



Clave Security Review

Pashov Audit Group

Conducted by: Said, ast3ros, pontifex

December 23th 2024 - December 26th 2024

Contents

1. About Pashov Audit Group	2
2. Disclaimer	2
3. Introduction	2
4. About Clave	2
5. Risk Classification	3
5.1. Impact	3
5.2. Likelihood	3
5.3. Action required for severity levels	4
6. Security Assessment Summary	4
7. Executive Summary	5
8. Findings	7
8.1. Medium Findings	7
[M-01] SessionKeyValidator is not working on ZkSync mainnet	7
[M-02] sessionCounter check not enforced when removing SessionKeyValidator	7
[M-03] SessionKeyValidator module cannot be removed properly	9
[M-04] validateFeeLimit does not properly limit the transaction fee	10
8.2. Low Findings	14
[L-01] Leaving transient storage slots with nonzero values	14
[L-02] sessionStatus and sessionState does not consider expiresAt	14
[L-03] Incorrect parameter extraction for dynamic types over 32 bytes	14
[L-04] Not restricting SessionKeyValidator as the transaction target	16

1. About Pashov Audit Group

Pashov Audit Group consists of multiple teams of some of the best smart contract security researchers in the space. Having a combined reported security vulnerabilities count of over 1000, the group strives to create the absolute very best audit journey possible - although 100% security can never be guaranteed, we do guarantee the best efforts of our experienced researchers for your blockchain protocol. Check our previous work [here](#) or reach out on Twitter [@pashovkrum](#).

2. Disclaimer

A smart contract security review can never verify the complete absence of vulnerabilities. This is a time, resource and expertise bound effort where we try to find as many vulnerabilities as possible. We can not guarantee 100% security after the review or even if the review will find any problems with your smart contracts. Subsequent security reviews, bug bounty programs and on-chain monitoring are strongly recommended.

3. Introduction

A time-boxed security review of the **Abstract-Foundation/clave-contracts** repository was done by **Pashov Audit Group**, with a focus on the security aspects of the application's smart contracts implementation.

4. About Clave

Clave is a self-custodial smart wallet built on ZKsync that allows users to manage their on-chain assets with account abstraction. It enables transactions with any token for gas fees, offers customizable user features like nicknames, and simplifies asset transfers through link-based sharing.

5. Risk Classification

Severity	Impact: High	Impact: Medium	Impact: Low
Likelihood: High	Critical	High	Medium
Likelihood: Medium	High	Medium	Low
Likelihood: Low	Medium	Low	Low

5.1. Impact

- High - leads to a significant material loss of assets in the protocol or significantly harms a group of users.
- Medium - only a small amount of funds can be lost (such as leakage of value) or a core functionality of the protocol is affected.
- Low - can lead to any kind of unexpected behavior with some of the protocol's functionalities that's not so critical.

5.2. Likelihood

- High - attack path is possible with reasonable assumptions that mimic on-chain conditions, and the cost of the attack is relatively low compared to the amount of funds that can be stolen or lost.
- Medium - only a conditionally incentivized attack vector, but still relatively likely.
- Low - has too many or too unlikely assumptions or requires a significant stake by the attacker with little or no incentive.

5.3. Action required for severity levels

- Critical - Must fix as soon as possible (if already deployed)
- High - Must fix (before deployment if not already deployed)
- Medium - Should fix
- Low - Could fix

6. Security Assessment Summary

review commit hash - 3e5cb6784ad067ecba23758aa39ab78468026f5d

fixes review commit hash - 1aba0968925632b57bccbfc07bc488687f3e8937

Scope

The following smart contracts were in scope of the audit:

- `ClaveImplementation`
- `BatchCaller`
- `TimestampAsserter`
- `TimestampAsserterLocator`
- `ClaveStorage`
- `Errors`
- `SessionLib`
- `ValidatorManager`
- `SessionKeyValidator`

7. Executive Summary

Over the course of the security review, Said, ast3ros, pontifex engaged with Clave to review Clave. In this period of time a total of **8** issues were uncovered.

Protocol Summary

Protocol Name	Clave
Repository	https://github.com/Abstract-Foundation/clave-contracts
Date	December 23th 2024 - December 26th 2024
Protocol Type	Account Abstraction Wallet

Findings Count

Severity	Amount
Medium	4
Low	4
Total Findings	8

Summary of Findings

ID	Title	Severity	Status
[<u>M-01</u>]	SessionKeyValidator is not working on ZkSync mainnet	Medium	Resolved
[<u>M-02</u>]	sessionCounter check not enforced when removing SessionKeyValidator	Medium	Resolved
[<u>M-03</u>]	SessionKeyValidator module cannot be removed properly	Medium	Resolved
[<u>M-04</u>]	validateFeeLimit does not properly limit the transaction fee	Medium	Resolved
[<u>L-01</u>]	Leaving transient storage slots with nonzero values	Low	Acknowledged
[<u>L-02</u>]	sessionStatus and sessionState does not consider expiresAt	Low	Resolved
[<u>L-03</u>]	Incorrect parameter extraction for dynamic types over 32 bytes	Low	Acknowledged
[<u>L-04</u>]	Not restricting SessionKeyValidator as the transaction target	Low	Resolved

8. Findings

8.1. Medium Findings

[M-01] `SessionKeyValidator` is not working on ZkSync mainnet

Severity

Impact: Low

Likelihood: High

Description

The `SessionKeyValidator` contract fails to function on ZkSync mainnet due to the `TimestampAsserterLocator.locate` function explicitly reverting on chainId `324` (ZkSync mainnet). This breaks all session key functionality for mainnet deployments.

```
function locate() internal view returns (ITimestampAsserter) {  
    ...  
    if (block.chainid == 324) { // @audit revert if the chain is ZkSync mainnet  
        revert("Timestamp asserter is not deployed on ZKsync mainnet yet");  
    }  
    ...  
}
```

Recommendations

Update the `TimestampAsserterLocator` with the mainnet address.

[M-02] `sessionCounter` check not enforced when removing `SessionKeyValidator`

Severity

Impact: Medium

Likelihood: Medium

Description

When users remove `SessionKeyValidator`, it will ensure that `sessionCounter` is 0 before triggering `removeModuleValidator` and `removeHook` to complete the module removal. The `sessionCounter` check is necessary to prevent the use of active session keys from the past if the module is installed again later.

```
function disable() external {
    if (_isInitialized(msg.sender)) {
        // Here we have to revoke all keys, so that if the module
        // is installed again later, there will be no active sessions from the
        // past.
        // Problem: if there are too many keys, this will run out of gas.
        // Solution: before uninstalling, require that all keys are revoked
        // manually.
    >>> require(sessionCounter[msg.sender] == 0, "Revoke all keys first");
        IValidatorManager(msg.sender).removeModuleValidator(address(this));
        IHookManager(msg.sender).removeHook(address(this), true);
    }
}
```

However, if `disable` is reverted due to the `sessionCounter` check, the module removal still succeeds because the success status of the `disable` call is not checked.

```
function _removeModule(address module) internal {
    _modulesLinkedList().remove(module);

    >>> (bool success, ) = module.excessivelySafeCall(
        gasleft(),
        0,
        0,
        abi.encodeWithSelector(IInitable.disable.selector)
    );
    (success); // silence unused local variable warning

    emit RemoveModule(module);
}
```

Recommendations

When removing a module, consider adding an option (additional param) to check if the `disable` call is successful. Alternatively, move the `sessionCounter[msg.sender] == 0` check to `init` instead.

[M-03] `SessionKeyValidator` module cannot be removed properly

Severity

Impact: Medium

Likelihood: Medium

Description

When the module is removed, `disable` will be called after the module has been removed from the registered list.

```
function _removeModule(address module) internal {
    _modulesLinkedList().remove(module);

>>>    (bool success, ) = module.excessivelySafeCall(
        gasleft(),
        0,
        0,
        abi.encodeWithSelector(IInitable.disable.selector)
    );
    (success); // silence unused local variable warning

    emit RemoveModule(module);
}
```

Inside `SessionKeyValidator`, it attempts to trigger `removeModuleValidator` and `removeHook`, which are restricted functions that can only be called via self-call or by registered modules.

```
function disable() external {
    if (!_isInitialized(msg.sender)) {
        // Here we have to revoke all keys, so that if the module
        // is installed again later, there will be no active sessions from the
        // past.
        // Problem: if there are too many keys, this will run out of gas.
        // Solution: before uninstalling, require that all keys are revoked
        // manually.
        require(sessionCounter[msg.sender] == 0, "Revoke all keys first");
>>>    IValidatorManager(msg.sender).removeModuleValidator(address(this));
>>>    IHookManager(msg.sender).removeHook(address(this), true);
    }
}
```

```
function removeModuleValidator(address validator) external onlySelfOrModule {
    _removeModuleValidator(validator);
}
```

```
function removeHook
  (address hook, bool isValidation) external override onlySelfOrModule {
    _removeHook(hook, isValidation);
  }
```

But since `SessionKeyValidator` is no longer registered as a module, the calls will silently fail, as `removeModule` doesn't enforce the `disable` call to succeed. This will wrongly give the impression to users that `SessionKeyValidator` is no longer registered as a hook and module validator.

Recommendations

Consider moving `disable` call before removing the module from the list.

[M-04] `validateFeeLimit` does not properly limit the transaction fee

Severity

Impact: Medium

Likelihood: Medium

Description

`validateFeeLimit` will be called within `SessionKeyValidator`'s `validationHook` to ensure that the caller's provided `maxFeePerGas` and `gasLimit` is within the usage limit.

```

function validationHook(
    bytes32signedHash,
    Transactioncalldataatransaction,
    bytescalldatahookData
) external {
    if (hookData.length == 0) {
        // There's no session data so we aren't validating anything
        return;
    }
    (bytes memory signature, address validator, ) = abi.decode(
        (transaction.signature, (bytes, address, bytes[])));
    if (validator != address(this)) {
        // This transaction is not meant to be validated by this module
        return;
    }
    (
        SessionLib.SessionSpecmemoryspec,
        uint64[]memoryperiodIds
    ) = abi.decode(
        hookData,
        (SessionLib.SessionSpec, uint64[]))
    );
    require(spec.signer != address(0), "Invalid signer (empty)");
    bytes32 sessionHash = keccak256(abi.encode(spec));
    // this generally throws instead of returning false
    sessions[sessionHash].validate(transaction, spec, periodIds);
    (
        addressrecoveredAddress,
        ECDSA.RecoverErrorrecoverError,
    ) = ECDSA.tryRecover(signedHash, signature
    if
        (recoverError != ECDSA.RecoverError.NoError || recoveredAddress == address(0)) {
            return;
        }
    require(recoveredAddress == spec.signer, "Invalid signer (mismatch)");
    // This check is separate and performed last to prevent gas estimation
    // failures
    >>> sessions[sessionHash].validateFeeLimit(transaction, spec, periodIds[0]);

    // Set the validation result to 1 for this hash, so that isValidSignature
    // succeeds
    uint256 slot = uint256(signedHash);
    assembly {
        tstore(slot, 1)
    }
}

```

However, `validateFeeLimit` incorrectly checks the fee when `paymaster` is configured, instead of when it is not.

```

function validateFeeLimit(
    SessionStorage storage state,
    Transaction calldata transaction,
    SessionSpec memory spec,
    uint64 periodId
) internal {
    // This is split from `validate` to prevent gas estimation failures.
    // When this check was part of `validate`, gas estimation could fail due to
    // fee limit being smaller than the upper bound of the gas estimation binary
    // search.
    // By splitting this check, we can now have this order of operations in
    // `validateTransaction`:
    // 1. session.validate()
    // 2. ECDSA.tryRecover()
    // 3. session.validateFeeLimit()
    // This way, gas estimation will exit on step 2 instead of failing, but will
    // still run through
    // most of the computation needed to validate the session.

    // TODO: update fee allowance with the gasleft/refund at the end of
    // execution
    >>> if (transaction.paymaster != 0) {
        // If a paymaster is paying the fee, we don't need to check the fee limit
        uint256 fee = transaction.maxFeePerGas * transaction.gasLimit;
        spec.feeLimit.checkAndUpdate(state.fee, fee, periodId);
    }
}

```

This will cause the fee limit to not work properly, requiring the session key caller to provide a fee without any limit.

Recommendations

Update the `checkAndUpdate` condition to the following:

```

```solidity
function validateFeeLimit(
 SessionStorage storage state,
 Transaction calldata transaction,
 SessionSpec memory spec,
 uint64 periodId
) internal {
 // This is split from `validate` to prevent gas estimation failures.
 // When this check was part of `validate`, gas estimation could fail due to
 // fee limit being smaller than the upper bound of the gas estimation binary
 // search.
 // By splitting this check, we can now have this order of operations in
 // `validateTransaction`:
 // 1. session.validate()
 // 2. ECDSA.tryRecover()
 // 3. session.validateFeeLimit()
 // This way, gas estimation will exit on step 2 instead of failing, but will
 // still run through
 // most of the computation needed to validate the session.

 // TODO: update fee allowance with the gasleft/refund at the end of
 // execution
- if (transaction.paymaster != 0) {
+ if (transaction.paymaster == 0) {
 // If a paymaster is paying the fee, we don't need to check the fee limit
 uint256 fee = transaction.maxFeePerGas * transaction.gasLimit;
 spec.feeLimit.checkAndUpdate(state.fee, fee, periodId);
 }
}

```

## 8.2. Low Findings

### [L-01] Leaving transient storage slots with nonzero values

---

The Security considerations from the EIP-1153 standard do not recommend leaving nonzero values in transient storage slots (<https://eips.ethereum.org/EIPS/eip-1153#security-considerations>).

```
function handleValidation
 (bytes32 signedHash, bytes memory signature) external view returns (bool) {
 // This only succeeds if the validationHook has previously succeeded for
 // this hash.
 uint256 slot = uint256(signedHash);
 uint256 hookResult;
 assembly {
 >> hookResult := tload(slot)
 }
 require(
 hookResult==1,
 "Can't call this function without calling validationHook"
);
 return true;
}
```

### [L-02] `sessionStatus` and `sessionState` does not consider `expiresAt`

---

When `sessionStatus` and `sessionState` are called by the user to get the provided session key status, it will return `Active`, even if the session has already expired. This returned value could mislead users, implying that the session key can still be used. Consider adding an additional state (e.g., `Expired`), or returning `Closed` if the session has already expired.

### [L-03] Incorrect parameter extraction for dynamic types over 32 bytes

---

The `checkAndUpdate` function incorrectly extracts calldata parameters when handling dynamic types larger than 32 bytes. The function assumes all parameters can be extracted using a fixed 32-byte offset, but this fails for dynamic types that use a more complex encoding scheme.

```
function checkAndUpdate(
 Constraint memory constraint,
 UsageTracker storage tracker,
 bytes calldata data,
 uint64 period
) internal {
 uint256 index = 4 + constraint.index * 32;
 bytes32 param = bytes32
 /*(data[index:index + 32]); // @audit Incorrect assumption that parameter can be e
 Condition condition = constraint.condition;
 bytes32 refValue = constraint.refValue;

 ...
}
```

Let's consider the following example:

This is the function signature:

```
contract Example {
 function exampleFunction
 (string memory text, uint256[] memory numbers) external {}
}
```

There are two cases:

1. First case when the text is less than 32 bytes - hello word is included in 32-byte word.

Input: `hello`, `[1,2,3]`

[illegible]



2. Second case when the text is more than 32 bytes - The data spans multiple 32-byte words.

Input:

[illegible][illegible]

In the second case, the text cannot be extracted correctly using one index like in `checkAndUpdate` function. It leads to misinterpretation of the actual parameter values with the following impact:

- Session key constraints can be bypassed
- Functions with dynamic parameters become unusable with session keys when constraints are set on the dynamic parameters.

Handle the dynamic types correctly in the `checkAndUpdate` function using multiple 32-byte words.

## [L-04] Not restricting `SessionKeyValidator` as the transaction target

Within `SessionLib.validate`, it checks `transaction.to` to ensure it is not set to `msg.sender`, preventing callers from abusing session keys to administer the smart account. However, it allows `transaction.to` to be set to `SessionKeyValidator`, which could enable callers to create additional session keys with unrestricted calls if allowed.

```

function validate(
 SessionStorage storage state,
 Transaction calldata transaction,
 SessionSpec memory spec,
 uint64[] memory periodIds
) internal {
 // Here we additionally pass uint64[] periodId to check allowance limits

 // periodIds[0] is for fee limit,
 // periodIds[1] is for value limit,
 // periodIds[2:] are for call constraints, if there are any.
 // It is required to pass them in
 //(instead of computing via block.timestamp) since during validation
 // we can only assert the range of the timestamp, but not access its value.

 require(state.status[msg.sender] == Status.Active, "Session is not active");
 TimestampAsserterLocator.locate().assertTimestampInRange(0, spec.expiresAt);

 address target = address(uint160(transaction.to));

 if (transaction.paymasterInput.length >= 4) {
 bytes4 paymasterInputSelector = bytes4(transaction.paymasterInput[0:4]);
 require(
 paymasterInputSelector != IPaymasterFlow.approvalBased.selector,
 "Approval based paymaster flow not allowed"
);
 }

 if (transaction.data.length >= 4) {
 // Disallow self-targeting transactions with session keys as these have
 // the ability to administer
 // the smart account.
 >>> require(address(uint160
 (transaction.to)) != msg.sender, "Can not target self");

 // ...
 }
}

```

Consider reverting if `transaction.to` is set to the `SessionKeyValidator` address.