How has the community dealt with MEV?

Systematization of Value Extraction

- Assume that extraction is inevitable as validators are rational agents
- But some validators have more capability than others
- Systematically give every validator access to the most profitable block *possible*
- Proposer Builder Separation (PBS)
- Often the profits to validators come at the expense of ordinary users, leaving ordinary users vulnerable to systematic extraction

Systematization of Value Extraction



Systematization of Value Extraction

- Widespread in industry
- Validation of the rational model



Fair Ordering

- Temporal Fair Ordering
 - (Receive Order Fairness) "If sufficiently many (at least γ -fraction) nodes receive a transaction tx1 before another transaction tx2, then all honest nodes must output tx1 before tx2" [KZGJ20]
- Blind Ordering
 - Ordering policy does not consider transaction contents (except transaction fees). Can be enforced through threshold encryption, Trusted Execution Environments (TEEs)
- A large body of *academic* literature
- Protection for users
- Why would a rational validator opt in, unless protocol is revamped?



Externality: Latency racing for the top of the block

A practical question

Can users get protection against the most pernicious forms of MEV while accounting for rational validators?



PROF: <u>Protected Order Flow</u> in a Profit-Seeking World

PROF Mechanism

Simple

Backward Compatible

Protects Users without service degradation

Accounts for Rational Validators

PROF Design Summary



Validator's perspective





Which block does the validator choose?



Block *B* Reward *R* Block B^* Reward $R^* = R + \varepsilon$

User's perspective



Which path does the user choose?

Proposer Builder Separation (PBS)



PROF Key Insight



Learn practically nothing about PROF transactions if you leave-it

Why should relays adopt PROF?

- Relays compete to have their blocks accepted
- All else equal, a PROF-enhanced relay is more competitive than a regular relay
- Workflow for builders remains unchanged

PBS Workflow



PROF Design Details





Latency Penalty in PBS Auction

10,000 randomly selected historical auction slots (between 1/3/24 and 4/11/24) 50 percentile 0.010 75 percentile 90 percentile 800.0 Penalty (ETH) 95 percentile mean with SEM 0.006 0.004 0.002 0.000 50 0 100 150 200 250 Latency (ms)

Percentiles of slots for a particular latency and penalty

Example: If auction were ended 85ms earlier, 90% of slots would give ~0.003 ETH less

Inclusion Likelihood

$$\alpha = \Pr[\operatorname{Fees}(\theta_{\operatorname{PROF}}) > \\ \max(\operatorname{Bids}(T_0)) - \max(\operatorname{Bids}(T_0 - \delta))].$$

$$\operatorname{Latency} \operatorname{Penalty}(\delta)$$

Inclusion Likelihood

$$\alpha = \Pr[g\gamma f > \text{Latency Penalty}(\delta)].$$
Relationship between α, g, γ
Gas used in PROF bundle Overhead as a multiple of ``base fee'' f

Inclusion Likelihood



A Step Further: Redistribution of MEV to Users



A Step Further: Redistribution of MEV to Users



A Step Further: Redistribution of MEV to Users



Share \$X with Alice, \$20-X divided up between validator and arbitrageur

PROF-Share : A Step Further

- Redistribute any MEV opportunity created by PROF users back to them
- For instance, arbitrage from backrunning of DEX trades



Related Redistribution Mechanisms

- MEV-Share and MEV-Blocker
- Attempts to prevent frontrunning through a trusted intermediary
- Yet, needs to leak hints about transaction contents for attracting and facilitating backrunning and redistribution
- Widespread in industry : Revenue to the validator from MEV-Share and MEV-Blocker is pivotal in deciding the winner of a majority of auctions!

Other benefits of PROF-Share

- PROF-Share transactions are completely private until the validator commits to including them, and then are completely released for backrunning
- As a result:
- More efficient backrunning compared to backrunning based on hints (gas savings as state is known offchain)
- PROF-Share users get to keep *almost all* of the backrunning profits rather than sharing it with validators (as in MEV-Share)
- Organic backrunning between transactions of a PROF bundle one PROF user could be a "backrunner" of another user if they trade in opposite directions

Economic Utility Analysis

- Compare different protection mechanisms
- PROF v/s PROF-Share v/s MEV-Share
- Model:
 - DEX : A constant product AMM
 - An external infinite liquidity market for arbitragers (Centralized Exchanges)

 constant price P
 - Start out with AMM price of P
 - Each user trades a unit quantity in randomly either direction
 - Demand Ratio (informally) : A maximum cap on how much volume of trades are in one direction compared to a baseline of net 0 buy and 0 sell

Economic Utility Analysis



- Takeaway1 : PROF-Share always delivers the highest value of users
- Takeaway2: In times of low net demand, PROF delivers higher value even without redistribution benefits (MEV-Share), thanks to organic backrunning

Flexibility in PROF

- Multiple Sequencers
- PROF Sequencer here is a black-box
 - Centralized / Decentralized
 - PROF supports any ordering policy



Conclusion

- PROF: A simple backward-compatible system designed for protecting users from harmful MEV extraction, while accounting for the profitmaximizing nature of validators
- PROF Endgame Thesis: Transactions that want top of the priority can go through the gauntlet of MEV auctions*. All other transactions should go through PROF to enjoy protection from MEV

*nullifies the externality of latency racing in fair and blind ordering

31

To Learn More



- Visit the website: prof-project.github.io (FAQs)
 - Watch the demo of PROF-enriched blocks landing at validators
- Uniswap RFP: \$50k for maturing PROF implementation
- Announcements @PROF_MEV ×
- Contact: babel@cs.cornell.edu
- PROF paper just released!

PROF: <u>Protected</u> <u>Order</u> <u>Flow in a Profit-Seeking World</u>

Kushal Babel^{†§}, Nerla Jean-Louis^{‡§}, Yan Ji^{†§}, Ujval Misra^{||§}, Mahimna Kelkar^{†§}, Kosala Yapa Mudiyanselage[¶], Andrew Miller^{‡§}, Ari Juels^{†§}

[†]Cornell Tech, [‡]UIUC, ^{||}UC Berkeley, [§]IC3, [¶]Fidelity Center for Applied Technology