


SMART CONTRACT CODE REVIEW AND SECURITY ANALYSIS REPORT



Customer: AAG Ventures

Date: November 23rd, 2021



This document may contain confidential information about IT systems and the intellectual property of the Customer as well as information about potential vulnerabilities and methods of their exploitation.

The report containing confidential information can be used internally by the Customer, or it can be disclosed publicly after all vulnerabilities are fixed — upon a decision of the Customer.

Document

Name	Smart Contract Code Review and Security Analysis Report for AAG		
Name			
	Ventures.		
Approved by	Andrew Matiukhin CTO Hacken OU		
Туре	ERC20 token; Vesting		
Platform	Ethereum / Solidity		
Methods	Architecture Review, Functional Testing, Computer-Aided		
	Verification, Manual Review		
Repository	https://github.com/AAG-Ventures/aag-token		
Commit	47db025234789efd1a4a79b0db3c6d5278dcfdfc		
Technical	YES		
Documentation			
JS tests	YES		
Website	aag.ventures		
Timeline	09 NOVEMBER 2021 - 23 NOVEMBER 2021		
Changelog	12 NOVEMBER 2021 - INITIAL AUDIT		
<u> </u>	23 NOVEMBER 2021 - Second Review		






Table of contents

Introduction	
Scope	4
Executive Summary	5
Severity Definitions	6
Audit overview	7
Conclusion	9
Disclaimers	10



Introduction

Hacken OÜ (Consultant) was contracted by AAG Ventures (Customer) to conduct a Smart Contract Code Review and Security Analysis. This report presents the findings of the security assessment of the Customer's smart contract and its code review conducted between November 9^{th} , 2021 - November 12^{th} , 2021.

The second review conducted on November 23rd, 2021.

Scope

The scope of the project is smart contracts in the repository:

Repository:

https://github.com/AAG-Ventures/aag-token

Commit:

47db025234789efd1a4a79b0db3c6d5278dcfdfc

Technical Documentation: Yes,

https://litepaper.aag.ventures/litepaper/tokenomics

JS tests: Yes, in the repository

Contracts:

AAGToken.sol

AAGVestingContract.sol

We have scanned this smart contract for commonly known and more specific vulnerabilities. Here are some of the commonly known vulnerabilities that are considered:

Category	Check Item
Code review	Reentrancy
	Ownership Takeover
	Timestamp Dependence
	Gas Limit and Loops
	DoS with (Unexpected) Throw
	DoS with Block Gas Limit
	 Transaction-Ordering Dependence
	Style guide violation
	Costly Loop
	ERC20 API violation
	Unchecked external call
	Unchecked math
	Unsafe type inference
	Implicit visibility level
	Deployment Consistency
	Repository Consistency
	Data Consistency



Functional	review

- Business Logics Review
- Functionality Checks
- Access Control & Authorization
- Escrow manipulation
- Token Supply manipulation
- Assets integrity
- User Balances manipulation
- Data Consistency manipulation
- Kill-Switch Mechanism
- Operation Trails & Event Generation

Executive Summary

According to the assessment, the Customer's smart contracts are well-secured.

Insecure	Poor secured	Secured	Well-secured
		You are here	

Our team performed an analysis of code functionality, manual audit, and automated checks with Mythril and Slither. All issues found during automated analysis were manually reviewed, and important vulnerabilities are presented in the Audit overview section. All found issues can be found in the Audit overview section.

As a result of the audit, security engineers found 4 low severity issues.

After the second review security engineers found that **all** issues were fixed.



Severity Definitions

Risk Level	Description
Critical	Critical vulnerabilities are usually straightforward to exploit and can lead to assets loss or data manipulations.
High	High-level vulnerabilities are difficult to exploit; however, they also have a significant impact on smart contract execution, e.g., public access to crucial functions
Medium	Medium-level vulnerabilities are important to fix; however, they can't lead to assets loss or data manipulations.
Low	Low-level vulnerabilities are mostly related to outdated, unused, etc. code snippets that can't have a significant impact on execution



Audit overview

■ ■ ■ Critical

No critical issues were found.

High

No high severity issues were found.

■ ■ Medium

No medium severity issues were found.

Low

1. Code and documentation divergency

Token allocation in code/documentation is slightly different(e.g. 43%/41% for Community & Ecosystem, 1%/3% for Liquidity etc.)

Contracts: AAGToken.sol

Recommendation: Update code or documentation.

Status: fixed

2. A function could become unreliable

When the token will be available on the market, any malicious user that obtains any amount of them could call *createVestingSchedule* method to create a schedule record for any address and effectively block valid schedule creation for this address in the future. Only if **all** records will be created **before** the availability of tokens, this is not an issue.

Contracts: AAGVestingContract.sol

Functions: createVestingSchedule

Recommendation: Add onlyOwner modifier.

Status: fixed

3. State variables that could be declared constant

Constant state variables should be declared constant to save gas.

Contracts: AAGToken.sol

Variables: vestingContractAddress, _name, _symbol

Recommendation: Add the constant attributes to state variables that

never change.

Status: fixed



4. A public function that could be declared external.

public functions that are never called by the contract should be declared external to save gas.

Contracts: AAGVestingContract.sol

Functions: createVestingSchedule, cancelVestingForBeneficiary,

emergencyWithdrawAllTokens

Recommendation: Use the external attribute for functions never called

from the contract.

Status: fixed



Conclusion

Smart contracts within the scope were manually reviewed and analyzed with static analysis tools.

The audit report contains all found security vulnerabilities and other issues in the reviewed code.

As a result of the audit, security engineers found 4 low severity issues.

After the second review security engineers found that **all** issues were fixed.



Disclaimers

Hacken Disclaimer

The smart contracts given for audit have been analyzed in accordance with the best industry practices at the date of this report, in relation to cybersecurity vulnerabilities and issues in smart contract source code, the details of which are disclosed in this report (Source Code); the Source Code compilation, deployment, and functionality (performing the intended functions).

The audit makes no statements or warranties on the security of the code. It also cannot be considered as a sufficient assessment regarding the utility and safety of the code, bug-free status, or any other statements of the contract. While we have done our best in conducting the analysis and producing this report, it is important to note that you should not rely on this report only — we recommend proceeding with several independent audits and a public bug bounty program to ensure the security of smart contracts.

Technical Disclaimer

Smart contracts are deployed and executed on a blockchain platform. The platform, its programming language, and other software related to the smart contract can have vulnerabilities that can lead to hacks. Thus, the audit can't guarantee the explicit security of the audited smart contracts.