

Onchain Pass

Security assessment by HashEye · prepared for Pass App Ltd

HASHEYE AUDITED

PROJECT	Onchain Pass
CLIENT	Pass App Ltd
CATEGORY	Blockchain
PUBLISHED	August 1, 2024
REPORT ID	research-onchain-pass-2024-08-01-13i3cm

This report was produced under HashEye's layered review process – **automated detection**, **pattern correlation**, and **senior manual verification** – with every finding signed off by a human reviewer. Full findings detail and on-chain attestation are available on the report page at hashey.io/audits/research-onchain-pass-2024-08-01-13i3cm.

OnchainPassAppContracts SecurityAssessment(SummaryReport) September10,2024 Preparedfor:
ManuSiddalingegowda PassAppLtd. Preparedby:GuillermoLarregay

About hashey Founded in 2012 and headquartered in New York, hashey provides technical security assessment and advisory services to some of the world's most targeted organizations. We combine high-end security research with a real-world attacker mentality to reduce risk and fortify code. With 100+ employees around the globe, we've helped secure critical software elements that support billions of end users, including Kubernetes and the Linux kernel. We maintain an exhaustive list of publications at <https://github.com/hashey-io/publications>, with links to papers, presentations, public audit reports, and podcast appearances. In recent years, hashey consultants have showcased cutting-edge research through presentations at CanSecWest, HCSS, Devcon, Empire Hacking, GrrCon, LangSec, NorthSec, the O'Reilly Security Conference, PyCon, REcon, Security BSides, and SummerCon. We specialize in software testing and code review projects, supporting client organizations in the technology, defense, and finance industries, as well as government entities. Notable clients include HashiCorp, Google, Microsoft, Western Digital, and Zoom. hashey also operates a center of excellence with regard to blockchain security. Notable projects include audits of Algorand, Bitcoin SV, Chainlink, Compound, Ethereum 2.0, MakerDAO, Matic, Uniswap, Web3, and Zcash. To keep up to date with our latest news and announcements, please follow hashey on Twitter and explore our public repositories at <https://github.com/hashey-io>. To engage us directly, visit our "Contact" page at <https://www.hashey.io/contact>, or email us at info@hashey.io. hashey, Inc. 497 Carroll St., Space 71, Seventh Floor Brooklyn, NY 11215 <https://www.hashey.io> info@hashey.io hashey 1PassAppLtd.SecurityAssessment PUBLIC

Notices and Remarks Copyright and Distribution ©2024 by hashey, Inc.

All rights reserved. hashey hereby asserts its right to be identified as the creator of this report in the United Kingdom.

This report is considered by hashey to be public information; it is licensed to PassApp Ltd. under the terms of the project statement of work and has been made public at PassApp Ltd's request. Material within this report may not be reproduced or distributed in part or in whole without the express written permission of hashey.

This is the canonical source for hashey publications; the hashey Publications page.

Reports accessed through any source other than that page may have been modified and

should not be considered authentic. Test Coverage Disclaimer

All activities undertaken by hashey in association with this project were performed in accordance with a statement of work and agreed upon project plan. Security assessment projects are time-boxed and often reliant on information that may be

provided by a client, its affiliates, or its partners. As a result, the findings documented in this report should not be considered a comprehensive list of security issues, flaws, or defects in the target system or codebase.

hashey uses automated testing techniques to rapidly test the controls and security properties of software. These techniques augment our manual security review work, but each has its limitations: for example, a tool may not generate a random edge case that violates a property or may not fully complete its analysis during the allotted time. Their use is also limited by the time and resource constraints of a project. hashey 2PassAppLtd.SecurityAssessment PUBLIC

Table of Contents About hashey 1 Notices and Remarks 2 Table of Contents 3 Project Summary 4 Project Targets 5 Executive Summary 6 Codebase Maturity Evaluation 8 Summary of Findings 11 A. Vulnerability Categories 12 B. Code Maturity Categories 14 C. Token Integration Checklist 16 D. Incident Response Recommendations 19 E. Security Best Practices for Using Multi-signature Wallets 21 F. Upgradability Checks with SLIther 23 G. Fix Review Results 24 Detailed Fix Review Results 25 H. Fix Review Status Categories 27 hashey 3PassAppLtd.SecurityAssessment PUBLIC

Project Summary Contact Information The following project manager was associated with this project: Sam Greenup, Project Manager sam.greenup@hashey.io

The following engineering director was associated with this project:

Joselin Feist, Engineering Director, Blockchain joselin.feist@hashey.io

The following consultants were associated with this project: Guillermo Larregay, Consultant guillermo.larregay@hashey.io Project Timeline

The significant events and milestones of the project are listed below. Date Event August 5, 2024 Pre-

ProjectTargets Theengagementinvolvedareviewandtestingofthefollowingtarget. PassAppContracts
Repository<https://github.com/PassHQ/pass-contracts> Versioncommit deb8e33 TypeSolidity
PlatformEVMcompatible hashey 5PassAppLtd.SecurityAssessment PUBLIC

ExecutiveSummary EngagementOverview

PassAppLtd.engagedhasheyetoreviewthesecurityofPassAppContractscommit deb8e33

.Thecontractimplementsamultisignature-ownedVaultthatacceptsERC20

tokensandnativeassetsdepositsandwithdrawals.Additionally,thereisaswap
functionalitythatperforms swappingandbridgingofassetsusingathird-partyaggregator
exchange, andafunctiontofundanexternalpaymaster.

AteamofoneconsultantconductedthereviewfromAugust5toAugust9,2024,foratotal ofoneengineer-
weekofeffort.Withfullaccesstosourcecodeanddocumentation,we

performedstaticanddynamictestingofthetargetusingautomatedandmanual processes. ObservationsandImpact
TheengagementwasscopedtoprovideasecurityassessmentofthePassAppVault

contract. Specifically, wesoughttoanswerthefollowingnon-exhaustivelistofquestions: •

Canthefundsbe withdrawnfromthevaultbyanattacker, bypassingtheowner's role? •

CantheSwapperperformanyotherprivilegedactions otherthantheexpected swaps? •

Cananexternaluserlockfundsorotherwiseaffecttheowner'sorswapper'sability toaccessthefundsinthevault?

Theauditfoundsevenissues:oneofmediumseverity,oneoflowseverity, andthree

informationalissues. Theseverityoftheremainingtwoissuescouldnotbedetermined

fromtheinformationavailableatthetimeoftheengagement. Inparticular, the medium-severityissue(TOB-PASS-

1)couldleadtoanunexpectedlossoffundsfromthe Vaultcontract. Oneoftheundetermined-severityissues(TOB-

PASS-5)isrelatedtothe Swapperrole, whichcanbeconsideredasinglepointoffailureintheVaultifitwere

misassignedtoanon-trustedcontractoraddress.

Please note that this review's coverage was limited; we did not have access to the back-end

code, including the event handlers, the Rangoswap call data generation, the multisignature

wallet contracts, or any other code besides the content of the repository mentioned above. Recommendations

Based on the code base maturity evaluation and findings identified during the security

review, hashey recommends that PassAppLtd. take the following steps: hashey 6

6PassAppLtd.SecurityAssessment PUBLIC

- Remediate the findings disclosed in this report. These findings should be
addressed as part of a direct remediation or as part of any refactoring that may
occur when addressing other recommendations. •

Improve the test suite. Add tests for the upgrade procedure, and review the
conditions for the failing fuzzing tests. •

Improve the user and developer documentation and source code comments.

Include information about how the system is expected to behave, such as how the

backend works, how the swapper obtains the call data for the swap, how the

integration between the paymaster and the swapper works, and any other

information that can be useful for users or developers integrating with the Vault contract. hashey 7

7PassAppLtd.SecurityAssessment PUBLIC

Codebase Maturity Evaluation hashey uses a traffic-

light protocol to provide each client with a clear understanding of

the areas in which its code base is mature, immature, or underdeveloped. Deficiencies

identified here often stem from root causes within the software development lifecycle that

should be addressed through standardization measures (e.g., the use of common libraries,

functions, or frameworks) or training and awareness programs. Category Summary Result

Arithmetic Because the code uses Solidity compiler version 0.8.23,

SafeMath is included by default. The code does not depend on arithmetic algorithms.

However, we found two usages of unchecked arithmetic in for-loop variable incrementing, with no further

documentation or explanation. Satisfactory Auditing The vault contract interacts with the backend through

events. However, it is documented that deposit and withdrawal functions deliberately miss event emissions, as

they rely on the ERC20 standard events. This leads to issue TOB-PASS-3.

At the time of the audit, we were not aware of an incident monitoring system or response plan. For

recommendations on incident response plans, see appendix D. Moderate Authentication/ Access Controls

There are two actors in the Vault contract, and their privileges are clearly specified in the documentation.

Anyone can deposit assets into the vaults, but withdrawing, transferring, and swapping assets are

privileged functions. The owner role is assigned to a 2-of-4 multisignature wallet

controlled by the team, and the swapper role is assumed to be fully trusted. The swapper role is assigned to a single

external contract address and can be changed. The owner can also be changed, but it is not a two-step

process. If the swapper is set to a malicious contractor EOA, it can drain the vaults or call any external contract Satisfactory hashey 8PassAppLtd.SecurityAssessment PUBLIC

function on behalf of the vault. Complexity Management The contract's functions are short, easy to read, and clear in purpose. There is no redundant code, and the naming conventions are easy to understand. Some functions present unnecessary low-level code. Satisfactory Decentralization The Vault contract is centralized by design. All withdrawal functions are callable only by the owner role, and the swap function is callable by the swapper and owner roles. The swapper role is a single point of failure in the contract, as assigning it to a malicious actor can allow them to drain the contract or to interact with any third-party contract (TOB-PASS-5). Weak Documentation The documentation provided for the audit consisted of a document explaining the purpose of the functions and roles in the contract. Also, a diagram of the high-level architecture of the PassApp contract was provided. The code is well commented in general, using NatSpec for most functions. There was no specific documentation for the backend, the interaction between the Vault and external contracts (Rango and Biconomy), or the privileged roles. Moderate Low-Level Manipulation The code uses unjustified low-level (assembly) calls for native asset transfers instead of using the Solady Safe Transfer library, which is also used for token transfers (TOB-PASS-4). Although the low-level parts of the code do not have specific comments, most are self-explanatory and consist of a single line. Moderate Testing and Verification Test coverage is not 100% for the Vault contract. No tests implement a vault upgrade procedure. Some test cases for the expected functionality are missing. In particular, the test suites should have detected issue TOB-PASS-1. Unit and basic Fuzz tests have been implemented. Weak hashey 9PassAppLtd.SecurityAssessment PUBLIC

However, one of the fuzzing tests occasionally fails (testFuzz_RevertNotOwner_FillPaymasterGasTank). Testing is part of the CI/CD pipeline. Transaction Ordering We detected a transaction ordering risk when the owner updates the Swapper account address (TOB-PASS-5). Moderate hashey 10PassAppLtd.SecurityAssessment PUBLIC

Summary of Findings The table below summarizes the findings of the review, including type and severity details. ID Title Type Severity 1 Value is set for all calls to Rango, even when swapping tokens Data Validation Medium 2 The backend can be event-spammed Auditing and Logging Undetermined 3 Lack of event emission for ERC20 deposits and withdrawals Data Validation Low 4 Ether transfers use low-level calls Data Validation Informational 5 Swapper can front-run the updateSwapperAddress call Timing Undetermined 6 Unused libraries in the project Configuration Informational 7 Lack of a two-step process for ownership transfer Data Validation Informational hashey 11PassAppLtd.SecurityAssessment PUBLIC

A. Vulnerability Categories

The following tables describe the vulnerability categories, severity levels, and difficulty levels used in this document. Vulnerability Categories Category Description

Access Controls Insufficient authorization or assessment of rights

Auditing and Logging Insufficient auditing of actions or logging of problems

Authentication Improper identification of users

Configuration Misconfigured servers, devices, or software components

Cryptography Breach of system confidentiality or integrity Data Exposure Exposure of sensitive information

Data Validation Improper reliance on the structure or values of data

Denial of Service A system failure with an availability impact

Error Reporting Insecure or insufficient reporting of error conditions

Patching Use of an outdated software package or library

Session Management Improper identification of authenticated users

Testing Insufficient test methodology or test coverage Timing Race conditions or other order-of-operations flaws Undefined Behavior Undefined behavior triggered within the system hashey 12PassAppLtd.SecurityAssessment PUBLIC

Severity Levels Severity Description

Informational The issue does not pose an immediate risk but is relevant to security best practices.

Undetermined The extent of the risk was not determined during this engagement.

Low The risk is small or is not one the client has indicated is important.

Medium User information is at risk; exploitation could pose reputational, legal, or moderate financial risks.

High The flaw could affect numerous users and have serious reputational, legal, or financial implications.

Difficulty Levels Difficulty Description

Undetermined The difficulty of exploitation was not determined during this engagement.

Low The flaw is well known; public tools for its exploitation exist or can be scripted.

Medium An attacker must write an exploit or will need in-depth knowledge of the system.

High An attacker must have privileged access to the system, may need to know

B. Code Maturity Categories

The following tables describe the code maturity categories and rating criteria used in this document.

Code Maturity Categories Category Description

Arithmetic The proper use of mathematical operations and semantics

Auditing The use of event auditing and logging to support monitoring Authentication/ Access Controls

The use of robust access controls to handle identification and

authorization and to ensure safe interactions with the system Complexity Management

The presence of clear structures designed to manage system complexity,

including the separation of system logic into clearly defined functions

Decentralization The presence of a decentralized governance structure for mitigating

insider threats and managing risks posed by contract upgrades

Documentation The presence of comprehensive and readable code-based documentation Low-Level Manipulation

The justified use of in-line assembly and low-level calls Testing and Verification

The presence of robust testing procedures (e.g., unit tests, integration

tests, and verification methods) and sufficient test coverage Transaction Ordering

The system's resistance to transaction-ordering attacks Rating Criteria Rating Description

Strong No issues were found, and the system exceeds industry standards.

Satisfactory Minor issues were found, but the system is compliant with best practices.

Moderate Some issues that may affect system safety were found.

Weak Many issues that affect system safety were found.

Missing Are required component missing, significantly affecting system safety. hashey

14PassAppLtd.SecurityAssessment PUBLIC

Not Applicable The category is not applicable to this review.

Not Considered The category was not considered in this review. Further Investigation Required

Further investigation is required to reach a meaningful conclusion. hashey 15PassAppLtd.SecurityAssessment

PUBLIC

C. Token Integration Checklist

The following checklist provides recommendations for interactions with arbitrary tokens.

Every unchecked item should be justified and its associated risks understood. For an up-to-date version of the checklist, see [crytic/building-secure-contracts](#).

For convenience, all Slither utilities can be run directly on a token address, such as the following: `slither-check-erc0xdac17f958d2ee523a2206206994597c13d831ec7TetherToken--ercerc20`

`slither-check-erc0x06012c8cf97BEaD5deAe237070F9587f8E7A266dKittyCore--ercerc721`

To follow this checklist, use the following output from Slither for the token: `slither-check-erc[target]`

`[contractName][optional:--ercERC_NUMBER] slither[target]--print human-summary slither[target]--`

`print contract-summary slither-prop.--contractContractName#requires configuration, and use of Echidna`

and Manticore General Considerations

☐ The contract has a security review. Avoid interacting with contracts that lack a

security review. Check the length of the assessment (i.e., the level of effort), the

reputation of the security firm, and the number and severity of the findings.

☐ You have contacted the developers. You may need to alert their team to an incident. Look for appropriate contact on

[blockchain-security-contacts](#).

☐ They have a security mailing list for critical announcements. Their team should

advise users when critical issues are found or when upgrades occur. Contract Composition

☐ The contract avoids unnecessary complexity. The tokens should be as simple

contract; a token with complex code requires a higher standard of review. Use Slither's `human-summary`

printer to identify complex code. ☐ The contract uses `SafeMath` or `Solidity0.8.0+`. Contracts that do not use

`SafeMath` require a higher standard of review. Inspect the contract by hand for `SafeMath /Solidity0.8.0+usage`.

☐ The contract has only a few non-token-related functions. Non-token-related

functions increase the likelihood of an issue in the contract. Use Slither's `contract-summary`

printer to broadly review the code used in the contract. hashey 16PassAppLtd.SecurityAssessment PUBLIC

☐ The token has only one address. Tokens with multiple entry points for balance

updates can break internal bookkeeping based on the address (e.g., `balances[token_address][msg.sender]`

may not reflect the actual balance). Owner Privileges

☐ The token is not upgradeable. Upgradeable contracts may change their rules over time. Use Slither's `human-`

`summary printer` to determine whether the contract is upgradeable.

☐ The owner has limited minting capabilities. Malicious or compromised owners

can misuse minting capabilities. Use Slither's `human-summary printer` to review

minting capabilities, and consider manually reviewing the code.

☐ The token is not pausable. Malicious or compromised owners can trap contracts

relying on pausable tokens. Identify pausable code by hand.

- ☐ The owner cannot deny list the contract. Malicious or compromised owners can trap contracts relying on tokens with a deny list. Identify deny listing features by hand.
- ☐ The team behind the token is known and can be held responsible for misuse.

Contracts with anonymous development teams or teams that reside in legal shelters require a higher standard of review. ERC-20 Tokens ERC-20 Conformity Checks Slither includes a utility, `slither-check-erc`, that reviews the conformance of a token to many related ERC standards. Use `slither-check-erc` to review the following:

- ☐ `Transfer` and `transferFrom` return a Boolean. Several tokens do not return a Boolean on these functions. As a result, their calls in the contract might fail.
- ☐ The `name`, `decimals`, and `symbol` functions are present if used. These functions are optional in the ERC-20 standard and may not be present.
- ☐ `Decimals` returns a `uint8`. Several tokens incorrectly return a `uint256`. In such cases, ensure that the value returned is less than 255.
- ☐ The token mitigates the known ERC-20 race condition. The ERC-20 standard has a known ERC-20 race condition that must be mitigated to prevent attackers from stealing tokens.

Slither includes a utility, `slither-prop`, that generates unit tests and security properties that can discover many common ERC flaws. Use `slither-prop` to review the following: `hashey 17 PassAppLtd.SecurityAssessment PUBLIC`

- ☐ The contract passes all unit tests and security properties from `slither-prop`.

Run the generated unit tests and then check the properties with Echidna and Manticore. Risks of ERC-20 Extensions

The behavior of certain contracts may differ from the original ERC specification. Conduct a manual review of the following conditions:

- ☐ The token is not an ERC-777 token and has no external function calls in `transfer` or `transferFrom`. External calls in the transfer functions can lead to reentrancies.
- ☐ `Transfer` and `transferFrom` should not take a fee. Deflationary tokens can lead to unexpected behavior.
- ☐ Potential interest earned from the token is accounted for. Some tokens distribute interest to token holders. This interest may be trapped in the contract if not accounted for.

Token Scarcity Reviews of token scarcity issues must be executed manually. Check for the following conditions:

- ☐ The supply is owned by more than a few users. If a few users own most of the tokens, they can influence operations based on the tokens' repartition.
- ☐ The total supply is sufficient. Tokens with a low total supply can be easily manipulated.
- ☐ The tokens are in more than a few exchanges. If all the tokens are in one exchange, a compromise of the exchange could compromise the contract relying on the token.
- ☐ Users understand the risks associated with a large amount of funds or flash loans. Contracts relying on the token balance must account for attackers with a large amount of funds or attack executed through flash loans.
- ☐ The token does not allow flash minting. Flash minting can lead to substantial swings in the balance and the total supply, which necessitate strict and comprehensive overflow checks in the operation of the token. `hashey 18 PassAppLtd.SecurityAssessment PUBLIC`

D. Incident Response Recommendations

This section provides recommendations on formulating an incident response plan.

- Identify the parties (either specific people or roles) responsible for implementing the mitigations when an issue occurs (e.g., deploying smart contracts, pausing contracts, upgrading the frontend, etc.).
- Document internal processes for addressing situations in which a deployed remedy does not work or introduces a new bug.
 - Consider documenting a plan of action for handling failed remediations.
 - Clearly describe the intended contract deployment process.
 - Outline the circumstances under which PassAppLtd. will compensate users affected by an issue (if any).
 - Issues that warrant compensation could include an individual or aggregate loss or loss resulting from user error, a contract flaw, or a third-party contract flaw.
 - Document how the team plans to stay up to date on new issues that could affect the system; awareness of such issues will inform future development work and help the team secure the deployment toolchain and the external on-chain and off-chain services that the system relies on.
 - Identify sources of vulnerability news for each language and component used in the system, and subscribe to updates from each source. Consider creating a private Discord channel in which a bot will post the latest vulnerability news; this will provide the team with a way to track all updates in one place.
 - Lastly, consider assigning certain team members to track news about vulnerabilities in specific system components.
 - Determine when the team will seek assistance from external parties (e.g., auditors, affected users, other protocol developers) and how it will onboard them.
 - Effective remediation of certain issues may require collaboration with external parties.
 - Define contract behavior that would be considered abnormal by off-chain monitoring solutions. `hashey 19 PassAppLtd.SecurityAssessment PUBLIC`

It is best practice to perform periodic dry runs of scenarios outlined in the incident response plan to find omissions and opportunities for improvement and to develop "muscle memory." Additionally, document the frequency with which the team should perform dry runs of various scenarios, and perform dry runs of more likely scenarios more regularly. Create a template to be filled out with descriptions of any necessary improvements after each dry run.

E. Security Best Practices for Using Multisignature Wallets

Consensus requirements for sensitive actions, such as spending funds from a wallet, are meant to mitigate the risks of the following:

- Anyone person overruling the judgment of others
- Failures caused by anyone person's mistake
- Failures caused by the compromise of anyone person's credentials

For example, in a 2-of-3 multisignature wallet, the authority to execute a "spend" transaction would require a consensus of two individuals in possession of two of the wallet's three private keys. For this model to be useful, the following conditions are required:

1. The private keys must be stored or held separately, and access to each one must be limited to a unique individual.
2. If the keys are physically held by third-party custodians (e.g., a bank), multiple keys should not be stored with the same custodian. (Doing so would violate requirement #1.)
3. The person asked to provide the second and final signature on a transaction (i.e., the cosigner) should refer to a pre-established policy specifying the conditions for approving the transaction by signing it with his or her key.
4. The cosigner should also verify that the half-signed transaction was generated willingly by the intended holder of the first signature's key.

Requirement #3 prevents the cosigner from becoming merely a "deputy" acting on behalf of the first signer (forfeiting the decision-making responsibility to the first signer and defeating these security models). If the cosigner can refuse to approve the transaction for any reason, the due-diligence conditions for approval may be unclear. That is why a policy for validating transactions is needed. A verification policy could include the following:

- A protocol for handling a request to cosign a transaction (e.g., a half-signed transaction will be accepted only via an approved channel)
- A list of specific addresses allowed to be the payee of a transaction
- A limit on the amount of funds spent in a single transaction or in a single day

Requirement #4 mitigates the risks associated with a single stolen key. For example, say that an attacker somehow acquired the unlocked Ledger Nano S of one of the signatories. A voice call from the cosigner to the initiating signatory to confirm the transaction would reveal that the key had been stolen and that the transaction should not be signed. If the signatory were under an active threat of violence, he or she could use a duress code (a codeword, a phrase, or another signal agreed upon in advance) to covertly alert the others that the transaction had not been initiated willingly, without alerting the attacker.

F. Upgradability Checks with Slither

Slither developed the `slither-check-upgradability` tool to aid in the development of secure proxies; it performs safety checks relevant to both upgradeable and immutable delegatecall proxies. Consider using this tool during the development of the PassApp contracts' codebase.

- Use `slither-check-upgradeability` to check for issues such as a corrupted storage layout between the previous and new implementations.

```
slither-check-upgradeability.ContractV1--new-contract-nameContractV2
```

Figure F.1: An example of how to use `slither-check-upgradeability`

For example, if a variable `a` is incorrectly added in the new implementation before other storage variables, `slither-check-upgradeability` will issue a warning like the one shown in figure F.2.

```
... INFO:Slither: Different variables between ContractV1 (contracts/versions/ContractV1.sol#9-54) and ContractV2 (contracts/versions/ContractV2.sol#11-133) ContractV1.__gap (contracts/versions/ContractV1.sol#15) ContractV2.a (contracts/versions/ContractV2.sol#20)
```

Reference: <https://github.com/crytic/slither/wiki/Upgradability-Checks#incorrect-variables-with-the-v2>

Figure F.2: Example `slither-check-upgradeability` output

- Use `slither-read-storage` with the new implementation to manually check that the expected storage layout matches the previous implementation. Running the command shown in figure F.3 for the previous and new implementations will list the storage locations for variables in both versions. Make sure that variables in the previous implementation have the same slot number in the upgraded version.

```
slither-read-storage.--contractContractV1--table
```

Figure F.3: An example of how to use `slither-read-storage`

- If gaps are used in parent contracts, check the storage layout with `slither-read-storage` after adding new functionality and decrease the gap size accordingly. Make sure that storage is not overwritten or shifted in child contracts.
- Simulate the upgrade with a local mainnet fork, verify that all storage variables have

6. FixReviewResults Whenundertakingafixreview,hasheyreviewsthefixesimplementedforissues identifiedintheoriginalreport.Thisworkinvolvesareviewofspecificareasofthesource codeandsystemconfiguration,notcomprehensiveanalysisofthesystem.

OnAugust21,2024,hasheyreviewedthefixesandmitigationsimplementedbythe PassAppLtd.teamfortheissuesidentifiedinthisreport.Wereviewedeachfixto determineitseffectivenessinresolvingtheassociatedissue.

Inadditiontofixingtheissuesmentionedinthisreport,theteamalsoupdatedandshared thedocumentationregardingthebackendanditsinteractionwiththevault,clarifyingthe actionsexecutedbythebackend.

Insummary,ofthesevenissuesdescribedinthisreport,PassAppLtd.hasresolvedsix issues,andhasnotresolvedtheremainingissue.Foradditionalinformation,pleaseseethe DetailedFixReviewResultsbelow. IDTitleStatus

1ValueissetforallcallstoRango,evenwhenswappingtokensResolved 2Thebackendcanbeevent-spammedResolved 3LackofeventemissionforERC20deposits/withdrawalsResolved 4Ethertransfersuselow-levelcallsResolved 5Swappercanfront-runtheupdateSwapperAddresscallUnresolved 6UnusedlibrariesintheprojectResolved 7Lackofatwo-stepprocessforownershiptransferResolved hashey 24PassAppLtd.SecurityAssessment PUBLIC

DetailedFixReviewResults TOB-PASS-1:ValueissetforallcallstoRango,evenwhenswappingtokens ResolvedinPR#20.ThecalltotheRangocontractisnowhandlledifferentlyforthenative assetandERC20token.Thevaluefieldissetonlyforthenativeasset.

NewunitandfuzzingtestshavebeenaddedtoensureRangoreceivesthecorrect parametersandassetsineachcase.

TOB-PASS-2:Thebackendcanbeevent-spammed

Resolved.Fromtheupdateddocumentation,thebackendchecksforallowlistedtoken balancesonlyonceadayanddoesnotlistenforevents,aspreviouslystated.Itisworth notingthatnochangesweremadetothecontractstoaddressthisissue,andthebackend isoutofscopeforthisaudit.

Theclientprovidedthefollowingcontextforthisfinding'sfixstatus:

Wehaveasysteminthebackendtochecktokenwhitelistingcriteria,includingtokens

supportedbyRango.Thischeckisperformedbeforecontractinteraction.Wedonot

listentoeventstocheckifthetokenissupportedbyRango.Hence,eveniftherearealot ofevent-

emittingtransactionsfromacheapernetnetwork,thebackendissafefrombeing overloadedwithrequests. TOB-PASS-

3:LackofeventemissionforERC20deposits/withdrawals

ResolvedinPR#21.TwoneweventswereaddedtotheVaultcontract: Erc20TokenWithdraw and Erc20TokenReceived .Existingevents havebeenrenamedto

matchthenamingconventions,andnewunittestshavebeenimplementedtocheckthe emissionofevents. TOB-PASS-

4:Ethertransfersuselow-levelcalls ResolvedinPR#22.Low-

levelnativeassettransfersandtheassociatedfailureeventhave beenreplacedby SafeTransferLib functions.

TOB-PASS-5:Swappercanfront-runtheupdateSwapperAddresscall

Unresolved.Theswapperisassumedtobefullytrusted,andnochangesweremadetothe contracts.

Theclientprovidedthefollowingcontextforthisfinding'sfixstatus:

Wetrusttheswappersmartaccount.Incaseswapperbecomesmalicious,wehavethe

provisiontochangeswapperaddressfromthemultisigowner. TOB-PASS-6:Unusedlibrariesintheproject

ResolvedinPR#24.Unusedlibrarymoduleshavebeenremoved. hashey 25PassAppLtd.SecurityAssessment PUBLIC

TOB-PASS-7:Lackofatwo-stepprocessforownershiptransfer ResolvedinPR#23.InheritancefromOpenZeppelin's Ownable2StepUpgradeable isnow usedforthevaultinsteadof OwnableUpgradeable .

Additionally,newunitandfuzztestsforthetwo-stepownershipchangehavebeenadded. hashey

26PassAppLtd.SecurityAssessment PUBLIC

H. FixReviewStatusCategories

Thefollowingtabledescribesthestatusesusedtoindicatewetheranissuehasbeensufficientlyaddressed.

FixStatus StatusDescription UndeterminedThestatusoftheissuewasnotdeterminedduringthisengagement.

UnresolvedTheissuepersistsandhasnotbeenresolved.

PartiallyResolvedTheissuepersistsbuthasbeenpartiallyresolved.

ResolvedTheissuehasbeensufficientlyresolved. hashey 27PassAppLtd.SecurityAssessment PUBLIC