



SMART CONTRACT AUDIT REPORT

for

Aladdin DAO Concentrator



Prepared By: Patrick Lou

PeckShield
April 2, 2022

Document Properties

Client	AladdinDAO
Title	Smart Contract Audit Report
Target	Concentrator
Version	1.0
Author	Xuxian Jiang
Auditors	Jing Wang, Shulin Bie, Xuxian Jiang
Reviewed by	Patrick Lou
Approved by	Xuxian Jiang
Classification	Public

Version Info

Version	Date	Author(s)	Description
1.0	April 2, 2022	Xuxian Jiang	Final Release
1.0-rc1	April 1, 2022	Xuxian Jiang	Release Candidate #1

Contact

For more information about this document and its contents, please contact PeckShield Inc.

Name	Patrick Lou
Phone	+86 183 5897 7782
Email	contact@peckshield.com

Contents

1	Introduction	4
1.1	About AladdinDAO Concentrator	4
1.2	About PeckShield	5
1.3	Methodology	5
1.4	Disclaimer	7
2	Findings	9
2.1	Summary	9
2.2	Key Findings	10
3	Detailed Results	11
3.1	Possible Costly LPs From Improper AladdinCRV Initialization	11
3.2	Trust Issue of Admin Keys	13
4	Conclusion	15
	References	16



1 | Introduction

Given the opportunity to review the design document and related smart contract source code of the Aladdin DAO Concentrator protocol, we outline in the report our systematic approach to evaluate potential security issues in the smart contract implementation, expose possible semantic inconsistencies between smart contract code and design document, and provide additional suggestions or recommendations for improvement. Our results show that the given version of smart contracts can be further improved due to the presence of several issues related to either security or performance. This document outlines our audit results.

1.1 About AladdinDAO Concentrator

AladdinDAO is a decentralized asset management protocol which shifts crypto investment from venture capitalists to wisdom of crowd. AladdinDAO aims to be the liquidity gateway for DeFi world by identifying and providing liquidity support to the most promising DeFi projects, and benefiting Aladdin and DeFi community from enjoying the fast growth and returns from selected projects. The audited Concentrator is a yield enhancement product built for smart farmers who wish to use their Convex LP assets to farm top-tier DeFi tokens (CRV, CVX) at the highest APY possible. The basic information of the audited protocol is as follows:

Table 1.1: Basic Information of The Aladdin DAO Concentrator Protocol

Item	Description
Issuer	AladdinDAO
Website	https://concentrator.aladdin.club/
Type	Ethereum Smart Contract
Platform	Solidity
Audit Method	Whitebox
Latest Audit Report	April 2, 2022

In the following, we show the Git repository of reviewed files and the commit hash value used in

this audit.

- <https://github.com/AladdinDAO/aladdin-v3-contracts.git> (94170cb)

1.2 About PeckShield

PeckShield Inc. [7] is a leading blockchain security company with the goal of elevating the security, privacy, and usability of current blockchain ecosystems by offering top-notch, industry-leading services and products (including the service of smart contract auditing). We are reachable at Telegram (<https://t.me/peckshield>), Twitter (<http://twitter.com/peckshield>), or Email (contact@peckshield.com).

Table 1.2: Vulnerability Severity Classification

Impact	High	Critical	High	Medium
	Medium	High	Medium	Low
	Low	Medium	Low	Low
		High	Medium	Low
		Likelihood		

1.3 Methodology

To standardize the evaluation, we define the following terminology based on OWASP Risk Rating Methodology [6]:

- Likelihood represents how likely a particular vulnerability is to be uncovered and exploited in the wild;
- Impact measures the technical loss and business damage of a successful attack;
- Severity demonstrates the overall criticality of the risk.

Likelihood and impact are categorized into three ratings: *H*, *M* and *L*, i.e., *high*, *medium* and *low* respectively. Severity is determined by likelihood and impact and can be classified into four categories accordingly, i.e., *Critical*, *High*, *Medium*, *Low* shown in Table 1.2.

To evaluate the risk, we go through a list of check items and each would be labeled with a severity category. For one check item, if our tool or analysis does not identify any issue, the

Table 1.3: The Full List of Check Items

Category	Check Item
Basic Coding Bugs	Constructor Mismatch
	Ownership Takeover
	Redundant Fallback Function
	Overflows & Underflows
	Reentrancy
	Money-Giving Bug
	Blackhole
	Unauthorized Self-Destruct
	Revert DoS
	Unchecked External Call
	Gasless Send
	Send Instead Of Transfer
	Costly Loop
	(Unsafe) Use Of Untrusted Libraries
	(Unsafe) Use Of Predictable Variables
	Transaction Ordering Dependence
Deprecated Uses	
Semantic Consistency Checks	Semantic Consistency Checks
Advanced DeFi Scrutiny	Business Logics Review
	Functionality Checks
	Authentication Management
	Access Control & Authorization
	Oracle Security
	Digital Asset Escrow
	Kill-Switch Mechanism
	Operation Trails & Event Generation
	ERC20 Idiosyncrasies Handling
	Frontend-Contract Integration
	Deployment Consistency
	Holistic Risk Management
Additional Recommendations	Avoiding Use of Variadic Byte Array
	Using Fixed Compiler Version
	Making Visibility Level Explicit
	Making Type Inference Explicit
	Adhering To Function Declaration Strictly
Following Other Best Practices	

contract is considered safe regarding the check item. For any discovered issue, we might further deploy contracts on our private testnet and run tests to confirm the findings. If necessary, we would additionally build a PoC to demonstrate the possibility of exploitation. The concrete list of check items is shown in Table 1.3.

In particular, we perform the audit according to the following procedure:

- Basic Coding Bugs: We first statically analyze given smart contracts with our proprietary static code analyzer for known coding bugs, and then manually verify (reject or confirm) all the issues found by our tool.
- Semantic Consistency Checks: We then manually check the logic of implemented smart contracts and compare with the description in the white paper.
- Advanced DeFi Scrutiny: We further review business logics, examine system operations, and place DeFi-related aspects under scrutiny to uncover possible pitfalls and/or bugs.
- Additional Recommendations: We also provide additional suggestions regarding the coding and development of smart contracts from the perspective of proven programming practices.

To better describe each issue we identified, we categorize the findings with Common Weakness Enumeration (CWE-699) [5], which is a community-developed list of software weakness types to better delineate and organize weaknesses around concepts frequently encountered in software development. Though some categories used in CWE-699 may not be relevant in smart contracts, we use the CWE categories in Table 1.4 to classify our findings.

1.4 Disclaimer

Note that this security audit is not designed to replace functional tests required before any software release, and does not give any warranties on finding all possible security issues of the given smart contract(s) or blockchain software, i.e., the evaluation result does not guarantee the nonexistence of any further findings of security issues. As one audit-based assessment cannot be considered comprehensive, we always recommend proceeding with several independent audits and a public bug bounty program to ensure the security of smart contract(s). Last but not least, this security audit should not be used as investment advice.



Table 1.4: Common Weakness Enumeration (CWE) Classifications Used in This Audit

Category	Summary
Configuration	Weaknesses in this category are typically introduced during the configuration of the software.
Data Processing Issues	Weaknesses in this category are typically found in functionality that processes data.
Numeric Errors	Weaknesses in this category are related to improper calculation or conversion of numbers.
Security Features	Weaknesses in this category are concerned with topics like authentication, access control, confidentiality, cryptography, and privilege management. (Software security is not security software.)
Time and State	Weaknesses in this category are related to the improper management of time and state in an environment that supports simultaneous or near-simultaneous computation by multiple systems, processes, or threads.
Error Conditions, Return Values, Status Codes	Weaknesses in this category include weaknesses that occur if a function does not generate the correct return/status code, or if the application does not handle all possible return/status codes that could be generated by a function.
Resource Management	Weaknesses in this category are related to improper management of system resources.
Behavioral Issues	Weaknesses in this category are related to unexpected behaviors from code that an application uses.
Business Logics	Weaknesses in this category identify some of the underlying problems that commonly allow attackers to manipulate the business logic of an application. Errors in business logic can be devastating to an entire application.
Initialization and Cleanup	Weaknesses in this category occur in behaviors that are used for initialization and breakdown.
Arguments and Parameters	Weaknesses in this category are related to improper use of arguments or parameters within function calls.
Expression Issues	Weaknesses in this category are related to incorrectly written expressions within code.
Coding Practices	Weaknesses in this category are related to coding practices that are deemed unsafe and increase the chances that an exploitable vulnerability will be present in the application. They may not directly introduce a vulnerability, but indicate the product has not been carefully developed or maintained.

2 | Findings

2.1 Summary

Here is a summary of our findings after analyzing the design and implementation of the `Aladdin DAO Concentrator` protocol. During the first phase of our audit, we study the smart contract source code and run our in-house static code analyzer through the codebase. The purpose here is to statically identify known coding bugs, and then manually verify (reject or confirm) issues reported by our tool. We further manually review business logics, examine system operations, and place DeFi-related aspects under scrutiny to uncover possible pitfalls and/or bugs.

Severity	# of Findings	
Critical	0	
High	0	
Medium	1	
Low	1	
Informational	0	
Total	2	

We have so far identified a list of potential issues: some of them involve subtle corner cases that might not be previously thought of, while others refer to unusual interactions among multiple contracts. For each uncovered issue, we have therefore developed test cases for reasoning, reproduction, and/or verification. After further analysis and internal discussion, we determined a few issues of varying severities that need to be brought up and paid more attention to, which are categorized in the above table. More information can be found in the next subsection, and the detailed discussions of each of them are in [Section 3](#).

2.2 Key Findings

Overall, these smart contracts are well-designed and engineered, though the implementation can be improved by resolving the identified issues (shown in Table 2.1), including 1 medium-severity vulnerability and 1 low-severity vulnerability.

Table 2.1: Key Concentrator Audit Findings

ID	Severity	Title	Category	Status
PVE-001	Low	Possible Costly LPs From Improper AladdinCRV Initialization	Time and State	Resolved
PVE-002	Medium	Trust on Admin Keys	Security Features	Mitigated

Besides recommending specific countermeasures to mitigate these issues, we also emphasize that it is always important to develop necessary risk-control mechanisms and make contingency plans, which may need to be exercised before the mainnet deployment. The risk-control mechanisms need to kick in at the very moment when the contracts are being deployed in mainnet. Please refer to Section 3 for details.



3 | Detailed Results

3.1 Possible Costly LPs From Improper AladdinCRV Initialization

- ID: PVE-001
- Severity: Low
- Likelihood: Low
- Impact: Medium
- Target: AladdinCRV
- Category: Time and State [4]
- CWE subcategory: CWE-362 [2]

Description

The Aladdin DAO Concentrator protocol allows users to deposit supported assets and get in return the share to represent the pool ownership. While examining the share calculation with the given deposits, we notice an issue that may unnecessarily make the pool share extremely expensive and bring hurdles (or even causes loss) for later depositors.

To elaborate, we show below the `_deposit()` routine. This routine is used for participating users to deposit the supported assets and get respective pool shares in return. The issue occurs when the pool is being initialized under the assumption that the current pool is empty.

```
260 function _deposit(address _recipient, uint256 _amount) internal returns (uint256) {
261     require(_amount > 0, "AladdinCRV: zero amount deposit");
262     uint256 _underlying = totalUnderlying();
263     uint256 _totalSupply = totalSupply();
264
265     IERC20Upgradeable(CVXCRV).safeApprove(CVXCRV_STAKING, 0);
266     IERC20Upgradeable(CVXCRV).safeApprove(CVXCRV_STAKING, _amount);
267     IConvexBasicRewards(CVXCRV_STAKING).stake(_amount);
268
269     uint256 _shares;
270     if (_totalSupply == 0) {
271         _shares = _amount;
272     } else {
273         _shares = _amount.mul(_totalSupply) / _underlying;
```

```
274     }
275     _mint(_recipient, _shares);
276
277     emit Deposit(msg.sender, _recipient, _amount);
278     return _shares;
279 }
```

Listing 3.1: AladdinCRV::_deposit()

Specifically, when the pool is being initialized (line 270), the share value directly takes the value of `_amount` (line 271), which is manipulatable by the malicious actor. As this is the first deposit, the current total supply equals the calculated `_shares = _amount = 1 WEI`. With that, the actor can further deposit a huge amount of the underlying assets with the goal of making the pool share extremely expensive.

An extremely expensive pool share can be very inconvenient to use as a small number of 1 Wei may denote a large value. Furthermore, it can lead to precision issue in truncating the computed pool tokens for deposited assets. If truncated to be zero, the deposited assets are essentially considered dust and kept by the pool without returning any pool tokens.

This is a known issue that has been mitigated in popular `Uniswap`. When providing the initial liquidity to the contract (i.e. when `totalSupply` is 0), the liquidity provider must sacrifice 1000 LP tokens (by sending them to `address(0)`). By doing so, we can ensure the granularity of the LP tokens is always at least 1000 and the malicious actor is not the sole holder. This approach may bring an additional cost for the initial liquidity provider, but this cost is expected to be low and acceptable.

Recommendation Revise current execution logic of `deposit()` to defensively calculate the share amount when the pool is being initialized. An alternative solution is to ensure a guarded launch process that safeguards the first deposit to avoid being manipulated.

Status The issue has been resolved as the protocol has been successfully deployed by properly following a guarded launch process.

3.2 Trust Issue of Admin Keys

- ID: PVE-002
- Severity: Medium
- Likelihood: Medium
- Impact: Medium
- Target: Multiple Contracts
- Category: Security Features [3]
- CWE subcategory: CWE-287 [1]

Description

In the Aladdin DAO Concentrator protocol, there is a special administrative account, i.e., `owner`. This `owner` account plays a critical role in governing and regulating the system-wide operations (e.g., zap adjustment and parameter setting). It also has the privilege to control or govern the flow of assets for token conversion. In the following, we examine the privileged account and their related privileged accesses in current contracts.

```

228  /// @dev Update the recipient
229  function updatePlatform(address _platform) external onlyOwner {
230      require(_platform != address(0), "AladdinCRV: zero platform address");
231      platform = _platform;

233      emit UpdatePlatform(_platform);
234  }

236  /// @dev Update the zap contract
237  function updateZap(address _zap) external onlyOwner {
238      require(_zap != address(0), "AladdinCRV: zero zap address");
239      zap = _zap;

241      emit UpdateZap(_zap);
242  }

244  /// @dev Claim EPS airdrop, only used in BSC.
245  function claimEPS(
246      address _distributor,
247      address _recipient,
248      uint256 merkleIndex,
249      uint256 index,
250      uint256 amount,
251      bytes32[] calldata merkleProof
252  ) external onlyOwner {
253      address eps = 0xA7f552078dcC247C2684336020c03648500C6d9F;
254      IEllipsisMerkleDistributor(_distributor).claim(merkleIndex, index, amount,
255          merkleProof);
256      IERC20Upgradeable(eps).safeTransfer(_recipient, IERC20Upgradeable(eps).balanceOf(
257          address(this)));

```

Listing 3.2: Example Privileged Operations in AladdinCRV

We understand the need of the privileged functions for proper contract operations, but at the same time the extra power to these privileged accounts may also be a counter-party risk to the contract users. Therefore, we list this concern as an issue here from the audit perspective and highly recommend making these privileges explicit or raising necessary awareness among protocol users.

Recommendation Promptly transfer the privileged account to the intended DAO-like governance contract. All changes to privileged operations may need to be mediated with necessary timelocks. Eventually, activate the normal on-chain community-based governance life-cycle and ensure the intended trustless nature and high-quality distributed governance.

Status The issue has been confirmed by the team. The team clarifies that the admin key is Gnosis Safe multi-sig (6/9) contract.



4 | Conclusion

In this audit, we have analyzed the design and implementation of the Aladdin DAO Concentrator protocol. The audited Concentrator is a yield enhancement product built for smart farmers who wish to use their Convex LP assets to farm top-tier DeFi tokens (CRV, CVX) at the highest APY possible. The current code base is clearly organized and those identified issues are promptly confirmed and fixed.

Meanwhile, we need to emphasize that Solidity-based smart contracts as a whole are still in an early, but exciting stage of development. To improve this report, we greatly appreciate any constructive feedbacks or suggestions, on our methodology, audit findings, or potential gaps in scope/coverage.



References

- [1] MITRE. CWE-287: Improper Authentication. <https://cwe.mitre.org/data/definitions/287.html>.
- [2] MITRE. CWE-362: Concurrent Execution using Shared Resource with Improper Synchronization ('Race Condition'). <https://cwe.mitre.org/data/definitions/362.html>.
- [3] MITRE. CWE CATEGORY: 7PK - Security Features. <https://cwe.mitre.org/data/definitions/254.html>.
- [4] MITRE. CWE CATEGORY: 7PK - Time and State. <https://cwe.mitre.org/data/definitions/361.html>.
- [5] MITRE. CWE VIEW: Development Concepts. <https://cwe.mitre.org/data/definitions/699.html>.
- [6] OWASP. Risk Rating Methodology. https://www.owasp.org/index.php/OWASP_Risk_Rating_Methodology.
- [7] PeckShield. PeckShield Inc. <https://www.peckshield.com>.