

# Audit Report June, 2022

For

Walli

# Table of Content

Executive Summary .....	01
Checked Vulnerabilities .....	03
Techniques and Methods .....	04
Manual Anaysis .....	05
<b>High Severity Issues</b>	05
<b>Medium Severity Issues</b>	05
<b>Low Severity Issues</b>	05
<b>Informational Issues</b>	05
A.1   Unlocked Pragma	05
A.2   General Recommendation	06
Functional Testing .....	07
Automated Testing .....	07
Closing Summary .....	08
About QuillAudits .....	08

# Executive Summary

**Project Name** WalliD

**Overview** It's an ERC1155 contract that extends from openzeppelin ERC1155 and the aim of the WalliDProofSignaturesNFT's is to store onchain an PDF file hash associated with the NFT id. For each NFT minted there's a hash of the document associated and a list of all signers for that document. Internally the contract stores a hashmap structure (DocumentInfo) for keeping the relation between the NFT id and the PDF file (hash).

**Timeline** 13 June, 2022 to 14 June, 2022

**Method** Manual Review, Functional Testing, Automated Testing etc.

**Scope of Audit** The scope of this audit was to analyse WalliD codebase for quality, security, and correctness.

**Sourcecode** <https://github.com/walliDprotocol/NFT-Proof-of-Signature>

**Commit Hash** de81186ed93f08656aac4f61a0f0404ff7a61971

**Fixed In** 2882e5687204af98cbb1287ecb7db4da26fe1be8



	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	2



## 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
- ✓ DoS with Block Gas Limit
- ✓ Transaction-Ordering Dependence
- ✓ Use of tx.origin
- ✓ Exception disorder
- ✓ Gasless send
- ✓ Balance equality
- ✓ Byte array
- ✓ Transfer forwards all gas
- ✓ ERC20 API violation
- ✓ Malicious libraries
- ✓ Compiler version not fixed
- ✓ Redundant fallback function
- ✓ Send instead of transfer
- ✓ Style guide violation
- ✓ Unchecked external call
- ✓ Unchecked math
- ✓ Unsafe type inference
- ✓ Implicit visibility leve



# 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 Analysis

## A. Contract - signDocumentsCollections

### High Severity Issues

No issues were found

### Medium Severity Issues

No issues were found

### Low Severity Issues

No issues were found

### Informational Issues

#### 1. Unlocked pragma (pragma solidity ^0.8.7)

##### Description

Contracts should be deployed with the same compiler version and flags that they have been tested with thoroughly. Locking the pragma helps to ensure that contracts do not accidentally get deployed using, for example, an outdated compiler version that might introduce bugs that affect the contract system negatively.

##### Recommendation

Here all the in-scope contracts have an unlocked pragma, it is recommended to lock the same. Moreover, we strongly suggest not to use experimental Solidity features (e.g., pragma experimental ABIEncoderV2) or third-party unaudited libraries. If necessary, refactor the current code base to only use stable features.

##### Status

Fixed





## 2. General Recommendations

In conclusion, we would like to mention that the function “removeOwnership” checks for a zero address but there is no need of that because the existing owner address won’t be zero and the parameter should be named as “existingOwner” instead of “newOwner”. Moreover, the contract should have a check that checks the existence of the passed address in the “\_owners” mapping while removing the ownership.

In our opinion, the zero address check should be in the “mintDocument” function to avoid setting a zero address as the owner by mistake.

### Status

**Fixed**





# Functional Testing

## Some of the tests performed are mentioned below

- ✓ Should be able to mint document as a semi-fungible token
- ✓ Should be able to signers info based on "id" and "document hash"
- ✓ Should be able to set new uri for items
- ✓ Should be able to set/change contract's ur
- ✓ Should be able to set collection name
- ✓ Should revert if the mint document function is called by an address that is not in the owners mapping
- ✓ Should be able to add and remove ownerships
- ✓ Should revert if the new owner address is a zero 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.



# Closing Summary

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

Some issues of Low and informational severity were found, Some suggestions and best practices are also provided in order to improve the code quality and security posture.

In the End, Wallid Team Resolved all Issues.

## Disclaimer

QuillAudits smart contract audit is not a security warranty, investment advice, or an endorsement of the WalliD 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 WalliD 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.



**500+**

Audits Completed



**\$15B**

Secured



**500K**

Lines of Code Audited



## Follow Our Journey





# Audit Report June, 2022

For

Walli



QuillAudits

📍 Canada, India, Singapore, United Kingdom

🌐 [audits.quillhash.com](https://audits.quillhash.com)

✉️ [audits@quillhash.com](mailto:audits@quillhash.com)