



Smart Contract Audit for Battlehard

Overlord SECURITY

May 11, 2024

Contents

1	Project Overview	3
2	Project Introduction	3
3	Findings and Recommendations	3
3.1	Summary	3
3.2	Critical Vulnerabilities	5
3.3	Medium Vulnerabilities	7
3.4	Low Vulnerabilities	8
3.5	Informational Vulnerabilities	10
4	Conclusion	15

1 Project Overview

Created by: Battlehard

Based on: Neo Blockchain

Date Conducted: May, 2024

Battlehard hardened contract

Contracts: **hardened**

Github: <https://github.com/battlehard/hardened>

Commit: **675320f70a72**

Programming Language: **C#**

OS Env: **Neo 3.6.0**

2 Project Introduction

The idea for Battle Hardened was born out of the despair and loss that happens when a project creator pulls the rug, absconds as a leader, and leaves a community of token holders behind. The protocol seeks to remedy this despair by giving the NFT project's ownership back to the NFT holders while simultaneously giving agency to the project creators.

3 Findings and Recommendations

3.1 Summary

The following findings and recommendations after analyzing the **Battlehard hardened contract** implementation. Any additional recommendations beyond what any scanning tools supply are included as necessary.

Severity	Number of findings
Critical	2
Medium	1
Low	2
Informational	5

Issue Id	Severity	Title	Category	Fixed
MS-01	Critical	Insufficient permission verification	Coding Practices	Fixed
MS-02	Critical	Re-entrancy risk	Coding Practices	Fixed
MS-03	Medium	Potential key conflicts	Coding Practices	Fixed
MS-04	Low	non-compliance with the NEP-11	Coding Practices	Fixed
MS-05	Low	Lack of validity checks	Coding Practices	Fixed
MS-06	Informational	Typo	Optimization	Fixed
MS-07	Informational	Redundant code	Optimization	Fixed
MS-08	Informational	Overly Strict Checks	Business Logic	Fixed
MS-09	Informational	Potential key conflict	Business Logic	Fixed
MS-10	Informational	Inaccurate GAS calculation	Optimization	Fixed

3.2 Critical Vulnerabilities

MS-01: Insufficient permission verification
Insufficient permission verification
Source Code link
https://github.com/battlehard/hardened/blob/f196c00db22811d6d9660cfc9f714f54f32bb6b5/src/Hardened/Hardened.Admin.cs#L18-L31
Description
In a hardened project, the owner's permission is well checked by both <code>Runtime.CheckWitness</code> and the transaction's sender. While in contrast, the admin's permission is only checked by the <code>tx.Sender</code> . Noticed that on NEO blockchain, the <code>tx.Sender</code> 's concept is somehow like the <code>tx.origin</code> on EVM-chains. We should not verify one's permission willing by only checking this sender cause any malicious dAPP could redirect a tx's execution path to anywhere.
Solution
It's recommended to replace the second <code>return true</code> to return <code>Runtime.CheckWitness(tx.Sender)</code> .
Status
The issue has been confirmed by the team and fixed in commit <code>e683d70</code>

MS-02: Re-entrancy risk
Re-entrancy risk
Source Code link
https://github.com/battlehard/hardened/blob/f196c00db22811d6d9660cfc9f714f54f32bb6b5/src/Hardened/Hardened.Admin.cs#L18-L31
Description
<p>In hardened project, the <code>InfusionMint</code> and <code>InfusionUpdate</code> as well as <code>CancelInfusion</code> didn't follow this pattern. Among all these functions, conditions are checked first, then the <code>Safe11Transfer</code> and <code>Safe17Transfer</code> and sometimes Mint are called, while the contract's storage is changed at the last step. All those token transfer could call unknown external code and may re-enter the hardened's contract. The attacker could drain the contract's NEP-17 token by re-enter the <code>CancelInfusion</code>.</p>
Solution
<p>It's recommended to change the <code>PendingStorage</code>'s state before all those external calls. The functions could perform checks first as before, and then change the <code>PendingStorage</code>, and at the last step do all other interactions such as transfer NEP-11 and NEP-17 to other addresses.</p>
Status
<p>The issue has been confirmed by the team and fixed in commit <code>161f7f2</code></p>

3.3 Medium Vulnerabilities

MS-3: Potential key conflicts colback
Potential key conflicts
Source Code link
https://github.com/battlehard/hardened/blob/f196c00db22811d6d9660cfc9f714f54f32bb6b5/src/Hardened/Hardened.Storage.cs#L13-L19
Description
In hardened, we still use the prefix 0x01 and 0x02 for other purposes. If the keys concatenated after the prefix were not well checked, the real storage key could conflict with the internal Nep11Token 's keys.
Solution
It's recommended to change the first prefix starting from 0x05 or 0x10.
Status
The issue has been confirmed by team and fixed in commit e2e763b .

3.4 Low Vulnerabilities

MS-04: Non-compliance with the NEP-11 proposal
Non-compliance with the NEP-11 proposal
Source Code link
https://github.com/battlehard/hardened/blob/f196c00db22811d6d9660cfc9f714f54f32bb6b5/src/Hardened/Hardened.Admin.cs#L39-L43
Description
In hardened project, there exist some functions lack of validity checks.
Solution
It's recommended to perform <code>ValidateScriptHash</code> for <code>contractHash</code> . It's recommended to perform valid range checks for the non-null parameters such as positive-test for <code>gasMintCost</code> . It's recommended to perform checks to <code>payTokenHash</code> and <code>payTokenAmount</code> in <code>InfusionUpdate</code> like what the <code>InfusionMint</code> done.
Status
The issue has been confirmed by the team and fixed in commit <code>c5a0bd2</code>

MS-05:Non-compliance with the NEP-11 proposal
Non-compliance with the NEP-11 proposal
Source Code link
https://github.com/battlehard/hardened/blob/f196c00db22811d6d9660cfc9f714f54f32bb6b5/src/Hardened/Hardened.Helpers.cs#L20
Description
In hardened project, <code>ValidateExternalNftOwnership</code> function use the properties instead of <code>ownerOf</code> for getting a NFT's owner which didn't conform to the proposal.
Solution
It's recommended to call the <code>ownerOf</code> method instead as suggested by the proposal here.
Status
The issue has been confirmed by team and fixed in commit 9670bb8

3.5 Informational Vulnerabilities

MS-06: Typo
Typo
Source Code link
https://github.com/battlehard/hardened/blob/f196c00db22811d6d9660cfc9f714f54f32bb6b5/src/Hardened/Hardened.cs#L159
Description
There exists typo in the code such as refun .
Solution
Replacing typo text.
Status
The issue has been confirmed by team and fixed.

MS-07: Redundant code
Redundant code
Source Code link
https://github.com/battlehard/hardened/issues/10
Description
There are a number of redundant codes that can be improved.
Solution
Most of those codes can be merged or deleted.
Status
The issue has been confirmed by the team and fixed in commit <code>a48d3d7</code>

MS-08: Overly Strict Checks
Overly Strict Checks
Source Code link
https://github.com/battlehard/hardened/blob/f196c00db22811d6d9660cfc9f714f54f32bb6b5/src/Hardened/Hardened.Helpers.cs#L37-L56
Description
In a hardened project, newly added NFTs to a bhNFT will be checked for duplicates among existing NFTs. While a unique NFT is defined by both it's ID and it's contract-hash..
Solution
Only checking the NFT's ID will be somehow strictly.
Status
The issue has been confirmed by team.

MS-09 Potential key conflict by malicious consensus node
Potential key conflict by malicious consensus node
Source Code link
https://github.com/battlehard/hardened/blob/f196c00db22811d6d9660cfc9f714f54f32bb6b5/src/Hardened/Hardened.Storage.cs#L92-L95
Description
On NEO platform, the random number could be manipulated by the consensus node now by specifying the block.nonce .
Solution
This risk will disappear automatically after NEO upgrades to a more secure random source.
Status
The issue has been confirmed by team.

MS-10 Potential key conflict by malicious consensus node
Potential key conflict by malicious consensus node
Source Code link
https://github.com/battlehard/hardened/blob/f196c00db22811d6d9660cfc9f714f54f32bb6b5/src/Hardened/Hardened.cs#L130-L132
Description
<p>If the admin call <code>CancelInfusion</code> for multiple users in one transaction, the GAS will be miscalculated and counted multiple times. If not, the admin will have to afford the NetworkFee and a few SystemFee before this function's execution.</p>
Solution
<p>Therefore, it's recommended to use the <code>((Transaction)Runtime.ScriptContainer).SystemFee + ((Transaction)Runtime.ScriptContainer).NetworkFee</code> and make sure only perform <code>CancelInfusion</code> for one user at once.</p>
Status
<p>The issue has been confirmed by team and fixed in commit 1d06f9d.</p>

4 Conclusion

In this audit, we have analyzed the **Battlehard hardened** design and implementation. The current code base is well organized and those identified issues are promptly confirmed and fixed.

Meanwhile, we need to emphasize that smart contracts as a whole are still in an early, but active stage of development. To improve this report, we greatly appreciate any constructive feedbacks or suggestions, on our methodology, audit findings, or potential gaps in scope/coverage.

For more information regarding this audit report, please send email to `contact@overlord.wtf`