



# Smart Contract Security Audit Report



# Table Of Contents

<b>1 Executive Summary</b>	_____
<b>2 Audit Methodology</b>	_____
<b>3 Project Overview</b>	_____
3.1 Project Introduction	_____
3.2 Vulnerability Information	_____
<b>4 Code Overview</b>	_____
4.1 Contracts Description	_____
4.2 Visibility Description	_____
4.3 Vulnerability Summary	_____
<b>5 Audit Result</b>	_____
<b>6 Statement</b>	_____

# 1 Executive Summary

On 2024.12.04, the SlowMist security team received the SoSoValueLabs team's security audit application for SSI Protocol, developed the audit plan according to the agreement of both parties and the characteristics of the project, and finally issued the security audit report.

The SlowMist security team adopts the strategy of "white box lead, black, grey box assists" to conduct a complete security test on the project in the way closest to the real attack.

The test method information:

Test method	Description
Black box testing	Conduct security tests from an attacker's perspective externally.
Grey box testing	Conduct security testing on code modules through the scripting tool, observing the internal running status, mining weaknesses.
White box testing	Based on the open source code, non-open source code, to detect whether there are vulnerabilities in programs such as nodes, SDK, etc.

The vulnerability severity level information:

Level	Description
Critical	Critical severity vulnerabilities will have a significant impact on the security of the DeFi project, and it is strongly recommended to fix the critical vulnerabilities.
High	High severity vulnerabilities will affect the normal operation of the DeFi project. It is strongly recommended to fix high-risk vulnerabilities.
Medium	Medium severity vulnerability will affect the operation of the DeFi project. It is recommended to fix medium-risk vulnerabilities.
Low	Low severity vulnerabilities may affect the operation of the DeFi project in certain scenarios. It is suggested that the project team should evaluate and consider whether these vulnerabilities need to be fixed.
Weakness	There are safety risks theoretically, but it is extremely difficult to reproduce in engineering.
Suggestion	There are better practices for coding or architecture.

## 2 Audit Methodology

The security audit process of SlowMist security team for smart contract includes two steps:

- Smart contract codes are scanned/tested for commonly known and more specific vulnerabilities using automated analysis tools.
- Manual audit of the codes for security issues. The contracts are manually analyzed to look for any potential problems.

Following is the list of commonly known vulnerabilities that was considered during the audit of the smart contract:

Serial Number	Audit Class	Audit Subclass
1	Overflow Audit	-
2	Reentrancy Attack Audit	-
3	Replay Attack Audit	-
4	Flashloan Attack Audit	-
5	Race Conditions Audit	Reordering Attack Audit
6	Permission Vulnerability Audit	Access Control Audit
		Excessive Authority Audit
7	Security Design Audit	External Module Safe Use Audit
		Compiler Version Security Audit
		Hard-coded Address Security Audit
		Fallback Function Safe Use Audit
		Show Coding Security Audit
		Function Return Value Security Audit
		External Call Function Security Audit

Serial Number	Audit Class	Audit Subclass
7	Security Design Audit	Block data Dependence Security Audit
		tx.origin Authentication Security Audit
8	Denial of Service Audit	-
9	Gas Optimization Audit	-
10	Design Logic Audit	-
11	Variable Coverage Vulnerability Audit	-
12	"False Top-up" Vulnerability Audit	-
13	Scoping and Declarations Audit	-
14	Malicious Event Log Audit	-
15	Arithmetic Accuracy Deviation Audit	-
16	Uninitialized Storage Pointer Audit	-

## 3 Project Overview

### 3.1 Project Introduction

This audit primarily focuses on the differences between the SSI Protocol and the previous audit, which includes the new token staking module. The StakeFactory contract is used to create StakeToken for staking asset tokens. The AssetLocking contract allows users to lock up permitted tokens by depositing them. The USSI contract enables users to deposit asset tokens to mint USSI tokens, and they can later redeem their USSI tokens for the predefined redeemToken set in the contract.

### 3.2 Vulnerability Information

The following is the status of the vulnerabilities found in this audit:

NO	Title	Category	Level	Status
N1	Missing updates to mapped values	Design Logic Audit	High	Fixed
N2	Potential risk of token compatibility	Design Logic Audit	Suggestion	Fixed
N3	Missing ERC20 return value check	Others	Suggestion	Fixed
N4	Risk of excessive authority	Authority Control Vulnerability Audit	Medium	Acknowledged
N5	Lack of checking of order expiration date	Design Logic Audit	Suggestion	Acknowledged

## 4 Code Overview

### 4.1 Contracts Description

**Audit Version:**

<https://github.com/SoSoValueLabs/ssi-protocol>

commit: 584f29cda02369b1483f7c5eefb2eb5634abb565

**Audit Scope:**

the iterative changes compared to the last audit commit 6058696c4e0dee930e12260144698d1a7c3a4b94.

**Fixed Version:**

<https://github.com/SoSoValueLabs/ssi-protocol>

commit: 4ff5f0db5951905f277d5e5a71025f0968102c06

The main network address of the contract is as follows:

Swap: <https://basescan.org/address/0x640cB7201810BC920835A598248c4fe4898Bb5e0>

AssetFactory: <https://basescan.org/address/0xb04eB6b64137d1673D46731C8f84718092c50B0D>

AssetIssuer: <https://basescan.org/address/0xdc74D8C5D9a900fdF8a6D03Ad419b236c9A1AD1d>

AssetRebalancer: <https://basescan.org/address/0x242626E1eCe44601A69d9BC3f72a755Eb393f4b1>

AssetFeeManager: <https://basescan.org/address/0x996c93827Ab4C55B1044aDd903D2bDb0dcd546BA>

StakeFactory: <https://basescan.org/address/0x585834242BB31427B1dC7486DD4BDe7c724e35c1>

AssetLocking: <https://basescan.org/address/0x935A4B1F6F3E891a226b2522ac22d45Ce5839383>

USSI: <https://basescan.org/address/0x3a46ed8FCeb6eF1ADA2E4600A522AE7e24D2Ed18>

StakeToken: <https://basescan.org/address/0x7f811E881693af12D84976D59fF3Fb0Eaf135524>

## 4.2 Visibility Description

The SlowMist Security team analyzed the visibility of major contracts during the audit, the result as follows:

StakeToken			
Function Name	Visibility	Mutability	Modifiers
<Constructor>	Public	Can Modify State	-
initialize	Public	Can Modify State	initializer
_authorizeUpgrade	Internal	Can Modify State	onlyOwner
pause	External	Can Modify State	onlyOwner
unpause	External	Can Modify State	onlyOwner
decimals	Public	-	-
stake	External	Can Modify State	whenNotPaused
unstake	External	Can Modify State	whenNotPaused
withdraw	External	Can Modify State	whenNotPaused

AssetLocking			
Function Name	Visibility	Mutability	Modifiers
<Constructor>	Public	Can Modify State	-
initialize	Public	Can Modify State	initializer
_authorizeUpgrade	Internal	Can Modify State	onlyOwner
pause	External	Can Modify State	onlyOwner

AssetLocking			
unpause	External	Can Modify State	onlyOwner
setEpoch	External	Can Modify State	onlyOwner
updateLockConfig	External	Can Modify State	onlyOwner
getActiveTokens	External	-	-
lock	External	Can Modify State	whenNotPaused
unlock	External	Can Modify State	whenNotPaused
withdraw	External	Can Modify State	whenNotPaused

StakeFactory			
Function Name	Visibility	Mutability	Modifiers
<Constructor>	Public	Can Modify State	-
initialize	Public	Can Modify State	initializer
_authorizeUpgrade	Internal	Can Modify State	onlyOwner
setSTImpl	External	Can Modify State	onlyOwner
_setSTImpl	Internal	Can Modify State	-
createStakeToken	External	Can Modify State	onlyOwner
getStakeTokens	External	-	-
pauseStakeToken	External	Can Modify State	onlyOwner
unpauseStakeToken	External	Can Modify State	onlyOwner

USSI			
Function Name	Visibility	Mutability	Modifiers
<Constructor>	Public	Can Modify State	-

USSI			
initialize	Public	Can Modify State	initializer
_authorizeUpgrade	Internal	Can Modify State	onlyOwner
decimals	Public	-	-
getSupportAssetIDs	External	-	-
addSupportAsset	External	Can Modify State	onlyOwner
removeSupportAsset	External	Can Modify State	onlyOwner
updateOrderSigner	External	Can Modify State	onlyOwner
updateRedeemToken	External	Can Modify State	onlyOwner
checkHedgeOrder	Public	-	-
applyMint	External	Can Modify State	onlyRole whenNotPaused
rejectMint	External	Can Modify State	onlyOwner
confirmMint	External	Can Modify State	onlyOwner
applyRedeem	External	Can Modify State	onlyRole whenNotPaused
rejectRedeem	External	Can Modify State	onlyOwner
confirmRedeem	External	Can Modify State	onlyOwner
getOrderHashs	External	-	-
getOrderHashLength	External	-	-
getOrderHash	External	-	-

### 4.3 Vulnerability Summary

**[N1] [High] Missing updates to mapped values**

**Category: Design Logic Audit**

**Content**

In the AssetFactory contract, the owner role can update the issuer, rebalancer, and fee manager roles of the assetToken by calling the setIssuer, setRebalancer, and setFeeManager functions. However, these functions do not modify the corresponding contract addresses in the mappings issuers, rebalancers, and feeManagers. This will lead to other project contracts (such as USSI.sol) being unable to correctly obtain the updated contract addresses through these mappings.

Code Location:

src/AssetFactory.sol#L105-135

```
function setIssuer(uint256 assetID, address issuer) external onlyOwner {
    ...
}

function setRebalancer(uint256 assetID, address rebalancer) external onlyOwner {
    ...
}

function setFeeManager(uint256 assetID, address feeManager) external onlyOwner {
    ...
}
```

### Solution

It is suggested to add the code implementation for updating the corresponding mapping values in these three functions.

### Status

Fixed

### [N2] [Suggestion] Potential risk of token compatibility

#### Category: Design Logic Audit

#### Content

In the AssetLocking contract, users can deposit tokens into the contract for staking by calling the lock function. However, the function does not check whether the difference in the contract's token balance before and after the transfer equals the value of the `amount` parameter. If the token is a deflationary token, it might result in the actual amount transferred being less than the value of the amount, ultimately leading to unexpected errors.

Code Location:

src/AssetLocking.sol#L100-111

```
function lock(address token, uint256 amount) external whenNotPaused {  
    ...  
  
    lockData.amount += amount;  
    lockConfig.totalLock += amount;  
    IERC20(token).transferFrom(msg.sender, address(this), amount);  
    emit Lock(msg.sender, token, amount);  
}
```

### Solution

It is recommended to use the difference in the token balance in the contract before and after the user's transfer as the actual amount, instead of directly using the `amount` parameter passed in.

### Status

Fixed

### [N3] [Suggestion] Missing ERC20 return value check

#### Category: Others

#### Content

The `ERC20.transferFrom()` function returns a boolean value indicating success. This parameter needs to be checked for success. Some tokens do not revert if the transfer failed but return false instead.

In the `AssetLocking` contract, users can deposit tokens into the contract by calling the `lock` function. However, it does not check the return value.

Code Location:

src/AssetLocking.sol#L109

```
function lock(address token, uint256 amount) external whenNotPaused {  
    ...  
  
    IERC20(token).transferFrom(msg.sender, address(this), amount);  
    emit Lock(msg.sender, token, amount);  
}
```

## Solution

It is recommended to use SafeERC20 library or add a check of the return value.

## Status

Fixed

## [N4] [Medium] Risk of excessive authority

### Category: Authority Control Vulnerability Audit

#### Content

1. In the AssetFactory contract, the owner role can update the underlying implementation contract of the asset token contract by calling the setTokenImpl function. If the privileges are lost or misused, this could lead to the underlying logic contract of the asset token being upgraded to a malicious contract, posing a risk to users' assets.

Code Location:

src/AssetFactory.sol#L72-82

```
function setTokenImpl(address tokenImpl_) external onlyOwner {  
    ...  
}
```

2. In the StakeFactory contract, the owner role can update the underlying implementation contract of the stake token contract by calling the setTokenImpl function. If the privileges are lost or misused, this could lead to the underlying logic contract of the stake token being upgraded to a malicious contract, posing a risk to users' assets.

Code Location:

src/StakeFactory.sol#L40-42

```
function setSTImpl(address stImpl_) external onlyOwner {  
    _setSTImpl(stImpl_);  
}
```

3. In the AssetLocking contract, the owner role can call the updateLockConfig function to set the configuration items for token staking, including the staking epoch, limit, and cooldown period. If the privileges are lost or misused, this may have an impact on the user's assets.

Code Location:

src/AssetLocking.sol#L72-82

```
function updateLockConfig(address token, uint8 epoch, uint256 lockLimit, uint48
cooldown) external onlyOwner {
    ...
}
```

4. In the USSI contract, the owner is responsible for confirming the minting and redemption operations of USSI tokens. Additionally, the owner can also call the `updateOrderSigner` function to set the signer for order data. If the privileges are lost or misused, this may have an impact on the user's assets.

Code Location:

src/USSI.sol

```
function updateOrderSigner(address orderSigner_) external onlyOwner {
    ...
}

...

function rejectMint(bytes32 orderHash) external onlyOwner {
    ...
}

function confirmMint(bytes32 orderHash) external onlyOwner {
    ...
}

function rejectRedeem(bytes32 orderHash) external onlyOwner {
    ...
}

function confirmRedeem(bytes32 orderHash, bytes32 txHash) external onlyOwner {
    ...
}
```

## Solution

In the short term, during the early stages of the project, the protocol may need to frequently set various parameters to ensure the stable operation of the protocol. Therefore, transferring the ownership of core roles to a multisig

management can effectively solve the single-point risk, but it cannot mitigate the excessive privilege risk. In the long run, after the protocol stabilizes, transferring the owner ownership to community governance or executing through a timelock can effectively mitigate the excessive privilege risk and increase the community users' trust in the protocol.

## Status

Acknowledged; The project team's response: we will use cobo mpc custody wallets to manage the ownership of the contracts.

Update: The contract was created using Cobo's MPC wallet, so the permissions for the core roles have been transferred to the MPC wallet for management. This has also been confirmed via official email by Cobo. The following are the transactions made during the setting of permissions:

<https://basescan.org/tx/0xcf3f55f38e960f67920bc6ad64c5d427e1195620870812d3b584ce3b4332a63c>

<https://basescan.org/tx/0xf799ed692feec633522184fb0a64b87ab5bd27c10585b293442fd43382a09970>

<https://basescan.org/tx/0xd1cca9aa47312f906afd4954e74c60341bd0d682c829dbc14c9fcc0d3e75b45d>

<https://basescan.org/tx/0x31ca36dccaafd358788655d277261d0a2d8d914bd106ada8aae9af05e101fd706>

<https://basescan.org/tx/0x7ba0be5e9655dd5b3d15edfec8a7853e1d38acaea78ab2d8bb95d216aeac4ffc>

<https://basescan.org/tx/0xd717eaa5e62c12014ce49312a67d7d6ed0a596cedff4f46b60b83b919fda2895>

<https://basescan.org/tx/0xab2877f317d48dec5f8c9ca4cf22e7b179a65dd2cc2ed94dc2120f74c7db598d>

<https://basescan.org/tx/0x59ed850c606e0c3ded162c240bb9f381fe58df1b229141a80dc69ff7029908d7>

<https://basescan.org/tx/0xbfe81349d9cc0285fabd29a2dc5d12c63458522498990597395ad393ac810138>

The taker role for the Swap contract has been set to the relevant contracts; the following are the transactions for this setting:

<https://basescan.org/tx/0x852cddcd5d7585b165849cb964d52c31183696f6b2f4c645e6d680adcb6815d9>

<https://basescan.org/tx/0xac38e9f56dc5e5554b28b8e056043b2bbf45213dca4e8dc428dcd7c6e2a39a53>

<https://basescan.org/tx/0x8ca6a324cfe6464c4d04fd69fd4a301bafea9fa6bb33fb41827f88d3133663eb>

When the maker role confirms the swap in the Swap contract, it's just for bookkeeping purposes; only when the taker role confirms will the user's funds be transferred to the maker. If the maker unexpectedly confirms, the taker role will roll back the confirm status of the maker role. Additionally, before the owner role confirms the transaction, they will check if the outTxHash meets expectations:

- Whether the amount transferred to the vault is as expected.
- Whether the orderHash is included in the data field of the transfer transaction.

## [N5] [Suggestion] Lack of checking of order expiration date

### Category: Design Logic Audit

#### Content

In the USSI contract, when performing a mint or redemption, the data submitted will set a deadline for the order. However, when the owner confirms the mint or redemption request, they do not check this deadline parameter. This means that even if the submitted order has exceeded the expected expiration time, it can still be successfully confirmed and executed.

Code Location:

src/USSI.sol

```
function applyMint(HedgeOrder calldata hedgeOrder, bytes calldata orderSignature)
external onlyRole(PARTICIPANT_ROLE) whenNotPaused {
    ...

    hedgeOrder_.deadline = hedgeOrder.deadline;

    ...
}

function confirmMint(bytes32 orderHash) external onlyOwner {
    ...
}

function applyRedeem(HedgeOrder calldata hedgeOrder, bytes calldata
orderSignature) external onlyRole(PARTICIPANT_ROLE) whenNotPaused {
    ...

    hedgeOrder_.deadline = hedgeOrder.deadline;

    ...
}

function confirmRedeem(bytes32 orderHash, bytes32 txHash) external onlyOwner {
    ...
}
```

## Solution

It is recommended to add a check for the deadline when confirming mint and redemption requests.

## Status

Acknowledged; Project team response: As expected, we will check the deadline off-chain.

# 5 Audit Result

Audit Number	Audit Team	Audit Date	Audit Result
0X002412060007	SlowMist Security Team	2024.12.04 - 2024.12.06	Low Risk

Summary conclusion: The SlowMist security team uses a manual and SlowMist team's analysis tool to audit the project, during the audit work we found 1 high risk, 1 medium risk and 3 suggestion. All the findings were fixed or acknowledged. The project has been deployed on the mainnet, and the permissions of the core roles have been transferred to be managed by the Cobo's MPC wallet and the contracts.

## 6 Statement

SlowMist issues this report with reference to the facts that have occurred or existed before the issuance of this report, and only assumes corresponding responsibility based on these.

For the facts that occurred or existed after the issuance, SlowMist is not able to judge the security status of this project, and is not responsible for them. The security audit analysis and other contents of this report are based on the documents and materials provided to SlowMist by the information provider till the date of the insurance report (referred to as "provided information"). SlowMist assumes: The information provided is not missing, tampered with, deleted or concealed. If the information provided is missing, tampered with, deleted, concealed, or inconsistent with the actual situation, the SlowMist shall not be liable for any loss or adverse effect resulting therefrom. SlowMist only conducts the agreed security audit on the security situation of the project and issues this report. SlowMist is not responsible for the background and other conditions of the project.



**Official Website**  
[www.slowmist.com](http://www.slowmist.com)



**E-mail**  
[team@slowmist.com](mailto:team@slowmist.com)



**Twitter**  
[@SlowMist\\_Team](https://twitter.com/SlowMist_Team)



**Github**  
<https://github.com/slowmist>