

Recently, we saw 9 missed slots caused by an optimistic relay bug. Missed slots aren't the end of the world but they do result in economic loss for the network. Due to the burn implemented in 1559 the economic penalty that the proposer incurs for missing a slot is about an order of magnitude lower than it would be without the burn because transaction fees are dramatically reduced. I think we should implement a missed slot penalty of $15m * \text{base fee}$ so that we can realign the economic incentives for the proposer with the overall social welfare of the network.

This change would be a relatively simple change to the slashing conditions that would both decrease the effect of timing games and increase penalties for builders and optimistic relays that cause missed slots.

I think we should aim to include this change in Electra.

Wanted to see if there are any objections to this other than the obvious solo staker argument. My response to the solo staker argument is that solo staker or not it still makes sense to align public and private incentives. If the transaction fee mechanism we were using didn't have the burn and incentives were properly aligned, I don't think anyone would argue that we need to lower the economic penalty for missing a slot to preserve the long tail of solo stakers.