



CHAVO

Security Assessment

www.coinchavo.com/

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Summary

Overview

Project Summary

Audit Summary

Vulnerability Summary

Audit Scope

Findings

01 : Centralization Risk in _hasBeenLiqAdded() Function

02 : Initial Token Distribution

03 : PotentialSandwich Attacks

04 : Redundant Code

05 : Typos In The Contract

06 : Function and Variable Naming Doesn't Match the Operating Environment

07 : Potential ResourceExhaustion

08 : FullInlinerNonExpressionSplitArgumentEvaluationOrder

09 : StorageWriteRemovalBeforeConditionalTermination

10 : DelegateCallReturnValue

Appendix

Disclaimer

About

Summary

This report has been prepared for to discover issues and vulnerabilities in the source code of the project as well as any contract dependencies that were not part of an officially recognized library. A comprehensive examination has been performed, utilizing Static Analysis and Manual Review techniques. The auditing process pays special attention to the following considerations:

Testing the smart contracts against both common and uncommon attack vectors. Assessing the codebase to ensure compliance with current best practices and industry standards. Ensuring contract logic meets the specifications and intentions of the client. Cross referencing contract structure and implementation against similar smart contracts produced by industry leaders. Thorough line-by-line manual review of the entire codebase by industry experts.

The security assessment resulted in findings that ranged from critical to informational. We recommend addressing these findings to ensure a high level of security standards and industry practices. We suggest recommendations that could better serve the project from the security perspective:

Enhance general coding practices for better structures of source codes; Add enough unit tests to cover the possible use cases; Provide more comments per each function for readability, especially contracts that are verified in public; Provide more transparency on privileged activities once the protocols live.










Project Summary

Project Name	CHAVO - (https://coinchavo.com/)
Platform	BINANCE SMART CHAIN
Language	Solidity
Codebase	https://bscscan.com/address/0xa29685F043A89998eA18254e8E450Df989E13e2b
Commit	a160e76660962f682cada701404f37f35e6114a957267a0da3fbf

Audit Summary

Delivery Date	AUGUST 29, 2023
Audit Methodology	Static Analysis, Manual Review
Key Components	DxBurnToken

Vulnerability Summary

Vulnerability Level	Total	 Pending	 Declined	 Acknowledged	 Partially Resolved	 Resolved
 Critical	0	0	0	0	0	0
 Major	0	0	0	0	0	0
 Medium	0	0	0	0	0	0
 Minor	0	0	0	0	0	0
 Informational	0	0	0	0	0	0
 Discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0

Audit Scope

ID	File	SHA256 Checksum
CKP	contract.sol	f79198f1e334cd2889b09e0d9507c2b03e16e6299037cd30102d9496b69c383809

Overview

External Dependencies

The contract serves as the underlying entity to interact with third-party protocols (token- wrapping). The scope of the audit treats third-party entities as blackboxes and assumes their functional correctness. However, in the real world, third parties can be compromised and this may lead to lost or stolen assets.

Privileged Functions

The contract contains the following privileged functions that are restricted by role with the modifier. Since the contract is the owner cannot modify the contract configurations and address attributes.

Overview

External Dependencies

The contract serves as the underlying entity to interact with third-party protocols (token- wrapping). The scope of the audit treats third-party entities as blackboxes and assumes their functional correctness. However, in the real world, third parties can be compromised and this may lead to lost or stolen assets.

Privileged Functions

The contract contains the following privileged functions are restricted to gain access by the modifier/_owner. They are used to modify the contract configurations and address attributes. We grouped these functions below.

01 | Centralization Risk in Function

Description

The `addLiquidity()_hasLiqBeenAdded()` function calls the `UniswapV2Router.addLiquidityETH` function with the `to()` address specified as `owner()` for acquiring the generated LP tokens from the corresponding pool. As a result, over time the `_owner` address will accumulate a significant portion of LP tokens. If `_owner` is an EOA (Externally Owned Account), mishandling of its private key can have devastating consequences to the project as a whole.

Recommendation

We advise `to()` address of the `UniswapV2Router.addLiquidityETH()` function call to be replaced by the `contract()` itself, i.e. `address(this)`, and to restrict the management of the LP tokens within the scope of the contract's business logic. This will also protect the LP tokens from being stolen if the `_owner()` account is compromised. In general, we strongly recommend centralized privileges or roles in the protocol to be improved via a decentralized mechanism or via smart-contract based accounts with enhanced security practices, f.e. `Multisignature wallets()`.

02 | Initial Token Distribution

Category	Severity	Location	Status
Logical Issue	● Minor	projects/contract.sol (98ba012): 497	🕒 Acknowledged

Description

All of the tokens are sent to the contract deployer when deploying the contract. This could be a centralization risk as the deployer can distribute those tokens without obtaining the consensus of the community.

Recommendation

We recommend the team to be transparent regarding the initial token distribution process.

03 | Potential Sandwich Attacks

Description

A sandwich attack might happen when an attacker observes a transaction swapping tokens or adding liquidity without setting restrictions on slippage or minimum output amount. The attacker can manipulate the exchange rate by frontrunning (before the transaction being attacked) a transaction to purchase one of the assets and make profits by backrunning (after the transaction being attacked) a transaction to sell the asset.

The following functions are called without setting restrictions on slippage or minimum output amount, so transactions triggering these functions are vulnerable to sandwich attacks, especially when the input amount is large:

Recommendation

We recommend setting reasonable minimum output amounts, instead of 0, based on token prices when calling the fore mentioned functions.

04 | Redundant Code

Category	Severity	Location	Status
Logical Issue	● Informational	projects/contract.sol (98ba012): 862	🕒 Acknowledged

Description

The condition! _isExcluded[sender] & !_isExcluded[recipient] can be included in else .

Recommendation

The following code can be removed:

```
861 ... else if (!_isExcluded[sender] && !_isExcluded[recipient]) {
862     _transferStandard(sender, recipient, amount);
863 } ...
```

05 | Typos In The Contract

Category	Severity	Location	Status
Coding Style	● Informational	projects/contract.sol (98ba012): 470, 670	📄 Acknowledged

Description

There are several typos in the code and comments.

1. In the following code snippet, `tokensIntoLiquidity()` should be `tokensIntoLiquidity()`

```

1 event SwapAndLiquify(
2     uint256 tokensSwapped,
3     uint256 ethReceived,
4     uint256 tokensIntoLiquidity
5 );

```

2. `recieve()` should be `recieve()` `_swapping()` should be `_swapping()` in the line of comment `//to _recieve ETH from UniswapV2Router when swaping()` .

06 | Function and Variable Naming

Description

`_burnfee()`

`_creator()`

`_devfee()`

`_devWalletAddress()`

`_maxBurnFee()`

`_maxDevFee()`

`_allowance()`

`_balanceof()`

`_decimals`

`_isExcludedFromFee()`

`_mintedByDxsale()`

`_mintingFinishedPermanent()`

`_name()`

`_owner()`

`_symbol()`

`_totalsupply()`

07 | Potential Resource Exhaustion

Category	Severity	Location	Status
Logical Issue	● Informational	projects/contract.sol (98ba012): 614, 709	🕒 Acknowledged

Description

The `farloop()` within functions `and _getCurrentSupply()` takes the variable `_excluded.length()`, as the maximal iteration times. If the size of the array is very large, it could exceed the gas limit to execute the functions. In this case, the contract might suffer from DoS (Denial of Service) situation.

Recommendation

We recommend the team review the design and ensure investors that this would not cause loss to the project.

08 | FullInlinerNonExpressionSplitArgumentEvaluationOrder

Description

Function call arguments in Yul are evaluated right to left. This order matters when the argument expressions have side-effects, and changing it may change contract behavior. FullInliner is an optimizer step that can replace a function call with the body of that function. The transformation involves assigning argument expressions to temporary variables, which imposes an explicit evaluation order. FullInliner was written with the assumption that this order does not necessarily have to match usual argument evaluation order because the argument expressions have no side-effects. In most circumstances this assumption is true because the default optimization step sequence contains the ExpressionSplitter step. ExpressionSplitter ensures that the code is in **expression-split form**, which means that function calls cannot appear nested inside expressions, and all function call arguments have to be variables. The assumption is, however, not guaranteed to be true in general. Version 0.6.7 introduced a setting allowing users to specify an arbitrary optimization step sequence, making it possible for the FullInliner to actually encounter argument expressions with side-effects, which can result in behavior differences between optimized and unoptimized bytecode. Contracts compiled without optimization or with the default optimization sequence are not affected. To trigger the bug the user has to explicitly choose compiler settings that contain a sequence with FullInliner step not preceded by ExpressionSplitter.

09 | StorageWriteRemovalBeforeConditionalTermination

Description

A call to a Yul function that conditionally terminates the external EVM call could result in prior storage writes being incorrectly removed by the Yul optimizer. This used to happen in cases in which it would have been valid to remove the store, if the Yul function in question never actually terminated the external call, and the control flow always returned back to the caller instead. Conditional termination within the same Yul block instead of within a called function was not affected. In Solidity with optimized via-IR code generation, any storage write before a function conditionally calling `return(...)` or `stop()` in inline assembly, may have been incorrectly removed, whenever it would have been valid to remove the write without the `return(...)` or `stop()`. In optimized legacy code generation, only inline assembly that did not refer to any Solidity variables and that involved conditionally-terminating user-defined assembly functions could be affected.

10 | DelegateCallReturnValue

Description

The return value of the low-level `.delegatecall()` function is taken from a position in memory, where the call data or the return data resides. This value is interpreted as a boolean and put onto the stack. This means if the called function returns at least 32 zero bytes, `.delegatecall()` returns false even if the call was successful.

Appendix

Finding Categories

Centralization / Privilege

Centralization / Privilege findings refer to either feature logic or implementation of components that act against the nature of decentralization, such as explicit ownership or specialized access roles in combination with a mechanism to relocate funds.

Logical Issue

Logical Issue findings detail a fault in the logic of the linked code, such as an incorrect notion on how block.timestamp works.

Volatile Code

Volatile Code findings refer to segments of code that behave unexpectedly on certain edge cases that may result in a vulnerability.

Coding Style

Coding Style findings usually do not affect the generated byte-code but rather comment on how to make the codebase more legible and, as a result, easily maintainable.

Inconsistency

Inconsistency findings refer to functions that should seemingly behave similarly yet contain different code, such as a constructor assignment imposing different requirements on the input variables than a setter function.

Checksum Calculation Method

The "Checksum" field in the "Audit Scope" section is calculated as the SHA-256 (Secure Hash Algorithm 2 with digest size of 256 bits) digest of the content of each file hosted in the listed source repository under the specified commit.

The result is hexa-decimal encoded and is the same as the output of the Linux "sha256sum" command against the target file.

Disclaimer

This report is subject to the terms and conditions (including without limitation, description of services, confidentiality, disclaimer and limitation of liability) set forth in the Services Agreement, or the scope of services, and terms and conditions provided to you ("Customer" or the "Company") in connection with the Agreement. This report provided in connection with the Services set forth in the Agreement shall be used by the Company only to the extent permitted under the terms and conditions set forth in the Agreement.

This report may not be transmitted, disclosed, referred to or relied upon by any person for any purposes, nor may copies be delivered to any other person other than the Company, without FusionTech prior written consent in each instance.

This report is not, nor should be considered, an "endorsement" or "disapproval" of any particular project or team. This report is not, nor should be considered, an indication of the economics or value of any "product" or "asset" created by any team or project that contracts FusionTech to perform a security assessment. This report does not provide any warranty or guarantee regarding the absolute bug-free nature of the technology analyzed, nor do they provide any indication of the technologies proprietors, business, business model or legal compliance.

This report should not be used in any way to make decisions around investment or involvement with any particular project. This report in no way provides investment advice, nor should be leveraged as investment advice of any sort. This report represents an extensive assessing process intending to help our customers increase the quality of their code while reducing the high level of risk presented by cryptographic tokens and blockchain technology.

Blockchain technology and cryptographic assets present a high level of ongoing risk. FusionTech's position is that each company and individual are responsible for their own due diligence and continuous security.

FusionTech's goal is to help reduce the attack vectors and the high level of variance associated with utilizing new and consistently changing technologies, and in no way claims any guarantee of security or functionality of the technology we agree to analyze.

The assessment services provided by FusionTech is subject to dependencies and under continuing development. You agree that your access and/or use, including but not limited to any services, reports, and materials, will be at your sole risk on an as-is, where-is, and as-available basis. Cryptographic tokens are emergent technologies and carry with them high levels of technical risk and uncertainty. The assessment reports could include false positives, false negatives, and other unpredictable results. The services may access, and depend upon, multiple layers of third-parties.

ALL SERVICES, THE LABELS, THE ASSESSMENT REPORT, WORK PRODUCT, OR OTHER MATERIALS, OR ANY PRODUCTS OR RESULTS OF THE USE THEREOF ARE PROVIDED "AS IS" AND "AS

AVAILABLE” AND WITH ALL FAULTS AND DEFECTS WITHOUT WARRANTY OF ANY KIND. TO THE MAXIMUM EXTENT PERMITTED UNDER APPLICABLE LAW, FusionTech HEREBY DISCLAIMS ALL WARRANTIES, WHETHER EXPRESS, IMPLIED, STATUTORY, OR OTHERWISE WITH RESPECT TO THE SERVICES, ASSESSMENT REPORT, OR OTHER MATERIALS. WITHOUT LIMITING THE FOREGOING, FusionTech SPECIFICALLY DISCLAIMS ALL IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY, FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE, TITLE AND NON-INFRINGEMENT, AND ALL WARRANTIES ARISING FROM COURSE OF DEALING, USAGE, OR TRADE PRACTICE. WITHOUT LIMITING THE FOREGOING, FusionTech MAKES NO WARRANTY OF ANY KIND THAT THE SERVICES, THE LABELS, THE ASSESSMENT REPORT, WORK PRODUCT, OR OTHER MATERIALS, OR ANY PRODUCTS OR RESULTS OF THE USE THEREOF, WILL MEET CUSTOMER’S OR ANY OTHER PERSON’S REQUIREMENTS, ACHIEVE ANY INTENDED RESULT, BE COMPATIBLE OR WORK WITH ANY SOFTWARE, SYSTEM, OR OTHER SERVICES, OR BE SECURE, ACCURATE, COMPLETE, FREE OF HARMFUL CODE, OR ERROR-FREE. WITHOUT LIMITATION TO THE FOREGOING, FusionTech PROVIDES NO WARRANTY OR UNDERTAKING, AND MAKES NO REPRESENTATION OF ANY KIND THAT THE SERVICE WILL MEET CUSTOMER’S REQUIREMENTS, ACHIEVE ANY INTENDED RESULTS, BE COMPATIBLE OR WORK WITH ANY OTHER SOFTWARE, APPLICATIONS, SYSTEMS OR SERVICES, OPERATE WITHOUT INTERRUPTION, MEET ANY PERFORMANCE OR RELIABILITY STANDARDS OR BE ERROR FREE OR THAT ANY ERRORS OR DEFECTS CAN OR WILL BE CORRECTED.

WITHOUT LIMITING THE FOREGOING, NEITHER FusionTech NOR ANY OF FusionTech’S AGENTS MAKES ANY REPRESENTATION OR WARRANTY OF ANY KIND, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED AS TO THE ACCURACY, RELIABILITY, OR CURRENCY OF ANY INFORMATION OR CONTENT PROVIDED THROUGH THE SERVICE. FusionTech WILL ASSUME NO LIABILITY OR RESPONSIBILITY FOR (I) ANY ERRORS, MISTAKES, OR INACCURACIES OF CONTENT AND MATERIALS OR FOR ANY LOSS OR DAMAGE OF ANY KIND INCURRED AS A RESULT OF THE USE OF ANY CONTENT, OR (II) ANY PERSONAL INJURY OR PROPERTY DAMAGE, OF ANY NATURE WHATSOEVER, RESULTING FROM CUSTOMER’S ACCESS TO OR USE OF THE SERVICES, ASSESSMENT REPORT, OR OTHER MATERIALS.

ALL THIRD-PARTY MATERIALS ARE PROVIDED “AS IS” AND ANY REPRESENTATION OR WARRANTY OF OR CONCERNING ANY THIRD-PARTY MATERIALS IS STRICTLY BETWEEN CUSTOMER AND THE THIRD-PARTY OWNER OR DISTRIBUTOR OF THE THIRD-PARTY MATERIALS.

THE SERVICES, ASSESSMENT REPORT, AND ANY OTHER MATERIALS HEREUNDER ARE SOLELY PROVIDED TO CUSTOMER AND MAY NOT BE RELIED ON BY ANY OTHER PERSON OR FOR ANY PURPOSE NOT SPECIFICALLY IDENTIFIED IN THIS AGREEMENT, NOR MAY COPIES BE DELIVERED TO, ANY OTHER PERSON WITHOUT FusionTech’S PRIOR WRITTEN CONSENT IN EACH INSTANCE.

NO THIRD PARTY OR ANYONE ACTING ON BEHALF OF ANY THEREOF, SHALL BE A THIRD PARTY OR OTHER BENEFICIARY OF SUCH SERVICES, ASSESSMENT REPORT, AND ANY ACCOMPANYING

FOR AVOIDANCE OF DOUBT, THE SERVICES, INCLUDING ANY ASSOCIATED ASSESSMENT REPORTS OR MATERIALS, SHALL NOT BE CONSIDERED OR RELIED UPON AS ANY FORM OF FINANCIAL, TAX, LEGAL, REGULATORY, OR OTHER ADVICE.

About

Founded in 2022 by leading academics in the field of Computer Science, FusionTech is going to be a leading blockchain security company that serves to verify the security and correctness of smart contracts KYC and blockchain-based protocols. Through the utilization of our world-class technical expertise, alongside our proprietary, innovative tech, we're able to support the success of our clients with best-in-class security, all whilst realizing our overarching vision; provable trust for all throughout all facets of blockchain.



<https://fusiontech.live>

<https://twitter.com/fusiontechh>

<https://t.me/fusiontechofficial>

<https://github.com/fusiontechofficial>