

Audit of 888 DAO

A report of findings by

Genji Sakamoto

February 21th, 2020

Table of Contents

| | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| Executive Summary | 2 |
| Audited smart contracts | 2 |
| Audit Method | 2 |
| Audit Focus | 2 |
| Conclusion | 3 |
| Type of Issues | 3 |
| Findings..... | 5 |
| 888-token.sol..... | 5 |
| Code optimization..... | 5 |
| 888-vault.sol..... | 6 |
| Transparency and Security..... | 7 |

Executive Summary

This audit report has been written to discover issues and vulnerabilities in the 888 DAO smart contracts.

This process included a line by line analysis of the in-scope contracts, optimization analysis, analysis of key functionalities and limiters, and reference against intended functionality.

Audited smart contracts

- 888-token.sol
- 888-vault.sol

Audit Method

- Static analysis based on source.
- Dynamic analysis by testing deployed ones on BSC main net.

Audit Focus

- Contract logic.
- Vulnerabilities for common and uncommon attacks
- Gas optimization
- Validation for variable limiters
- Transparency for all users.

Conclusion

While auditing the smart contracts for 888 DAO project, I realized that the idea is very interesting that could attract many users in near future once deployed.

The logic is some tricky and some complex, but the whole flow of contracts meet the specification perfectly, except there are some issues I recommend to fix before deployment.

Type of Issues

| Title | Description | Issues | SWC ID |
|--------------------------------|---|--------|--------------------|
| Integer Overflow and Underflow | An overflow/underflow happens when an arithmetic operation reaches the maximum or minimum size of a type. | 0 | SWC-101 |
| Function Incorrectness | Function implementation does not meet the specification, leading to intentional or unintentional vulnerabilities. | 0 | |
| Buffer Overflow | An attacker is able to write to arbitrary storage locations of a contract if array of out bound happens. | 0 | SWC-124 |
| Reentrancy | A malicious contract can call back into the calling contract before the first invocation of the function is finished. | 0 | SWC-107 |
| Transaction Order Dependence | A race condition vulnerability occurs when code depends on the order of the transactions submitted to it. | 0 | SWC-114 |
| Timestamp Dependence | Timestamp can be influenced by minors to some degree. | 0 | SWC-116 |
| Insecure Compiler Version | Using a fixed outdated compiler version or floating pragma can be problematic, if there are publicly disclosed bugs and issues that affect the current compiler version used. | 0 | SWC-102 SWC-103 |
| Insecure Randomness | Block attributes are insecure to generate random numbers, as they can | 0 | SWC-120 |

| | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|---|---------|
| | be influenced by minors to some degree. | | |
| “tx.origin” for authorization | “tx.origin” should not be used for authorization. Use “msg.sender” instead. | 0 | SWC-115 |
| Delegate call to Untrusted Calling | Calling into untrusted contracts is very dangerous, the target and arguments provided must be sanitized. | 0 | SWC-112 |
| State Variable Default Visibility | Labeling the visibility explicitly makes it easier to catch incorrect assumptions about who can access the variable. | 0 | SWC-108 |
| Function Default Visibility | Functions are public by default. A malicious user is able to make unauthorized or unintended state changes if a developer forgot to set the visibility. | 0 | SWC-100 |
| Uninitialized Variables | Uninitialized local storage variables can point to other unexpected storage variables in the contract. | 0 | SWC-109 |
| Assertion Failure | The assert() function is meant to assert invariants. Properly functioning code should never reach a failing assert statement. | 0 | SWC-110 |
| Deprecated Solidity Features | Several functions and operators in Solidity are deprecated and should not be used as best practice. | 0 | SWC-111 |
| Unused Variables | Unused variables reduce code quality. | 0 | |

Findings

888-token.sol

Code optimization

The token contract source is perfect. I just recommend to move the same code of transfer and transferFrom function to `_transfer` internal function. But it is not must.

```
if (_checkWithoutFee()) {
    _transfer(sender, recipient, amount);
} else {
    uint256 feeAmount = amount.mul(uint256(_taxFee)).div(10000);
    uint256 leftAmount = amount.sub(feeAmount);

    _transfer(sender, _vault, feeAmount);
    _transfer(sender, recipient, leftAmount);
    I222Vault(_vault).addTaxFee(feeAmount);
}
```

888-vault.sol

The source of vault contract is perfect and works seamlessly.

There are just some small optimization issues but it doesn't affect to main flow.

Transparency and Security

- There is not any mint function that somebody would ever use for an irregular purpose.