

# Ultrade CODEX

## Ultrade EVM

Smart Contract Audit Report

# Contents

<b>Contents.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Revision History &amp; Version Control.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1. Executive Summary.....</b>	
<b>2. Overview.....</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1. Project Overview.....	4
2.2. Scope.....	4
2.3. Summary of Findings.....	4
2.4. Security Level References.....	4
<b>3.Comprehensive Analysis findings.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>4. Vulnerabilities.....</b>	<b>6</b>
4.1. Private state variable is being returned in a public function.....	6
4.2. Bytes data type is being used instead of bytes32 for login Address.....	7
4.3. Functions not used internally could be marked as external.....	7
4.4. Missing Zero Address Validation.....	8
4.5. Uninitialized Local Variables.....	8
4.6. Usage of differentPragma directives.....	9
4.7. Constants should be defined and used instead of literals.....	10
4.8. Presence of Dead Code.....	10
4.9. Unchecked Transfer.....	11
4.10. Unused State Variable.....	12
<b>5. Tested for Scenarios.....</b>	<b>13</b>
5.1. Successful USDC Deposit to Codex.....	13
5.2. Invalid Login Address Handling in Deposit .....	14
5.3. Zero Amount Deposit Rejection .....	15
5.4. Insufficient Allowance Handling in Deposit.....	16
5.5. Insufficient Balance Handling in Deposit.....	17
5.6. Successful Gas Token (ETH) Deposit to Codex.....	18
5.7. Invalid Chain ID Handling in Cross-Chain Deposit Quote.....	18
5.8. Successful Application Contract Registration.....	19
5.9. Unauthorized Application Contract Registration Attempt.....	20
5.10. Successful Token Manager Contract Registration.....	21
5.11. Passing Checks.....	21
<b>6. EVM To Algorand Transactions.....</b>	<b>22</b>
6.1. Depositing USDC.....	22
6.2. Withdrawing USDC.....	24
6.3. Deposit Gas Token To Codex.....	26
6.4. Withdrawing zero amount.....	27
6.5. Withdrawing with zero fee amount.....	27
6.6. Withdrawing with the user that has not deposited any USDC.....	29
6.7. Deposit to codex function with zero amount.....	31
<b>7. Auditing Approach and Methodologies Applied.....</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>8. Limitations on Disclosure and Use of this Report.....</b>	<b>34</b>

# Revision History & Version Control

Version	Date	Author(s)	Description
1.0	08-Nov-2024	Gurkirat singh, Shashank, Laxmi Prasad	Interim Report

## 1. Executive Summary

Entersoft has conducted a static and dynamic smart contract audit of the Ultrade EVM project through a comprehensive smart contract audit. The primary objective was to identify potential vulnerabilities and risks within the codebase, ensuring adherence to industry-leading standards while prioritizing security, reliability, and performance. Our focus was on prompt and efficient identification and resolution of vulnerabilities to enhance the overall robustness of the solidity smart contract.

### Testing Methodology:

Our testing methodology in Solidity adhered to industry standards and best practices, integrating partially implemented OWASP and NIST SP 800 standards for encryption and signatures.

We have performed a detailed manual analysis, adherence to industry standards, and the use of a comprehensive toolset. Our approach ensured a thorough evaluation within the designated Solidity code files.

### Findings and Security Posture:

Our primary focus was on Access Control Policies, Transaction Signature Validations, Reentrancy, Time Manipulation, Default Visibility, Outdated Compiler Version, Input Validation, Deprecated Solidity Functions, Shadowing State Variables, Presence of Unused Variables, Overflow and Underflow Conditions, Assets Integrity, Errors and Exception.

Importantly, our audit process intentionally avoided reliance solely on automated tools, emphasizing a more in-depth and nuanced approach to security analysis. Conducted from June 6, 2024 to November 6, 2024, our team diligently assessed and validated the security posture of the solidity smart contract, ultimately classifying it as "Secure," reflecting the absence of identified vulnerabilities and the robustness of the codebase against potential threats.

## 2. Overview

### 2.1 Project Overview

Entersoft has meticulously audited the smart contract project from August 1, 2024 to November 8, 2024 with a primary focus on Solidity code files integral to blockchain functionality, emphasizing vulnerabilities in associated gas claiming. The working of basic functionalities was also tested during the review.

### 2.2. Scope

The audit scope covers the CODEX-dev smart contract available in the GitHub private repository:

<b>Github</b>	<a href="https://github.com/ultrade-org/CODEX">https://github.com/ultrade-org/CODEX</a>
<b>Branch</b>	Dev Branch
<b>Commit ID</b>	2b696ebe28016021a996d7172effaf79ee3dc339
<b>Scope</b>	codex\CODEX-dev\dev\contracts\chains\evm

**OUT-OF-SCOPE:** External contracts, other imported smart contracts.

### 2.3 Summary of Findings

The following table is the summary of findings, which summarizes the overall risks identified during the audit.

● Critical	● High	● Medium	● Low	● Informational
0	0	1	5	4

### 2.4 Security Level References

Every vulnerability in this report was assigned a severity level from the following classification table:



### 3. Comprehensive Analysis findings: A Dual Approach through Static and Manual Examination

#### Phase 1: Static Analysis

In our rigorous smart contract audit process, we employed a multifaceted approach combining both static and dynamic analysis methodologies to comprehensively evaluate the security posture of the protocol. Our static analysis phase involved the utilization of static analyzing tools such as Slither, Aderyn. These tools enabled us to conduct automated code analysis to identify potential vulnerabilities within the smart contracts.

#### Tools and Efforts:

Slither, Aderyn were instrumental in performing static analysis, allowing us to efficiently scan the codebase for common vulnerabilities such as reentrancy, denial-of-service (DOS) attacks, front-running vulnerabilities, time dependencies, token approval issues, and arithmetic errors. Through meticulous examination of the code, we meticulously identified and categorized potential risks, laying the groundwork for further in-depth analysis.

#### Phase 2: Dynamic Analysis

After the static analysis phase, we transitioned to dynamic analysis, which involved a more hands-on approach to scrutinizing the intended functionality and security of the smart contracts. Further, we devised a comprehensive suite of unit tests to validate the expected behavior of the smart contracts under various scenarios.

#### Processes and Test Cases:

Our dynamic analysis encompassed a systematic exploration of the smart contracts' functionalities, focusing on critical areas prone to vulnerabilities. We meticulously crafted test cases to assess the resilience of the contracts against potential attack vectors, including but not limited to reentrancy attacks, DOS vulnerabilities, front-running exploits, time-sensitive vulnerabilities, token approval vulnerabilities, and arithmetic errors.

Throughout both the static and dynamic analysis phases, our team dedicated substantial efforts to meticulously review the codebase, identify vulnerabilities, and develop robust test cases to assess the security posture of the protocol comprehensively. By combining automated analysis with manual examination and testing, we ensured a thorough evaluation of the smart contracts, ultimately enhancing the security and reliability of the protocol.

## 4. Vulnerabilities

### Note:

The following values for "Severity" mean:

- **Critical**: This vulnerability poses a direct and severe threat to the funds or the main functionality of the protocol.
- **High**: Direct impact on the funds or the main functionality of the protocol.
- **Medium**: Indirect impact on the funds or the protocol's functionality.
- **Low**: Minimal to no impact on the funds or the protocol's main functionality.

The following values for "Result" mean:

- **PASS**: indicates that there is no security risk.
- **FAIL**: indicates that there is a security risk that needs to be remediated.
- **Informational** : Suggestions related to good coding practices and gas-efficient code.
- **Not Applicable**: means the attack vector is Not applicable or Not available

### 4.1 Private state variable is being returned in a public function

<b>Severity</b>	Medium
<b>Description</b>	The private state variable <code>current_msg</code> is being returned by the public function <code>getCurrentMsg()</code> , which exposes the private variable externally. This contradicts the intended behavior of a private variable. Returning private variables through public functions undermines the purpose of keeping them private.
<b>Location / Source File</b>	TokenManagerUpgradeable – 305
<b>Observation</b>	The function <code>getCurrentMsg()</code> is public but returns the private state variable <code>current_msg</code> . Since <code>getCurrentMsg()</code> is publicly accessible, this makes the private variable publicly available within the contract, contradicting the principle that private variables should not be exposed publicly.
<b>Remediation</b>	<p>Make the function <code>getCurrentMsg()</code> as private/internal</p> <p>Add</p> <pre>function getCurrentMsg() private view returns (string memory) { return current_msg; }</pre> <p>Remove</p> <pre>function getCurrentMsg() public view returns (string memory) { return current_msg; }</pre>
<b>Remark</b>	Issue fixed in commit:

## 4.2 Bytes data type is being used instead of bytes32 for login Address

<b>Severity</b>	Low
<b>Description</b>	In the functions <code>depositToCodex</code> and <code>depositGasTokenToCodex</code> <code>bytes</code> type is being used for the <code>loginAddress</code> . The <code>loginAddress</code> must be of 32 bytes of length which is being checked by <code>require</code> statements inside the functions. In this regard <code>bytes memory loginAddress</code> can be replaced by <code>bytes32 loginAddress</code> , by doing this we can also remove the <code>require</code> statement as it's already 32 bytes now. It will save gas and make the implementation more efficient.
<b>Location / Source File</b>	TokenManagerUpgradeable – 123, 136
<b>Observation</b>	<code>bytes</code> data type uses more gas than <code>bytes32</code> as it is a dynamic data type. If <code>bytes</code> is used for <code>loginAddress</code> , an additional required check is needed inside the function to verify that the value is 32 bytes in length. By using the <code>bytes32</code> data type for <code>loginAddress</code> , additional checks for length are unnecessary, which results in gas savings.
<b>Remediation</b>	<p>Change the data type of <code>loginAddress</code> from <code>bytes</code> to <code>bytes32</code>.</p> <p>Add:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <code>bytes32 loginAddress</code></li> </ul> <p>Remove:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <code>bytes memory loginAddress</code></li> <li>• <code>require(loginAddress.length == 32, "Check loginAddress has the normalized type");</code></li> </ul>
<b>Remark</b>	Issue fixed in commit:

## 4.3 Functions not used internally could be marked as external

<b>Severity</b>	Low
<b>Description</b>	Functions intended to be called externally by users or other contracts, rather than internally within the contract, should be marked as <code>external</code> instead of <code>public</code> for clarity and potential optimization.
<b>Location / Source File</b>	TokenManagerUpgradeable
<b>Observation</b>	The functions are declared as <code>public</code> , but they are not called internally within the contract. Since they are meant to be called externally, marking them as <code>external</code> would make the code more gas-optimized.
<b>Remediation</b>	Change the visibility of these functions to <code>external</code> if they are intended to be called from outside the contract. This improves readability and provides a hint to developers about the intended usage.
<b>Remark</b>	Issue fixed in commit:

## 4.4 Missing Zero Address Validation

<b>Severity</b>	Low
<b>Description</b>	Zero address validation is a security measure to prevent transactions to or from a specific address that represents nothing. Missing this validation could allow accidental or malicious transfers to this address, resulting in permanently locked funds that cannot be recovered.
<b>Location / Source File</b>	TokenManagerUpgradeable – 84,86,87,
<b>Observation</b>	<p>Missing zero address validation in TokenManagerUpgradeable.initialize() can lead to accidental or malicious transfers to the zero address, resulting in permanently locked and unrecoverable funds. This oversight, affecting the wormhole_core_bridge_address, cctpUSDC, and wrappedNative, compromises the security and reliability of the contract, potentially causing financial losses and diminishing user trust.</p> <pre> 66 //TokenManagerUpgradeable.sol 67     function initialize( 68         // address initialOwner, 69         address _wormholeRelayer, 70         address _wormhole, 71         address _circleMessageTransmitter, 72         address _circleTokenMessenger, 73         address _USDC, 74         address _WETH 75     ) public initializer { 76         __Pausable_init(); 77         // __Ownable_init(initialOwner); 78         __Ownable_init(msg.sender); 79         __UUPSUpgradeable_init(); 80         __WormholeCCTP_init(_wormholeRelayer, _wormhole, _circleMessageTransmitter, _circleTokenMessenger, _USDC); 81 82         GAS_LIMIT = 250_000; 83         UNIFIED_USDC = "CCTPUSDC"; 84         wormhole_core_bridge_address = _wormhole; <span style="border: 2px solid red;">// Line 84</span> 85         core_bridge = IWormhole(wormhole_core_bridge_address); 86         cctpUSDC = _USDC; <span style="border: 2px solid red;">// Line 86</span> 87         wrappedNative = _WETH; <span style="border: 2px solid red;">// Line 87</span> 88         nonce = 0; 89 </pre>
<b>Remediation</b>	To address this vulnerability, implement a validation step to ensure that the addresses involved are not zero. By incorporating this check, the risk of unintended ownership transfers or other undesirable outcomes can be mitigated effectively.
<b>Remark</b>	Issue fixed in commit:

## 4.5 Uninitialized Local Variables

<b>Severity</b>	Low
<b>Description</b>	Uninitialized local variables in Solidity smart contracts can lead to unpredictable behavior and security vulnerabilities. These variables have default values leading to logical errors and potential exploits. Using uninitialized local variables can result in incorrect calculations, faulty contract states, and unintended contract behavior.
<b>Location / Source File</b>	WormholeCCTP.sol – 259-283
<b>Observation</b>	Uninitialized local variables in Solidity smart contracts, such as amountUSDCReceived in WormholeCCTP.receiveWormholeMessages(), can lead to unpredictable behaviour and security vulnerabilities. This can cause incorrect calculations, faulty contract states, and unintended contract behaviour, potentially resulting in financial losses and exploitation by malicious actors.

<b>Remediation</b>	Entersoft recommends that, for uninitialized local variables in Solidity contracts, it's crucial to initialize all variables properly. Explicitly set each variable to its intended initial value upon declaration. Even if a variable is meant to start at zero, assign it explicitly for clarity.
<b>Remark</b>	Issue fixed in commit:

## 4.6 Usage of different Pragma directives

<b>Severity</b>	Low
<b>Description</b>	Usage of different Pragma directives
<b>Location / Source File</b>	TokenManagerUpgradeable
<b>Observation</b>	<p>Pragma directives are compiler instructions that can optimize performance, manage warnings, and control data alignment. They enhance code efficiency and readability but may introduce bugs or runtime errors if misused. Proper usage balances benefits and potential risks.</p> <pre>//TokenManagerUpgradeable.sol pragma solidity ^0.8.13;  //WormholeCCTP.sol pragma solidity ^0.8.13;  //BytesLib.sol pragma solidity &gt;=0.8.0 &lt;0.9.0;  //IWETH.sol pragma solidity ^0.8.13;</pre>
<b>Remediation</b>	<p>To remediate the issue of different Solidity versions being used, standardize on a single, stable version of Solidity for all contracts and their dependencies. This approach minimizes compatibility issues and potential security vulnerabilities, leading to more robust and secure smart contracts.</p> <p>Use ^ or &gt;= Carefully: When specifying versions, using ^ (e.g., pragma solidity ^0.8.0;) or &gt;= (e.g., pragma solidity &gt;=0.8.0;) allows for some flexibility but can introduce compatibility risks if not managed carefully.</p>
<b>Remark</b>	Issue fixed in commit:

## 4.7 Constants should be defined and used instead of literals

<b>Severity</b>	Informational
-----------------	---------------

<b>Description</b>	<p>Constants should be declared instead of using literals in the code like in</p> <pre><code>require(loginAddress.length == 32, "Check loginAddress has the normalized type");</code></pre> <p>These literals represent fixed values, fees, or conditions.</p>
<b>Location / Source File</b>	TokenManagerUpgradeable.sol
<b>Observation</b>	<p>It makes the code more efficient.</p> <pre><code>function depositToCodex(address token, uint256 amount, bytes memory loginAddress, uint256 loginChainId) public returns (     //check login address     require(loginAddress.length == 32, "Check loginAddress has the normalized type");     //receive token from user wallet     _transferFrom(token, amount);      //emit deposit message to wormhole     sequence = _sendDepositMessage(token, amount, loginAddress, loginChainId);     return sequence; }  function depositGasTokenToCodex(bytes memory loginAddress, uint256 loginChainId) public payable returns (uint64 sequence) //check login address require(loginAddress.length == 32, "Check loginAddress has the normalized type");  //check deposit amount require(msg.value &gt; 0, "Deposit amount should be bigger than zero");  //convert ETH to WETH IWETH(wrappedNative).deposit{value: msg.value}();</code></pre>
<b>Remediation</b>	Replace the literals with the defined constants to improve code readability and maintainability.
<b>Remark</b>	Issue fixed in commit:

## 4.8 Presence of Dead Code

<b>Severity</b>	Informational
<b>Description</b>	Dead code in Solidity refers to functions or sections of code within a smart contract that are declared but never called or executed during the contract's lifecycle. These unused functions can accumulate over time due to changes in contract requirements or development iterations, resulting in unnecessary complexity and potentially increasing the contract's attack surface.
<b>Location / Source File</b>	TokenManagerUpgradeable – 13-89,183-187,300-306
<b>Observation</b>	In Entersoft's review of the Solidity smart contract, we identified the presence of dead code sections of the codebase that are never invoked or utilized throughout the contract's operations. The existence of such a dead code entails several significant drawbacks. Primarily, it introduces superfluous complexity, thereby complicating the understanding and maintenance of the contract. This added complexity can lead to increased deployment costs due to the larger contract size. Additionally, dead code enlarges the contract's attack surface, potentially obscuring vulnerabilities and unintended behaviors.

```

function receivePayloadAndUSDC(
    bytes memory payload,
    uint256 amountUSDCReceived,
    bytes32 sourceAddress,
    uint16 sourceChain,
    bytes32 deliveryHash
) internal virtual {}

function _sendMessageToRecipient(bytes memory message, uint32 _nonce) internal returns (uint64 sequence) {
    //call publishMessage of wormhole core to emit message
    sequence = core_bridge.publishMessage(_nonce, message, 1);
    return sequence;
}

```

<b>Remediation</b>	Entersoft recommends removing or commenting out these unused portions to eliminate dead code, thereby ensuring a streamlined and efficient contract. Moreover, dead code enlarges the contract's attack surface, potentially concealing vulnerabilities and unintended behaviors.
<b>Remark</b>	Issue fixed in commit:

## 4.9 Unchecked Transfer

<b>Severity</b>	Informational
<b>Description</b>	Unchecked transfer vulnerabilities occur when the return value of an external transfer or transferFrom call in a smart contract is not validated. In blockchain and smart contract development, especially with Ethereum's ERC-20 tokens, these functions are used to move tokens between addresses.
<b>Location / Source File</b>	TokenManagerUpgradeable – 319-337
<b>Observation</b>	<p>Ignoring the return value of IERC20(USDC).transfer() in TokenManagerUpgradeable.receivePayloadAndUSDC() can lead to significant issues. Ensuring the return value is checked is crucial for maintaining contract integrity and user trust.</p> <p>In Solidity 0.8.0 and later, the <code>transfer</code> function will automatically revert if it fails, so there's no need for an explicit check of the return value. However, it's good practice to explicitly handle potential failures to ensure your contract is robust and clear in its error handling.</p>

```

function receivePayloadAndUSDC(
    bytes memory payload,
    uint256 amountUSDCReceived,
    bytes32, // sourceAddress
    uint16, // sourceChain
    bytes32 // deliveryHash
) internal override onlyWormholeRelayer {
    address recipient = abi.decode(payload.slice(0, 32), (address));
    IERC20(USDC).transfer(recipient, amountUSDCReceived);

    bytes memory txn_id = payload.slice(32, 32);

    emit WithdrawCCTP(
        txn_id,
        amountUSDCReceived
    );
}

receive() external payable {}
}

```

<b>Remediation</b>	<p>Entersoft recommends implementing the following measures to ensure robust handling of token transfers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Always verify the return values of transfer functions to confirm successful execution, using constructs such as <code>require(token.transfer(recipient, amount), "Transfer failed");</code>.</li> <li>Additionally, adopting safe transfer functions from trusted libraries, like OpenZeppelin's SafeERC20, can automate these checks and ensure proper handling, enhancing the security and reliability of token operations.</li> </ul>
<b>Remark</b>	Issue fixed in commit:

## 4.10 Unused State Variable

<b>Severity</b>	Informational
<b>Description</b>	<p>The issue typically indicates that a state variable defined within a Solidity smart contract is not utilized anywhere within the contract's logic. This situation arises when a variable is declared but never referenced or manipulated in any of the contract's functions or statements. This results in potential increases in gas prices due to inefficient code execution, contributes to storage problems, and exacerbates performance issues.</p>
<b>Location / Source File</b>	WormholeCCTP – 62

<b>Observation</b>	Throughout the entire contract, these sections of code remain unused. The ramifications of this issue transcend mere storage consumption, affecting gas costs, code clarity, maintainability, readability, and ultimately, security. Resolving this matter is imperative for optimizing gas usage, elevating code quality, and fortifying the overall efficiency and security of the smart contract.
<b>Remediation</b>	Entersoft suggests remediating the issue by identifying and removing or repurposing any unused variables within the contract's logic. By optimizing storage usage and improving code clarity, you can enhance the efficiency, readability, and security of the smart contract.
<b>Remark</b>	Issue fixed in commit:

## 5. Tested for Scenarios

### 5.1 Successful USDC Deposit to Codex

Result	PASS
Function	depositToCodex
Objective	To verify that the depositToCodex function correctly transfers USDC from a user to the TokenManagerUpgradeable contract and emits the appropriate event.
Test Case	<pre> function testDepositToCodex() public {     uint256 amount = 1 * 10 ** usdc.decimals();     bytes memory loginAddress = abi.encodePacked(bytes32("loginAddress"));      // Impersonate MetaMask address     vm.startPrank(user);      // Ensure MetaMask address has enough USDC     uint256 initialBalance = usdc.balanceOf(user);     require(         initialBalance &gt;= amount,         "Not enough USDC in MetaMask address"     );      // Approve tokenManager to spend MetaMask's USDC     usdc.approve(tokenManagerAddress, amount);      // Call depositToCodex     tokenManager.depositToCodex(address(usdc), amount, loginAddress, 1);      // Stop impersonation     vm.stopPrank();      // Verify the USDC balance of tokenManager     uint256 tokenManagerBalance = usdc.balanceOf(tokenManagerAddress);     assertEq(tokenManagerBalance, amount); } </pre>

<b>Expected Behavior</b>	This test checks if a user can successfully deposit a specified amount of USDC into the contract, ensuring the balance is updated correctly and the event is emitted.
--------------------------	---

## 5.2 Invalid Login Address Handling in Deposit

Result	PASS
Function	depositToCodex
Objective	To ensure the depositToCodex function reverts when provided with an invalid login address.
Test Case	<pre> function testDepositToCodexWithInvalidLoginAddress() public {     uint256 amount = 1 * 10 ** usdc.decimals();     bytes memory invalidLoginAddress = "invalidAddress"; // Invalid login address (not 32 bytes)      // Impersonate MetaMask address     vm.startPrank(user);      // Ensure MetaMask address has enough USDC     uint256 initialBalance = usdc.balanceOf(user);     require(         initialBalance &gt;= amount,         "Not enough USDC in MetaMask address"     );      // Approve tokenManager to spend MetaMask's USDC     usdc.approve(tokenManagerAddress, amount);      // Expect the transaction to revert due to invalid login address     vm.expectRevert("Check loginAddress has the normalized type");     tokenManager.depositToCodex(         address(usdc),         amount,         invalidLoginAddress,         1     );     vm.stopPrank(); } </pre>
Expected Behavior	This test verifies that the function correctly handles an invalid login address (not 32 bytes) by reverting the transaction.

## 5.3 Zero Amount Deposit Rejection

<b>Result</b>	PASS
<b>Function</b>	depositToCodex
<b>Objective</b>	To verify that the depositToCodex function reverts when attempting to deposit a zero amount.
<b>Test Case</b>	<pre> function testDepositToCodexWithZeroAmount() public {     uint256 zeroAmount = 0;     bytes memory loginAddress = abi.encodePacked(bytes32("loginAddress"));      // Impersonate MetaMask address     vm.startPrank(user);      // Ensure MetaMask address has enough USDC (though it won't be used in this test)     uint256 initialBalance = usdc.balanceOf(user);     require(         initialBalance &gt;= zeroAmount,         "Not enough USDC in MetaMask address"     );      // Approve tokenManager to spend MetaMask's USDC     usdc.approve(tokenManagerAddress, zeroAmount);      // Expect the transaction to revert due to zero amount     vm.expectRevert("You need to sell at least some tokens");     tokenManager.depositToCodex(address(usdc), zeroAmount, loginAddress, 1);      // Stop impersonation     vm.stopPrank(); } </pre>
<b>Expected Behavior</b>	This test ensures that the function checks for a non-zero amount and reverts if the amount is zero.

## 5.4 Insufficient Allowance Handling in Deposit

<b>Result</b>	PASS
<b>Function</b>	depositToCodex
<b>Objective</b>	To ensure the depositToCodex function reverts when the allowance is less than the deposit amount.
<b>Test Case</b>	<pre> function testDepositToCodexWithInsufficientAllowance() public {     uint256 amount = 2 * 10 ** usdc.decimals();     uint256 insufficientAllowance = 1 * 10 ** usdc.decimals(); // Less than the deposit amount     bytes memory loginAddress = abi.encodePacked(bytes32("loginAddress"));      // Impersonate MetaMask address     vm.startPrank(user);      // Ensure MetaMask address has enough USDC     uint256 initialBalance = usdc.balanceOf(user);     require(         initialBalance &gt;= amount,         "Not enough USDC in MetaMask address"     );      // Approve tokenManager to spend less than the deposit amount     usdc.approve(tokenManagerAddress, insufficientAllowance);      // Expect the transaction to revert due to insufficient allowance     vm.expectRevert("Check the token allowance");     tokenManager.depositToCodex(address(usdc), amount, loginAddress, 1);      // Stop impersonation     vm.stopPrank(); } </pre>
<b>Expected Behavior</b>	This test checks that the function correctly handles cases where the user's allowance is insufficient for the deposit.

## 5.5 Insufficient Balance Handling in Deposit

<b>Result</b>	PASS
<b>Function</b>	depositToCodex
<b>Objective</b>	To verify that the depositToCodex function reverts when the user's balance is insufficient for the deposit.
<b>Test Case</b>	<pre> function testDepositToCodexWithInsufficientBalance() public {     uint256 amount = 15 * 10 ** usdc.decimals();     bytes memory loginAddress = abi.encodePacked(bytes32("loginAddress"));      // Impersonate MetaMask address     vm.startPrank(user);      // Approve tokenManager to spend the insufficient balance     usdc.approve(tokenManagerAddress, amount);      // Expect the transaction to revert due to insufficient balance     vm.expectRevert("ERC20: transfer amount exceeds balance");     tokenManager.depositToCodex(address(usdc), amount, loginAddress, 1);      // Stop impersonation     vm.stopPrank(); } </pre>
<b>Expected Behavior</b>	This test ensures that the function checks the user's balance and reverts if it is less than the deposit amount.

## 5.6 Successful Gas Token (ETH) Deposit to Codex

<b>Result</b>	PASS
<b>Function</b>	depositGasTokenToCodex
<b>Objective</b>	To verify that the depositGasTokenToCodex function correctly converts ETH to WETH and deposits it into the contract.
<b>Test Case</b>	<pre> function testDepositGasTokenToCodex() public {     uint256 amount = 0.01 ether; // Valid amount of gas token (ETH)     bytes memory loginAddress = abi.encodePacked(bytes32("loginAddress"));      // Impersonate MetaMask address     vm.startPrank(user);      // Fund MetaMask address with ETH     vm.deal(user, amount);      // Call depositGasTokenToCodex     tokenManager.depositGasTokenToCodex{value: amount}(loginAddress, 1);      // Stop impersonation     vm.stopPrank();      // Verify the WETH balance of tokenManager     uint256 wethBalance = weth.balanceOf(tokenManagerAddress);     assertEq(wethBalance, amount); } </pre>
<b>Expected Behavior</b>	This test checks if a user can successfully deposit ETH, which is converted to WETH, ensuring the balance is updated correctly.

## 5.7 Invalid Chain ID Handling in Cross-Chain Deposit Quote

<b>Result</b>	PASS
<b>Function</b>	quoteCrossChainDeposit
<b>Objective</b>	To ensure the quoteCrossChainDeposit function reverts when provided with an invalid chain ID.
<b>Test Case</b>	<pre> function testQuoteCrossChainDepositWithInvalidChainId() public {     uint256 invalidTargetChainId = 99999; // Example invalid target chain ID      // Expect the transaction to revert due to invalid chain ID     vm.expectRevert(); // Adjust the expected revert message if the contract provides a specific one     tokenManager.quoteCrossChainDeposit(uint16(invalidTargetChainId)); } </pre>
<b>Expected Behavior</b>	This test verifies that the function handles invalid chain IDs by reverting the transaction.

## 5.8 Successful Application Contract Registration

<b>Result</b>	PASS
<b>Function</b>	registerApplicationContracts
<b>Objective</b>	To verify that the registerApplicationContracts function correctly registers application contracts for a given chain ID.
<b>Test Case</b>	<pre> function testRegisterApplicationContracts() public {     uint16 validChainId = 1; // Example valid chain ID     bytes32 validApplicationAddress = bytes32("applicationAddrs"); // Example valid application address      // Impersonate the owner address     vm.startPrank(tokenManager.owner());     // Call registerApplicationContracts     tokenManager.registerApplicationContracts(         validChainId,         validApplicationAddress     );      // Stop impersonation     vm.stopPrank();      // Verify the application contract was registered correctly     bytes32 registeredAddress = tokenManager._applicationContracts(         validChainId     );     assertEq(registeredAddress, validApplicationAddress); } </pre>
<b>Expected Behavior</b>	This test checks that the function updates the mapping of application contracts when called by the owner.

## 5.9 Unauthorized Application Contract Registration Attempt

<b>Result</b>	PASS
<b>Function</b>	registerApplicationContracts
<b>Objective</b>	To ensure the registerApplicationContracts function reverts when called by a non-owner.
<b>Test Case</b>	<pre> function testUnauthorizedRegisterApplicationContracts() public {     uint16 validChainId = 1; // Example valid chain ID     bytes32 validApplicationAddress = bytes32("applicationAddrs"); // Example valid application address      // Impersonate a non-owner address     address nonOwner = address(0x458a64653f613d932a37E95557af8085b39A2f3F);     vm.startPrank(nonOwner);      // Expect the transaction to revert due to unauthorized access     vm.expectRevert();     tokenManager.registerApplicationContracts(         validChainId,         validApplicationAddress     );      // Stop impersonation     vm.stopPrank(); } </pre>
<b>Expected Behavior</b>	This test verifies that only the owner can register application contracts, ensuring unauthorized access is prevented.

## 5.10 Successful Token Manager Contract Registration

<b>Result</b>	PASS
<b>Function</b>	registerApplicationContracts
<b>Objective</b>	To verify that the registerTokenManagerContracts function correctly registers token manager contracts for a given chain ID.
<b>Test Case</b>	<pre> function testRegisterTokenManagerContracts() public {     uint16 validChainId = 1; // Example valid chain ID     address validTokenManagerAddress = address(0x789); // Example valid token manager address      // Impersonate the owner address     vm.startPrank(tokenManager.owner());      // Call registerTokenManagerContracts     tokenManager.registerTokenManagerContracts(         validChainId,         validTokenManagerAddress     );      // Stop impersonation     vm.stopPrank();      // Verify the token manager contract was registered correctly     address registeredAddress = tokenManager._tokenManagerContracts(         validChainId     );     assertEq(registeredAddress, validTokenManagerAddress); } </pre>
<b>Expected Behavior</b>	This test checks that the function updates the mapping of token manager contracts when called by the owner.

## 5.11 Passing Checks

Here is the POC attached that depicts the execution of the test scripts and the corresponding results.

```

Ran 10 tests for test/TokenManagerForkTest.t.sol:TokenManagerForkTest
[PASS] testDepositGasTokenToCodex() (gas: 129035)
[PASS] testDepositToCodex() (gas: 149959)
[PASS] testDepositToCodexWithInsufficientAllowance() (gas: 70254)
[PASS] testDepositToCodexWithInsufficientBalance() (gas: 71983)
[PASS] testDepositToCodexWithInvalidLoginAddress() (gas: 66430)
[PASS] testDepositToCodexWithZeroAmount() (gas: 42897)
[PASS] testQuoteCrossChainDepositWithInvalidChainId() (gas: 42615)
[PASS] testRegisterApplicationContracts() (gas: 41563)
[PASS] testRegisterTokenManagerContracts() (gas: 42579)
[PASS] testUnauthorizedRegisterApplicationContracts() (gas: 16791)
Suite result: ok. 10 passed; 0 failed; 0 skipped; finished in 14.58s (42.85s CPU time)

```

```
Ran 1 test suite in 14.59s (14.58s CPU time): 10 tests passed, 0 failed, 0 skipped (10 total tests)
```



## Sepolia Etherscan Transaction

[ This is a Sepolia Testnet transaction only ]	
② Transaction Hash:	0x2fc149a9682e1f1237043356460c5831d3fe47a0ec98abb8fcfeecbed4ddcb71 <a href="#">Copy</a>
② Status:	<span>Success</span>
② Block:	7035187 <a href="#">4 Block Confirmations</a>
② Timestamp:	1 min ago (Nov-08-2024 07:48:12 AM UTC)
⚡ Transaction Action:	Call <a href="#">0xa0c4e485</a> Method by <a href="#">0xf0bA633D...51784B44d</a> on <a href="#">0x98Ed3E65...2f1ed97b3</a> <a href="#">Copy</a>
② From:	<a href="#">0xf0bA633D8C8b2EfEA8b988fE3B4Ce3951784B44d</a> <a href="#">Copy</a>
② Interacted With (To):	<a href="#">0x98Ed3E6543F5779D210135C319f8dc2f1ed97b3</a> <a href="#">Copy</a>
② ERC-20 Tokens Transferred:	<a href="#">All Transfers</a> <a href="#">Net Transfers</a> From <a href="#">0xf0bA633D...51784B44d</a> To <a href="#">0x98Ed3E65...2f1ed97b3</a> For 0.1 <a href="#">USDC (USDC)</a>
② Value:	0 ETH
② Transaction Fee:	0.000983530777163776 ETH
② Gas Price:	9.359115952 Gwei (0.000000009359115952 ETH)

## Algorand Transaction

Application ID	727096228	On Completion	NoOp	Fee	0.003
● Sender	<a href="#">QFBV46CWXOPCESNBPGUJETUJFIEILBLY6VUPHADAU2LBH45SCJH6EMPZBQ</a>				<a href="#">Copy</a>
Transaction details					
Group ID	<a href="#">mKUOPThJ+CUDGdFD7I+B3IC63v5luNL9xCjeR8ddiv4=</a>				<a href="#">Copy</a>
Transaction ID	<a href="#">62PJATIOR66YGXH66W52BSJXLHXRTY2L3IAOXB3HNVU32PFQU66A</a>				<a href="#">Copy</a>
Block	45584120				
Timestamp	Nov. 8, 2024, 7:48 a.m. (1 minute ago)				
Transaction type	Application Call				





## 6.3 Deposit Gas Token To Codex

### Sepolia Transaction

[ This is a Sepolia Testnet transaction only ]

② Transaction Hash:	0xa962d521f6dbdf01b2fcff51a0ef2133dac82fdadae8dd2eca85c0a8a2716162	<a href="#">Copy</a>
② Status:	<span>Success</span>	
② Block:	7035817	15 Block Confirmations
② Timestamp:	3 mins ago (Nov-08-2024 10:13:24 AM UTC)	
⚡ Transaction Action:	Call <a href="#">0x4ac6fe2d</a> Method by <a href="#">0xf0bA633D...51784B44d</a> on <a href="#">0x98Ed3E65...2f1ed97b3</a>	<a href="#">Copy</a>
② From:	0xf0bA633D8C8b2EfEA8b988fE3B4Ce3951784B44d	<a href="#">Copy</a>
② To:	<a href="#">0x98Ed3E6543F5779D210135C319fF8dc2f1ed97b3</a>	<a href="#">Copy</a>
	Transfer 0.000000000001 ETH From <a href="#">0x98Ed3E65...2f1ed97b3</a> To <a href="#">0xFF99767...2324d6B14</a>	
② Value:	0.000000000001 ETH	
② Transaction Fee:	0.00084653024898637 ETH	
② Gas Price:	10.502074895 Gwei (0.000000010502074895 ETH)	

### Algorand Transaction

Application ID	727096228	On Completion	NoOp	Fee	0.003
● Sender	QFBV46CWXOPCESNBPGUJETUJFIELBLY6VUPHADAU2LBH45SCJH6EMPZBQ			<a href="#">Copy</a>	
<b>Transaction details</b>					
Group ID	FFfW2ioYcRvU3DymV3YeOb/ZQZe/MMexBXGcOJgqbxA=			<a href="#">Copy</a>	
Transaction ID	TAGLBTHF2KVPGV4FEP13NNHZIUFUTYSZUKMY6IEH2SG4SQBO7OXKQ			<a href="#">Copy</a>	
Block	45587296				
Timestamp	Nov. 8, 2024, 10:12 a.m. (2 minutes ago)				
Transaction type	Application Call				



## Sepolia Transaction

[ This is a Sepolia Testnet transaction only ]

② Transaction Hash:	0x3ac9051b2262751e2d0cfad4d601208fe25734bd5f95ab901e3dd599e22863ea	<a href="#">Copy</a>
② Status:	<span>Success</span>	
② Block:	7036075	8 Block Confirmations
② Timestamp:	1 min ago (Nov-08-2024 11:11:36 AM UTC)	
⚡ Transaction Action:	Call <a href="#">Receive Encoded Msg</a>	Function by <a href="#">0xf0bA633D...51784B44d</a> on <a href="#">0x98Ed3E65...2f1ed97b3</a>
② From:	<a href="#">0xf0bA633D8C8b2EfEA8b988fE3B4Ce3951784B44d</a>	<a href="#">Copy</a>
② Interacted With (To):	<a href="#">0x98Ed3E6543F5779D210135C319f8dc2f1ed97b3</a>	<a href="#">Copy</a> ✓
② ERC-20 Tokens Transferred:	<a href="#">All Transfers</a>	<a href="#">Net Transfers</a>
	From <a href="#">0x98Ed3E65...2f1ed97b3</a> To <a href="#">0xf0bA633D...51784B44d</a> For 0.01 <a href="#">USDC (USDC)</a>	
② Value:	0 ETH	
② Transaction Fee:	0.000722150761427362 ETH	
② Gas Price:	4.491182834 Gwei (0.000000004491182834 ETH)	

## Algorand Transaction

Application ID	727096157	On Completion	NoOp	Fee	0.007
• Sender	AFIAAAPOX07ZN3CUWXIT2FQWD3VJCEPFU2DU6U642AV6XFJRKMS4GU64JU			<a href="#">Copy</a>	
<b>Transaction details</b>					
Group ID	F0aY8rGWDyNx9sSWAwC19MNmpq+e2jOVG8ssCsIMerw=			<a href="#">Copy</a>	
Transaction ID	ULSMONO7RZSG4KNP3MISHV5PBJRGM6NYB6MNGS2DFGSVHO5SHSQ			<a href="#">Copy</a>	
Block	45588581				
Timestamp	Nov. 8, 2024, 11:11 a.m. (3 minutes ago)				
Transaction type	Application Call				
Sender	All info	Dappflow	Chaintrail		





## 6.7 Deposit to codex function with zero amount

```
async function depositToCodex() {
    // const recipient = getArg(["--recipient", "-r"]) || "";
    const chainId = utils.getCurrentChainId();
    const chain = utils.getChain(chainId);
    const token = utils.getTestTokenAddress(chainId);
    const amount = utils.getDepositAmount();

    console.log("chain", chain);
    console.log("token", token);
    console.log("amount", amount);

    const loginChainId = chainId

    // const loginAddr = "0x6f7ccF76681dA80cBD7AD4b28697A2881A70286d";
    const loginAddr = "0xf0ba633d8c8b2efea8b988fe3b4ce3951784b44d";

    const tokenManager = utils.getTokenManager(chainId)
    const normalizedAddr = utils.getNormalizedAddress(loginAddr);

    // console.log(normalizedAddr,"this is normalizer address")

    const currentGasPrice = await utils.getGasPrice(chainId);
    console.log("currentGasPrice", currentGasPrice.toNumber());

    const rx = await tokenManager
        .depositToCodex(
            token,
            0,
            utils.hexToBytes(normalizedAddr.substring(2)),
            loginChainId,
            // {gasLimit: 500000}
        )
        .then(utils.wait)
}
```



## 7. Auditing Approach and Methodologies Applied

The solidity smart contract was audited in a comprehensive approach to ensure the highest level of security and reliability. Careful attention was given to the following key areas to ensure the overall quality of code:

- **Code quality and structure:** We conducted a detailed review of the codebase to identify any potential issues related to code structure, readability, and maintainability. This included analyzing the overall architecture of the solidity smart contract and reviewing the code to ensure it follows best practices and coding standards.
- **Security vulnerabilities:** Our team used manual techniques to identify any potential security vulnerabilities that could be exploited by attackers. This involved a thorough analysis of the code to identify any potential weaknesses, such as buffer overflows, injection vulnerabilities, Signatures, and deprecated functions.
- **Documentation and comments:** Our team reviewed the code documentation and comments to ensure they accurately describe the code's intended behavior and logic. This helps developers to better understand the codebase and make modifications without introducing new issues.
- **Compliance with best practices:** We checked that the code follows best practices and coding standards that are recommended by the solidity community and industry experts. This ensures that the solidity smart contract is secure, reliable, and efficient.

Our audit team followed OWASP and Ethereum(Solidity) community security guidelines for this audit. As a result, we were able to identify potential issues and provide recommendations to improve the smart contract security and performance.

Throughout the audit of the smart contract, our team placed great emphasis on ensuring the overall quality of the code and the use of industry best practices. We meticulously reviewed the codebase to ensure that it was thoroughly documented and that all comments and logic aligned with the intended behavior. Our approach to the audit was comprehensive, methodical, and aimed at ensuring that the smart contract was secure, reliable, and optimized for performance.

## 8. Limitations on Disclosure and Use of this Report

This report contains information concerning potential details of the Ultrade EVM Project and methods for exploiting them. Entersoft recommends that special precautions be taken to protect the confidentiality of both this document and the information contained herein. Security Assessment is an uncertain process, based on past experiences, currently available information, and known threats. All information security systems, which by their nature are dependent on human beings, are vulnerable to some degree. Therefore, while Entersoft considers the major security vulnerabilities of the analyzed systems to have been identified, there can be no assurance that any exercise of this nature will identify all possible vulnerabilities or propose exhaustive and operationally viable recommendations to mitigate those exposures. In addition, the analysis set forth herein is based on the technologies and known threats as of the date of this report. As technologies and risks change over time, the vulnerabilities associated with the operation of the Ultrade EVM solidity smart contract described in this report, as well as the actions necessary to reduce the exposure to such vulnerabilities will also change. Entersoft makes no undertaking to supplement or update this report based on changed circumstances or facts of which Entersoft becomes aware after the date hereof, absent a specific written agreement to perform the supplemental or updated analysis. This report may recommend that Entersoft use certain software or hardware products manufactured or maintained by other vendors. Entersoft bases these recommendations upon its prior experience with the capabilities of those products. Nonetheless, Entersoft does not and cannot warrant that a particular product will work as advertised by the vendor, nor that it will operate in the manner intended. This report was prepared by Entersoft for the exclusive benefit of Ultrade EVM and is proprietary information. The Non-Disclosure Agreement (NDA) in effect between Entersoft and Ultrade EVM governs the disclosure of this report to all other parties including product vendors and suppliers.