRACTS REVIEW



March 18th 2024 | v. 1.0

Security Audit Score

PASS

Zokyo Security has concluded that these smart contracts passed a security audit.



ZOKYO AUDIT SCORING CONVERGENT

1. Severity of Issues:

- Critical: Direct, immediate risks to funds or the integrity of the contract. Typically, these would have a very high weight.
- High: Important issues that can compromise the contract in certain scenarios.
- Medium: Issues that might not pose immediate threats but represent significant deviations from best practices.
- Low: Smaller issues that might not pose security risks but are still noteworthy.
- Informational: Generally, observations or suggestions that don't point to vulnerabilities but can be improvements or best practices.

2. Test Coverage: The percentage of the codebase that's covered by tests. High test coverage often suggests thorough testing practices and can increase the score.

3. Code Quality: This is more subjective, but contracts that follow best practices, are well-commented, and show good organization might receive higher scores.

4. Documentation: Comprehensive and clear documentation might improve the score, as it shows thoroughness.

5. Consistency: Consistency in coding patterns, naming, etc., can also factor into the score.

6. Response to Identified Issues: Some audits might consider how quickly and effectively the team responds to identified issues.

HYPOTHETICAL SCORING CALCULATION:

Let's assume each issue has a weight:

- Critical: -30 points
- High: -20 points
- Medium: -10 points
- Low: -5 points
- Informational: -1 point

Starting with a perfect score of 100:

- 0 Critical issues: 0 points deducted
- 0 High issues: 0 points deducted
- 0 Medium issues: 0 points deducted
- 1 Low issue: 1 acknowledged = - 3 points deducted
- 1 Informational issue: 1 acknowledged = 0 points deducted

Thus, $100 - 3 = 97$

TECHNICAL SUMMARY

This document outlines the overall security of the Convergent smart contract/s evaluated by the Zokyo Security team.

The scope of this audit was to analyze and document the Convergent smart contract/s codebase for quality, security, and correctness.

Contract Status



LOW RISK

There were 0 critical issues found during the review. (See [Complete Analysis](#))

It should be noted that this audit is not an endorsement of the reliability or effectiveness of the contract/s but rather limited to an assessment of the logic and implementation. In order to ensure a secure contract that can withstand the Ethereum network's fast-paced and rapidly changing environment, we recommend that the Convergent team put in place a bug bounty program to encourage further active analysis of the smart contract/s.



Table of Contents

Auditing Strategy and Techniques Applied	5
Executive Summary	7
Structure and Organization of the Document	8
Complete Analysis	9

AUDITING STRATEGY AND TECHNIQUES APPLIED

The source code of the smart contract was taken from the Convergent repository:

Repo: <https://github.com/Convergent-Finance/nft-staking>

Last commit: b552a56ce217fe6d9f3744f4a994ff3092d3fe9b

Within the scope of this audit, the team of auditors reviewed the following contract(s):

- programs/nft-staking/src/

During the audit, Zokyo Security ensured that the contract:

- Implements and adheres to the existing standards appropriately and effectively;
- The documentation and code comments match the logic and behavior;
- Distributes tokens in a manner that matches calculations;
- Follows best practices, efficiently using resources without unnecessary waste;
- Uses methods safe from reentrance attacks;
- Is not affected by the most recent vulnerabilities;
- Meets best practices in code readability, etc.

Zokyo Security has followed best practices and industry-standard techniques to verify the implementation of Convergent smart contract/s. To do so, the code was reviewed line by line by our smart contract developers, who documented even minor issues as they were discovered. In summary, our strategies consist largely of manual collaboration between multiple team members at each stage of the review:

- 01

Due diligence in assessing the overall code quality of the codebase.
- 02

Cross-comparison with other, similar smart contract/s by industry leaders.
- 03

Thorough manual review of the codebase line by line.








Executive Summary

The Zokyo team has performed a security audit of the provided codebase. The contracts submitted for auditing are well-crafted and organized. Detailed findings from the audit process are outlined in the "Complete Analysis" section.

STRUCTURE AND ORGANIZATION OF THE DOCUMENT

For the ease of navigation, the following sections are arranged from the most to the least critical ones. Issues are tagged as “Resolved” or “Unresolved” or “Acknowledged” depending on whether they have been fixed or addressed. Acknowledged means that the issue was sent to the Convergent team and the Convergent team is aware of it, but they have chosen to not solve it. The issues that are tagged as “Verified” contain unclear or suspicious functionality that either needs explanation from the Client or remains disregarded by the Client. Furthermore, the severity of each issue is written as assessed by the risk of exploitation or other unexpected or otherwise unsafe behavior:

- | | |
|---|---|
|  Critical
The issue affects the contract in such a way that funds may be lost, allocated incorrectly, or otherwise result in a significant loss. |  Low
The issue has minimal impact on the contract's ability to operate. |
|  High
The issue affects the ability of the contract to compile or operate in a significant way. |  Informational
The issue has no impact on the contract's ability to operate. |
|  Medium
The issue affects the ability of the contract to operate in a way that doesn't significantly hinder its behavior. | |

COMPLETE ANALYSIS

FINDINGS SUMMARY

#	Title	Risk	Status
1	No rewards calculations	Low	Acknowledged
2	Not commented code	Informational	Acknowledged

No rewards calculations

The smart contract allows to stake NFTs but doesn't calculate any rewards. The given documentation shows the points calculation, which is not implemented in the given codebase

Recommendation:

Implement rewards calculation

Client comment: It is handled off-chain and therefore is not in the scope of the smart contract. We have the rewards in the specs as a reference but it is not intended to be in the scope of the audit. The smart contract is designed to only handle the staking/unstaking. Since almost all the protocols that have points calculation are also handling it off-chain, we decided to go with this convention.

Not commented code

A smart contract doesn't have any comments in the code

Recommendation:

Add comments explaining the most important parts of the logic in the code repo. However, it's worth noting that it's not a security issue.

programs/nft-staking/src/	
Re-entrancy	Pass
Access Management Hierarchy	Pass
Arithmetic Over/Under Flows	Pass
Unexpected Ether	Pass
Delegatecall	Pass
Default Public Visibility	Pass
Hidden Malicious Code	Pass
Entropy Illusion (Lack of Randomness)	Pass
External Contract Referencing	Pass
Short Address/ Parameter Attack	Pass
Unchecked CALL Return Values	Pass
Race Conditions / Front Running	Pass
General Denial Of Service (DOS)	Pass
Uninitialized Storage Pointers	Pass
Floating Points and Precision	Pass
Tx.Origin Authentication	Pass
Signatures Replay	Pass
Pool Asset Security (backdoors in the underlying ERC-20)	Pass

We are grateful for the opportunity to work with the Convergent team.

The statements made in this document should not be interpreted as an investment or legal advice, nor should its authors be held accountable for the decisions made based on them.

Zokyo Security recommends the Convergent team put in place a bug bounty program to encourage further analysis of the smart contract by third parties.

