

Audit Report October, 2022

For

 SPACE

Table of Content

Executive Summary	01
Checked Vulnerabilities	03
Techniques and Methods	04
Manual Testing	05
A. Contract - Router.sol	05
High Severity Issues	05
Medium Severity Issues	05
Low Severity Issues	05
Informational Issues	05
B. Contract - Factory.sol	05
High Severity Issues	05
Medium Severity Issues	05
Low Severity Issues	05
Informational Issues	05
Functional Testing	06
Automated Testing	06
Closing Summary	09
About QuillAudits	10



Executive Summary

Project Name SpaceFi - swap contracts

Overview Space Fi contains a uniswap V2 style contract which can be used to swap between two tokens from the pool. Router contract iterate over the correct path between two tokens which are to be swapped and then call the exchange swap function. Factory contract is used to create different pairs of tokens which are added to the pool for swapping functionality.

Timeline 22 september,2022 - 3 october,2022

Method Manual Review, Functional Testing, Automated Testing etc.

Scope of Audit The scope of this audit was to analyze SpaceFi codebase for quality, security, and correctness

<https://github.com/SpaceFinance/space-contract/blob/main/Factory.sol>

<https://github.com/SpaceFinance/space-contract/blob/main/Router.sol>

0
Issues Found

High

Medium

Low

Informational

	High	Medium	Low	Informational
Open Issues	0	0	0	0
Acknowledged Issues	0	0	0	0
Partially Resolved Issues	0	0	0	0
Resolved Issues	0	0	0	0



Types of Severities

High

A high severity issue or vulnerability means that your smart contract can be exploited. Issues on this level are critical to the smart contract's performance or functionality, and we recommend these issues be fixed before moving to a live environment.

Medium

The issues marked as medium severity usually arise because of errors and deficiencies in the smart contract code. Issues on this level could potentially bring problems, and they should still be fixed.

Low

Low-level severity issues can cause minor impact and or are just warnings that can remain unfixed for now. It would be better to fix these issues at some point in the future.

Informational

These are severity issues that indicate an improvement request, a general question, a cosmetic or documentation error, or a request for information. There is low-to-no impact.

Types of Issues

Open

Security vulnerabilities identified that must be resolved and are currently unresolved.

Resolved

These are the issues identified in the initial audit and have been successfully fixed.

Acknowledged

Vulnerabilities which have been acknowledged but are yet to be resolved.

Partially Resolved

Considerable efforts have been invested to reduce the risk/impact of the security issue, but are not completely resolved.



Checked Vulnerabilities

- ✓ Re-entrancy
- ✓ Timestamp Dependence
- ✓ Gas Limit and Loops
- ✓ Exception Disorder
- ✓ Gasless Send
- ✓ Use of tx.origin
- ✓ Compiler version not fixed
- ✓ Address hardcoded
- ✓ Divide before multiply
- ✓ Integer overflow/underflow
- ✓ Dangerous strict equalities
- ✓ Tautology or contradiction
- ✓ Return values of low-level calls
- ✓ Missing Zero Address Validation
- ✓ Private modifier
- ✓ Revert/require functions
- ✓ Using block.timestamp
- ✓ Multiple Sends
- ✓ Using SHA3
- ✓ Using suicide
- ✓ Using throw
- ✓ Using inline assembly



Techniques and Methods

Throughout the audit of smart contract, care was taken to ensure:

- The overall quality of code.
- Use of best practices.
- Code documentation and comments match logic and expected behaviour.
- Token distribution and calculations are as per the intended behaviour mentioned in the whitepaper.
- Implementation of ERC-20 token standards.
- Efficient use of gas.
- Code is safe from re-entrancy and other vulnerabilities.

The following techniques, methods and tools were used to review all the smart contracts.

Structural Analysis

In this step, we have analysed the design patterns and structure of smart contracts. A thorough check was done to ensure the smart contract is structured in a way that will not result in future problems.

Static Analysis

Static analysis of smart contracts was done to identify contract vulnerabilities. In this step, a series of automated tools are used to test the security of smart contracts.

Code Review / Manual Analysis

Manual analysis or review of code was done to identify new vulnerabilities or verify the vulnerabilities found during the static analysis. Contracts were completely manually analysed, their logic was checked and compared with the one described in the whitepaper. Besides, the results of the automated analysis were manually verified.

Gas Consumption

In this step, we have checked the behaviour of smart contracts in production. Checks were done to know how much gas gets consumed and the possibilities of optimization of code to reduce gas consumption.

Tools and Platforms used for Audit

Remix IDE, Truffle, Truffle Team, Solhint, Mythril, Slither, Solidity statistic analysis.



Manual Testing

A. Contract - Router.sol

High Severity Issues

No issues found

Medium Severity Issues

No issues found

Low Severity Issues

No issues found

Informational Issues

No issues found

B. Contract - Factory.sol

High Severity Issues

No issues found

Medium Severity Issues

No issues found

Low Severity Issues

No issues found

Informational Issues

No issues found



Functional Testing

Router.sol

- ✓ Should Add Liquidity
- ✓ Should Be Able To Return Pair Address
- ✓ Should Be Able To Return Factory And WETH Address
- ✓ setfeetoo
- ✓ addliquidity
- ✓ Should Be Able To Return Pair Address

Factory.sol

- ✓ Should Be Able To Deploy Pair Address
- ✓ Should Be Able To Get Pair Hash
- ✓ Should Revert If Deploying The Same Pair
- ✓ Should Be Able To Create Pair With Test Tokens
- ✓ Should Be Able To Return The Length Of Pairs
- ✓ Should Set Feeto Address

Automated Tests

No major issues were found. Some false positive errors were reported by the tools. All the other issues have been categorized above according to their level of severity.




```

//solc contracts/factory.sol

@swagppair_upgrade(uint256,uint256,uint112,uint112) (contracts/factory.sol#208-211) uses a weak PHEM: "block.timestamp = uint32(block.timestamp % 2 ** 32)" (contracts/factory.sol#211)
Reference: https://github.com/OpenZeppelin/openzeppelin-contracts/blob/master/contracts/math/SafeMath.sol#990

@swagppair_safeTransfer(address,address,uint256) (contracts/factory.sol#239-242) uses a dangerous strict equality:
require(keccak256(msg.sender).length == 32,data.length == 0) [] solc_decodeData(decoded(),uint256) (contracts/factory.sol#241)
@swagppair_send(address,uint256,uint256,uint112,uint112) (contracts/factory.sol#245-248) uses a dangerous strict equality:
    totalSupply == 0 (contracts/factory.sol#247)
Reference: https://github.com/OpenZeppelin/openzeppelin-contracts/blob/master/contracts/math/SafeMath.sol#990

Reentrancy in @swagppair_burn(address) (contracts/factory.sol#329-351):
Entered call(s):
- safeTransfer(token,to,amount) (contracts/factory.sol#343)
    (success,data) = token.call(abi.encodeWithSelector(SAFE_TRANSFER,to,value)) (contracts/factory.sol#346)
- safeTransfer(token,to,amount) (contracts/factory.sol#344)
    (success,data) = token.call(abi.encodeWithSelector(SAFE_TRANSFER,to,value)) (contracts/factory.sol#346)
State variables written after the call(s):
- update(balance0.balance1_reserved,reserved) (contracts/factory.sol#340)
- blockTimestampLast = block.timestamp (contracts/factory.sol#329)
- least = uint256(reserved).mul(reserved) (contracts/factory.sol#348)
- update(balance0.balance1_reserved,reserved) (contracts/factory.sol#346)
- reserved = uint112(balance0) (contracts/factory.sol#327)
- update(balance0.balance1_reserved,reserved) (contracts/factory.sol#348)
- reserved = uint112(balance0) (contracts/factory.sol#327)

Reentrancy in @swagppFactory_createPair(address,address) (contracts/factory.sol#419-434):
Entered call(s):
- @swagpppair(pair),initialize(token,token) (contracts/factory.sol#426)
State variables written after the call(s):
- getPair[token] [token] = pair (contracts/factory.sol#430)
- setPair[token] [token] = pair (contracts/factory.sol#431)

Reentrancy in @swagppFactory_swap(uint256,uint256,address,bool) (contracts/factory.sol#554-582):
Entered call(s):
- safeTransfer(token,to,amount) (contracts/factory.sol#566)
    (success,data) = token.call(abi.encodeWithSelector(SAFE_TRANSFER,to,value)) (contracts/factory.sol#569)
- safeTransfer(token,to,amount) (contracts/factory.sol#566)
    (success,data) = token.call(abi.encodeWithSelector(SAFE_TRANSFER,to,value)) (contracts/factory.sol#569)
- @swagppCollectFeeOrSendPayment(sender,amountOut,amountOut.data) (contracts/factory.sol#582)
State variables written after the call(s):
- update(balance0.balance1_reserved,reserved) (contracts/factory.sol#580)
- blockTimestampLast = block.timestamp (contracts/factory.sol#529)
- update(balance0.balance1_reserved,reserved) (contracts/factory.sol#580)
- reserved = uint112(balance0) (contracts/factory.sol#527)
- update(balance0.balance1_reserved,reserved) (contracts/factory.sol#580)
- reserved = uint112(balance0) (contracts/factory.sol#527)
Reference: https://github.com/OpenZeppelin/openzeppelin-contracts/blob/master/contracts/math/SafeMath.sol#990

@swagpppair_initialize(address,address)_takeOne (contracts/factory.sol#661) lacks a zero-check on :
- token = takeOne (contracts/factory.sol#665)
@swagpppair_initialize(address,address)_takeAll (contracts/factory.sol#681) lacks a zero-check on :
- token = takeAll (contracts/factory.sol#684)
@swagppFactory_contractInfo(address)_feeToSetter (contracts/factory.sol#487) lacks a zero-check on :
- feeToSetter = feeToSetter (contracts/factory.sol#490)
@swagppFactory_setFee(address)_feeTo (contracts/factory.sol#486) lacks a zero-check on :
- feeTo = feeTo (contracts/factory.sol#486)
@swagppFactory_setFeeToSetter(address)_feeToSetter (contracts/factory.sol#491) lacks a zero-check on :
- feeToSetter = feeToSetter (contracts/factory.sol#494)

```

[illegible]

Closing Summary

In this report, we have considered the security of the SpaceFi. We performed our audit according to the procedure described above.

No Issues were Found During the Course of Audit

Disclaimer

QuillAudits smart contract audit is not a security warranty, investment advice, or an endorsement of the SpaceFi Platform. This audit does not provide a security or correctness guarantee of the audited smart contracts.

The statements made in this document should not be interpreted as investment or legal advice, nor should its authors be held accountable for decisions made based on them. Securing smart contracts is a multistep process. One audit cannot be considered enough. We recommend that the SpaceFi Team put in place a bug bounty program to encourage further analysis of the smart contract by other third parties.



About QuillAudits

QuillAudits is a secure smart contracts audit platform designed by QuillHash Technologies.

We are a team of dedicated blockchain security experts and smart contract auditors determined to ensure that Smart Contract-based Web3 projects can avail the latest and best security solutions to operate in a trustworthy and risk-free ecosystem.



600+

Audits Completed



\$15B

Secured



600K

Lines of Code Audited



Follow Our Journey



Audit Report October, 2022

For

ØSPACE



QuillAudits

📍 Canada, India, Singapore, United Kingdom

🌐 audits.quillhash.com

✉️ audits@quillhash.com