The zkEVM Architecture

Part V: Economics

Polygon zkEVM & Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya (UPC)

Marc Guzman-Albiol <marc.guzman.albiol@upc.edu>
Jose Luis Muñoz-Tapia <jose.luis.munoz@upc.edu>

Version: a26ddeaf521225eab1fd213e875f3d8e731766ea

January 18, 2024

Outline

Basic Ethereum Fee Schema i

The basic fee schema to which Ethereum users are used works as follows.

The gas is a unit that accounts the resources used when processing a transaction.

At the time of sending a transaction, the user can decide two parameters:

1. `gasLimit`:
   - It is the maximum amount of gas units that a user enables to be consumed by the transaction.
2. `gasPrice`:
   - It refers to the amount of Wei a user is willing to pay per unit of gas for the transaction execution.
   - In more detail, there is a market between users and network nodes such that if a user wants to prioritize his transaction, then he has to increase the `gasPrice`.

Basic Ethereum Fee Schema ii

- At the **start of the transaction processing**, the following amount of Wei is subtracted from the source account balance:

$$\texttt{gasLimit} \cdot \texttt{gasPrice}.$$

- Then,
  - If $\texttt{gasUsed} > \texttt{gasLimit}$, the transaction is reverted.
  - Otherwise, the amount of Wei associated with the unused gas is refunded.
- The refunded amount of Wei that is added back to the source account is calculated as:

$$\texttt{gasLimit} \cdot \texttt{gasPrice} - \texttt{gasUsed} \cdot \texttt{gasPrice}.$$

Generic User Fee Strategy of Layer 2 Solutions

- In general, Layers 2 follow the fee strategy of charging an L2 gas price that is a percentage of the L1 `gasPrice`:

  `L2GasPrice` = `L1GasPrice` · `L1GasPriceFactor`.

- For example:

  `L1GasPrice` = 20 Gwei
  `L1GasPriceFactor` = 0.04 (4% of L1 `gasPrice`)
  `L2GasPrice` = 20 Gwei · 0.04 = 0.8 Gwei

- You can check the current fees at `https://l2fees.info`.

L2 User Fee Strategies are More Complex

However, this is not as easy as it may seem and there are additional aspects to consider:

a) The `gasPrice` in L1 varies with time, so, how is this taken into account?

b) Different `gasPrice` values in L1 can be used to prioritize transactions, how are these priorities managed by the L2 solution?

c) The `gas/gasPrice` L1 schema may not be aligned with the actual resources spent by the L2 solution.

Obtaining L1 GasPrices



In the example, we poll for the L1 gasPrice every 5 seconds and, as shown, gas prices vary with time.

RPC Transaction Pre-execution



Sending a Transaction: User Experience

- We will operate in two steps: **gasPrice** suggestion and transaction sending.

- In the first step **A**, the user will ask via RPC call for a suggested **gasPrice** computed as

  $\texttt{L2GasPrice} = \texttt{L1GasPrice} \cdot \texttt{L1GasPriceFactor}$

  to sign its transaction with.



- In the second step **B**, the user sends the desired L2 transaction together with the **gasPrice**.



- If **gasPrice** provided by the user is less than the current **L2GasPrice**, the transaction is automatically **rejected**[a] and not included into the pool (error **ErrGasPrice**).

[a] Recall that the transaction can be rejected due to other checks explained before.

Sending a Transaction: Bad User Experience

- However, this previous schema is not a good UX.
- Between steps **A** and **B** there is an unbounded interval of time.
- Henceforth, the `L2GasPrice` from step **A** can be different from the one present in step **B**, leading to the following unwanted situation:



- Observe that, since the `L2GasPrice` has been refreshed, the transaction sent by the prover will be rejected even tough it was signed with the exact suggested `gasPrice`.

Sending a Transaction: `MinAllowedPriceInterval`

- The solution is to allow transactions from users that have signed any `SignedGasPrice` that is above the minimum L2 gas price recorded during a period of time (called `MinAllowedPriceInterval`).
- This minimum is denoted as `L2MinGasPrice`.



Pool Config

We can configure the previous parameters in the Polygon zkEVM node:

```
[Pool]
...
DefaultMinGasPriceAllowed = 0
MinAllowedGasPriceInterval = "5m"
PollMinAllowedGasPriceInterval = "1s"
IntervalToRefreshGasPrices = "5s"
...
```

https://github.com/0xPolygonHermez/zkevm-node/blob/develop/docs/config-file/node-config-doc.md#75-pooldb

- `DefaultMinGasPriceAllowed:` It is the default min gas price to suggest.
- `MinAllowedGasPriceInterval:` It is the interval to look back of the suggested min gas price for a transaction.
- `PollMinAllowedGasPriceInterval:` It is the interval to poll L1 to find the suggested L2 min gas price.
- `IntervalToRefreshGasPrices:` It is the interval to refresh L2 gas prices.

Multi Gas Provider

When computing the L1 **gasPrice**, we can activate the **multigasprovider**:

```
[Etherman]
...MultiGasProvider = false
```

When enabled, it allows using multiples sources for computing the L1 **gasPrice**.

L2 Gas Price Suggester

- However, with this particular design, the zkEVM endpoint that provides a suggestion for the gas price that the user has to sign with its transaction (which will be called L2 Gas Price Suggester) has a **big problem design.**
- Recall that the price of posting transactional data to L1 is charged to the zkEVM network to the **full L1 price**.
- Therefore, if we propose a gas price using `L1GasPriceFactor`, representing the measure of computational reduction in L2, there is a risk of running out of Wei reserves for posting data to L1.
- Consequently, we will recommend a slightly higher percentage of the gas price to the user, employing a `SuggesterFactor` of $0.15 \approx 4 \cdot$ `L1GasPriceFactor`:

$$\texttt{GasPriceSuggested} = \texttt{L1GasPrice} \cdot \texttt{SuggestedFactor}.$$

Gas Price Suggester

```
[L2GasPriceSuggester]
Type = "follower"
UpdatePeriod = "3s"
Factor = 0.12
DefaultGasPriceWei = 0
MaxGasPriceWei = 0
CleanHistoryPeriod = "1h"
CleanHistoryTimeRetention = "5m"
```

Numeric Example: Minimum Gas Price i



- Observe that, when the user queries the suggested gas price through the RPC, the networks responds the current suggested gas price computed as $0.04 \cdot 19$, which is the current L1 gas price updated every 5 seconds.

Numeric Example: Minimum Gas Price ii



- However, at the time of sending the transaction, the RPC will only accept the transaction if `GasPriceSigned` is strictly higher than the minimum suggested gas price from 5 minutes ago (highlighted in **bold** in the figure), which in this instance is $19 \cdot 0.04 = 2.85$.
- In order to get his transaction accepted, the user sets the gas price of the transaction to $\texttt{GasPriceSigned} = 3.3 > 2.85 = \texttt{L2MinGasPrice}$.

L1/L2 Costs Issues

- Gas in Ethereum accounts the resources used by the transaction.
- In particular, it takes into account:
  - **Data availability** (the transaction bytes).
  - **Processing resources**, like CPU, Memory and Storage.
- Ethereum users are used to priorize their transaction by increasing `gasPrice`.
- A big issue is that **there can be operations that consume low gas in L1 but that represent a major cost for L2**.
- The data availability costs are fixed once the transaction is known and they are directly proportional to L1 data availability costs.
- However, L2 execution is variable (because it depends on the state) and usually offers a smaller cost per gas.
- Henceforth, L2 transactions having high data availability costs and small execution costs are **highly problematic** in our pricing schema.

L1/L2 Costs Strategies

- Recall that the Ethereum fee is computed as **gasUsed** · **gasPrice**, giving us two ways of solving the misalignment problem:

  (A) **Arbitrum Approach. Increase gasUsed.**
  - This approach is based on changing the gas schema to increase the Gas costs for data availability.
  - This strategy is a relatively simple to implement and easy to understand but **it changes the Ethereum protocol**.
  - An L1 Ethereum transaction may execute different when compared to the same transaction executed in L2.

  (B) **Effective Gas Price Approach. Increase gasPrice.**
  - If we do not want to modify the Gas, we have to increase **gasPrice** in order to cover the costs.
  - Unlike the previous approach, this does not change the Ethereum specifications.
  - However, it is complex to achieve a fair **gasPrice**.
  - Moreover, we have to take into account that L2 users should be able to prioritize its transactions also increasing **gasPrice**, as they are used to.
  - This is actually our approach.

Effective Gas Price Overview i

- The user signs a relatively high gas price at the time of sending the L2 transaction.
- Later on, by pre-executing the sent transaction, the **sequencer** establishes a fair `gasPrice` according to the amount of resources used.
- To do so, the **sequencer** provides a single byte $\texttt{EffectivePercentageByte} \in \{0, 1, \ldots, 255\}$ (1 Byte), which will be used to compute a ratio called `effectivePercentage`

$$\texttt{EffectivePercentage} = \frac{1 + \texttt{EffectivePercentageByte}}{256}.$$

- The `effectivePercentage` will be used in order to compute the factor of the signed transaction's `gasPrice` which should be charged to the user:

$$\texttt{TxGasPrice} = \left\lfloor \texttt{GasPriceSigned} \cdot \frac{1 + \texttt{EffectivePercentageByte}}{256} \right\rfloor.$$

Effective Gas Price Overview ii

- For example, setting an `EffectivePercentageByte` of $255 = \texttt{0xFF}$ would mean that the user would pay the totality of the `gasPrice` signed when sending the transaction:

$$\texttt{TxGasPrice} = \texttt{GasPriceSigned}.$$

- In contrast, setting `EffectivePercentageByte` to 127 would reduce the `gasPrice` signed by the user to the half:

$$\texttt{TxGasPrice} = \frac{\texttt{GasPriceSigned}}{2}.$$

- Observe that, in this schema, users **must trust the sequencer**.
- As having `EffectivePercentage` implies having `EffectivePercentageByte`, and vice versa, we will abuse of notation and use them interchangeably as `EffectivePercentage`.

About the **EffectivePercentage** computation

- We could account the pricing resources by means of the number of **consumed counters** present in our proving system.
- Nevertheless, comprehending this can be challenging for users, and it is crucial to prioritize a positive user experience in this specific aspect.
- Moreover, stating the efficiency trough counters is not intuitive for users at the time of prioritizing their transactions.
- Henceforth, our actual goal is to compute **`EffectivePercentage` only by using `Gas`** and prioritizing users transactions by means of using **`gasPrice`**.

Introduction of the `BreakEvenGasPrice`

- Our goal as service providers is to **not accept transactions in which we loose money**.
- In order to achieve this, we will calculate the `BreakEvenGasPrice`, considering a secure threshold to avoid losses in the event of unexpected issues.
- As explained before, we will split the computation in two to take into account differently costs associated with data availability and costs associated with used Gas.

BreakEvenGasPrice: Costs Associated with Data Availability i

- Costs associated with Data Availability will be computed as

$$\texttt{DataCost} \cdot \texttt{L1GasPrice},$$

  where **dataCost** is the cost in Gas for data in L1.
- In the Ethereum ecosystem, the cost of data varies depending on whether it involves zero bytes or non-zero bytes

$$\texttt{NonZeroByteGasCost} = 16, \quad \texttt{ZeroByteGasCost} = 4$$

- In particular, **non-zero bytes** cost 16 **Gas** meanwhile **zero bytes** 4 **Gas**.

BreakEvenGasPrice: Costs Associated with Data Availability ii

- Also recall that, when computing non-zero bytes cost we should take into account some constant data[1], always appearing in a transaction:
  - The **signature**, consisting on 65 bytes.
  - The **EffectivePercentageBytesLength**, consisting on 1 bytes related to the RLP-encoded fields length.
- This results in a total of 66 constantly present bytes.
- Taking all in consideration, **DataCost** can be computed as:

$$(\texttt{TxConstBytes}+\texttt{TxNonZeroBytes})\cdot\texttt{NonZeroByteGasCost}+\texttt{TxZeroBytes}\cdot\texttt{ZerByteGasCost},$$

where **TxZeroBytes** (resp. **TxNonZeroBytes**) represents the count of zero bytes (resp. non-zero bytes) in the raw transaction sent by the user.

[1] This data can obtain zero bytes, but to optimize a little bit the processing we count them all of them as non-zero bytes.

BreakEvenGasPrice: Computational Costs

- For the computational cost, we will simply use the following formula:

$$\texttt{GasUsed} \cdot \texttt{L2GasPrice},$$

  where recall that we can obtain **L2GasPrice** by multiplying **L1GasPrice** by chosen factor less than 1:

$$\texttt{L2GasPrice} = \texttt{L1GasPrice} \cdot \texttt{L1GasPriceFactor}.$$

- In particular, we will choose a factor of 0.04

$$\texttt{L1GasPriceFactor} = 0.04.$$

- Observe that, unlike data costs, in order to compute computational costs we will need to **execute** the transaction.

BreakEvenGasPrice Formula

- Now, combining both **data** and **computational** costs, we will refer to it as `TotalTxPrice`:

$$\texttt{TotalTxPrice} = \texttt{DataCost} \cdot \texttt{L1GasPrice} + \texttt{GasUsed} \cdot \texttt{L1GasPrice} \cdot \texttt{L1GasPriceFactor}.$$

- We can compute **BreakEvenGasPrice** as the following ratio:

$$\texttt{BreakEvenGasPrice} = \frac{\texttt{TotalTxPrice}}{\texttt{GasUsed}}.$$

- This calculation helps to establish the gas price at which the total transaction cost is covered.
- Additionally, we incorporate a factor $\texttt{NetProfit} \geq 1$ that allows us to achieve a slight profit margin:

$$\texttt{BreakEvenGasPrice} = \frac{\texttt{TotalTxPrice}}{\texttt{GasUsed}} \cdot \texttt{NetProfit}.$$

- Observe that we still need to introduce here **gasPrice** prioritization.

Numeric Example: `BreakEvenGasPrice` i

- Recall the example proposed before, where the user ended up by setting `GasPriceSigned` to 2.85.
- Suppose the user sends a transaction having:
  - 200 non-zero bytes, including the constant ones.
  - 100 zero bytes.
- Moreover, at the time of pre-executing the transaction (without getting an **OOC** error), $60,000$ Gas is consumed (recall that, since we are using a *wrong* state root, this gas is only an estimation).

Numeric Example: **BreakEvenGasPrice** ii



- Hence, the total transaction cost is of

$$(200 \cdot 16 + 100 \cdot 4) \cdot 21 + 60,000 \cdot 21 \cdot 0.04 = 126,000 \text{ GWei}.$$

- Observe that 21 is the `L1GasPrice` at the time of sending the transaction.

Numeric Example: **BreakEvenGasPrice** iii

- Now, we are able to compute the **BreakEvenGasPrice** as

$$\texttt{BreakEvenGasPrice} = \frac{\texttt{TotalTxPrice}}{\texttt{GasUsed}} = \frac{126,000\ \text{GWei}}{60,000\ \text{Gas}} \cdot 1,2 = 2.52\ \text{GWei/Gas}.$$

- Observe that we have introduced a **NetProfit** value of 1.2, indicating a target of a 20% gain in this process.
- At a first glance, we might conclude acceptance since $\texttt{GasPriceSigned} = 3.3 > 2.52$ but, recall that this is only an estimation, gas consumed with the correct state root can differ.
- Therefore, we introduce a **BreakEvenFactor** of 30% to account for estimation uncertainties:

$$\texttt{GasPriceSigned} = 3.3 > 3.276 = 2.52 \cdot 1.3 = \texttt{BreakEvenGasPrice} \cdot \texttt{BreakEvenFactor}.$$

- Consequently, we decide to **accept the transaction**.

Numeric Example: `BreakEvenFactor` i

- Imagine we disable the `BreakEvenFactor` setting it to 1.
- Our original transaction's pre-execution consumed 60k Gas, `GasUsedRPC` $= 60$k.
- However, imagine that the correct execution at the time of sequencing consumes 35k Gas.
- If we recompute `BreakEvenGasPrice` using this updated used gas, we get 3.6 GWei/Gas, which is way higher than the original one.
- That means that, we should have charged the user with a higher gas price in order to cover the whole transaction cost, which now is of $105,000$ GWei.
- But, since we are accepting all the transactions signing more than 2.85 of gas price, we do not have margin to increase more.

Numeric Example: `BreakEvenFactor` ii

- In the worst case we are loosing

$$105,000 - 35,000 \cdot 2.85 = 5,250 \text{ GWei}.$$

- Introducing `BreakEvenFactor` we are limiting the accepted transactions to the ones having

$$\texttt{GasPriceSigned} \geq 3.27,$$

  in order to compensate such losses.
- In this case, we have the flexibility to avoid losses and adjust both user and our benefits since

$$105,000 - 35,000 \cdot 3.27 < 0.$$

Introducing Priority i

- Prioritization of transactions in Ethereum is determined by the signed `gasPrice`; higher values result in higher priority.
- To implement this, consider that users are only aware of two `gasPrice` values: the one signed with the transaction, called `GasPriceSigned`, and the one obtained from the RPC, that we will call `GasPriceSuggested`.

Introducing Priority ii

- In the case that $\texttt{gasPriceSigned} > \texttt{gasPriceSuggested}$, we establish a priority ratio as follows:
$$\texttt{PriorityRatio} = \frac{\texttt{GasPriceSigned}}{\texttt{GasPriceSuggested}} - 1.$$
- If $\texttt{GasPriceSigned} \leq \texttt{GasPriceSuggested}$, the user has chosen not to proritize its transaction (and maybe we can reject the transaction due to low gas price).
- In this case, we establish a priority ratio to be 0.
- The $\texttt{EffectiveGasPrice}$ will be computed as:
$$\texttt{EffectiveGasPrice} = \texttt{BreakEvenGasPrice} \cdot (1 + \texttt{PriorityRatio}).$$

Numeric Example: **EffectiveGasPrice**

- Recall that, in the example, we were signing a gas price of 3.3 at the time of sending the transaction.
- However, the suggested gas price was of

$$\texttt{GasPriceSuggested} = 2.85.$$

- The difference between both is taken into account in the priority ratio:

$$\texttt{PriorityRatio} = \frac{3.3}{2.85} - 1 = 0.16.$$

- Henceforth, the estimated **EffectiveGasPrice** in the RPC will be

$$\texttt{EffectiveGasPrice} = 2.52 \cdot (1 + 0.16) = 2.923.$$

gasPrice Flows: RPC i



gasPrice Flows: RPC ii

1. The user asks to the RPC for a suggested L2 `GasPrice`.
2. The users sends the transaction together with a selected `GasPriceSigned`.
3. The RPC pre-executes the transaction (**important**, using a wrong state root) and uses the gas used `GasUsedRPC` in order to compute the `BreakEvenGasPriceRPC`.
4. We have two cases here:
   - If the transaction pre-execution runs out of counters (**OOC** error), we immediately reject the transaction.
   - If not, the RPC computes the `BreakEvenGasPriceRPC` and we continue the flow.

gasPrice Flows: RPC iii

5. Now, we have two options:
   - If `GasPriceSigned` $>$ `BreakEvenGasPriceRPC` $\cdot$ `BreakEvenFactor`, we immediately accept the transaction, storing it in the pool.
   - `BreakEvenFactor` (which is equal to 1.3) is introduced to provide a wider safeness threshold.
   - Otherwise `GasPriceSigned` $\leq$ `BreakEvenGasPriceRPC` $\cdot$ `BreakEvenFactor`, we are in dangerous zone because we may be facing losings.
6. In the bad path, we allow two options:
   - If `GasPriceSigned` $\geq$ `GasPriceSuggested`, we take the risk and we introduce the transaction into the pool.
   - Otherwise `GasPriceSigned` $<$ `GasPriceSuggested`, we immediately reject the transaction because its **highly probable that we face losings**.

`gasPrice` Flows: RPC. Some Considerations

- It is important to remark that, **once a transaction is included into the pool, we should actually include it into a block**.
- Hence, if something goes bad in later steps and the processing consumes far more gas than expected, we will **loose money having no possibility to overcome that situation**.
- On the contrary, if the process goes well and the processing consumes less gas than expected, we can reward the user by modifying the previously introduced `effectivePercentage`.
- Also observe that all the transactions stored in the **Pool** should be ordered from larger to lower priorities (or, equivalently, `effectiveGasPrice`).

gasPrice Flows: Sequencer i



gasPrice Flows: Sequencer ii

1. The sequencer takes a transaction from the **Pool** and recomputes the estimated `EffectiveGasPrice` (which we will call `EEGP`) using the `GasUsedRPC` stored by the RPC and the current `L1GasPrice`.
2. At this point, we have two options:
   - If `GasPriceSigned` $\leq$ `EEGP`, there is a risk of loss.
   - In such cases, the user is charged the full `GasPriceSigned` and we end up the flow.
   - Conversely, if `GasPriceSigned` $>$ `EEGP`, there is room for further adjustment of the user's gas price.
3. In this case, we recompute a new `EffectiveGasPrice` (which we will call `NEGP`) with the execution-related data compute from the **correct state root**.

4. We have two paths:
   - If the difference between **EEGP** and **NEGP** is higher than some a parameter **FinalDeviationPct** (which is 10 in the actual configuration):

$$\frac{|\mathbf{NEGP} - \mathbf{EEGP}|}{\mathbf{EEGP}} \cdot 100 < \mathbf{FinalDeviationPct},$$

     we end up the flow just to avoid re-executions and save execution resources.
   - On the contrary, if the difference equals or exceeds the deviation parameter, there is a big difference between executions and we may better adjust gas price.
5. In the later case, two options arise:
   - If $\mathbf{GasPriceSigned} \leq \mathbf{NEGP}$ there is again a risk of loss.
   - In such cases, the user is charged the full **GasPriceSigned** and we end up the flow.
   - Otherwise, if $\mathbf{GasPriceSigned} > \mathbf{NEGP}$, means that we have margin to adjust the gas price.
   - However, we want to **save executions**, leading us to end up the process using a trick explained below.

6. We check if the transaction processing includes the two opcodes that use the gas price:
   - The `GASPRICE` opcode.
   - The `BALANCE` opcode from the source address.
7. If it is the case, to save one execution, we simply execute the transaction using the full `GasPriceSigned` to ensure we minimize potential losses and we end up the flow, as before.
8. If not, and with the intention of optimizing an execution while making a slight adjustment to the gasPrice, we proceed by executing the transaction using the `NEGP`.

Pool Effective Gas Price

```
...
    [Pool.EffectiveGasPrice]
    Enabled = false
    L1GasPriceFactor = 0.04
    ByteGasCost = 16
    ZeroByteGasCost = 4
    NetProfit = 1.2
    BreakEvenFactor = 1.3
    FinalDeviationPct = 10
    L2GasPriceSuggesterFactor = 0.3
```

https://github.com/0xPolygonHermez/zkevm-node/blob/develop/docs/config-file/node-config-doc.md

- `L1GasPriceFactor`: is the percentage of the L1 gas price that will be used as the L2 min gas price
- `ByteGasCost`: cost per byte that is not 0.
- `ZeroByteGasCost`: cost per byte that is 0.
- `NetProfit`: is the profit margin to apply to the calculated breakEvenGasPrice.
- `BreakEvenFactor`: is the factor to apply to the calculated breakevenGasPrice when comparing it with the gasPriceSigned of a tx.
- `FinalDeviationPct`: is the max allowed deviation percentage BreakEvenGasPrice on re-calculation
- `L2GasPriceSuggesterFactor`: is the factor to apply to L1 gas price to get the suggested L2 gas price used in the calculations when the effective gas price is disabled (testing/metrics purposes)