



Byelaws of the Linked Data Benchmark Council (LDBC)

Version 1.1

2 March 2017

Article 1 — Relationship of Byelaws to the Articles of Association	3
Article 1 — ADDRESSES	3
1.1 <i>Official Web Addresses</i>	3
1.2 <i>Postal Address</i>	4
1.3 <i>Mailing List</i>	4
Article 2 — MEMBERSHIP	4
2.1 <i>Membership Classes</i>	4
2.2 <i>Admission to Membership</i>	4
2.3 <i>Membership Registration</i>	5
2.4 <i>Sponsor Members</i>	5
Article 3 — DIRECTORS AND VOTING	5
3.1 <i>Board of Directors</i>	5
3.2 <i>Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Board</i>	5
3.3 <i>Steering Committee</i>	5
3.4 <i>Board Meetings</i>	6
3.5 <i>Arbitration</i>	6
Article 4 — Task Forces	6
4.1 <i>Task Force Scope</i>	6
4.2 <i>Task Force Organization</i>	7
4.3 <i>Creating and Disbanding Task Forces</i>	7
Article 5 — Benchmark Adoption, Retraction and Maintenance	8
5.1 <i>Minimum Benchmark Adoption Requirements</i>	8
5.2 <i>Maintenance of Benchmarks</i>	9
Article 6 — Benchmark Results	9
6.1 <i>System Under Test</i>	9
6.2 <i>Price Metrics</i>	9
6.3 <i>Test Sponsor</i>	9
6.4 <i>Benchmark Result Generation</i>	10
6.5 <i>Third Party Result Generation</i>	10
6.6 <i>Challenging Benchmark Results</i>	11
Article 7 — Benchmark Auditing	12
7.1 <i>Benchmark Auditors</i>	12
7.2 <i>Auditor Compensation</i>	12
7.3 <i>Auditor Qualification</i>	12
7.4 <i>Auditing by the Task Force itself</i>	12
7.5 <i>Auditor Independence</i>	12
7.6 <i>Audit Requirements</i>	13
Article 8 — Communications	13
8.1 <i>Confidentiality</i>	13

8.2 <i>Fair Use</i>	14
Article 9 — Intellectual Property Rights	14
9.1 <i>IPR Assets</i>	14
9.2 <i>Copyright</i>	14
9.3 <i>Licenses</i>	14
9.4 <i>Trademarks</i>	15

Article 1 — Relationship of Byelaws to the Articles of Association

These Byelaws are supplementary to the Articles of Association (the “Articles”) of the Linked Data Benchmark Council (the “Company”), and were adopted by the Directors of the Company at its meeting of [10 February 2017].

Terms whose interpretation is defined in Article 2 of the Articles are used in this document with the same meaning.

Nothing in these Byelaws may be interpreted as affecting or repealing any provision of the Articles.

Article 1 — ADDRESSES

1.1 Official Web Addresses

- (a) The Company shall maintain an internet website on the address:

<http://www.ldbcouncil.org>

- (b) Its official list of members is reflected on:

<http://www.ldbcouncil.org/industry/members>

- (c) Its official list of membership dues is at:

<http://www.ldbcouncil.org/industry/organization>

- (d) The digital archive of the Board of Directors, including its meeting minutes, is kept on:

<http://wiki.ldbcouncil.org/display/LBD>

- (e) The list of Task Forces, including their member lists and meeting minutes, is kept on:

<http://wiki.ldbcouncil.org/display/LOTF>

(f) The official open-source repository for LDBC software components is on:

<https://www.github.com/ldbc>

1.2 Postal Address

The LDBC's post and its administration is handled by:

Paul Goldwin
PKF Littlejohn LLP
1 Westferry Circus
Canary Wharf
London

Telephone: +44 (0)20 7516 2200
Fax: +44 (0)20 7516 2400
Email: pgoldwin@pkf-littlejohn.com

1.3 Mailing List

The Company maintains an email distribution list bod@lists.ldbcouncil.org which reaches all Directors of the Company.

Article 2 — MEMBERSHIP

2.1 Membership Classes

The class of membership for non-profit organisations established in Article 8.1 of the Articles shall be reserved for any corporation or association whose purpose is other than the making of profit, and which is not an Affiliate of a commercial organization, nor under the control of, nor in control of, nor under common control with a commercial organization.

2.2 Admission to Membership

Membership applications should be sent to the Board of Directors, using the email address given in Article 1 of this document. A decision on the application will be made at the latest by the next meeting of the Board of Directors, or by a written or electronic resolution of the Directors in accordance with Article 21.4 of the Articles.

2.3 Membership Registration

The Company will keep a public, freely accessible, list of active members on its official website as defined in Article 1.1 (b), that must be updated at most 10 business days after a membership change occurs.

2.4 Sponsor Members

Members can be denominated Sponsor members if they pay higher membership dues, as set by the Board of Directors.

Article 3 — DIRECTORS AND VOTING

3.1 Board of Directors

Any change, addition or deletion to the register of names and contact details of the Directors must be notified to all Directors by email and recorded in the archive of the Board of Directors referred to in Article 1.1 (d) within ten business days of the alteration.

3.2 Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Board

Any change in the names and contact details of the Chairman and Vice Chairman must be notified to all Directors by email and recorded in the archive of the Board of Directors referred to in Article 1.1 (d), within ten business days of the alteration.

3.3 Steering Committee

The Steering Committee consists of at least two Directors in addition to the Chairman and Vice Chairman, who are members ex officio. Steering committee members other than the Chairman and Vice Chairman are appointed at the first Board Meeting of the year.

The Steering Committee is responsible for the day-to-day management of the Company and should appoint from within its membership one person responsible for each of the following areas:

- (a) Financial Management: dues collection, payment of taxes, payment of expenses.

- (b) Secretarial Management: board meeting minutes, membership and task force list administration.
- (c) Communications Management: press releases, website, social media channels.

Any change in the names and contact details of the members of the Steering Committee or of the management roles given above must be notified to all Directors by email and recorded in the archive of the Board of Directors referred to in Article 1.1 (d), within ten business days of the alteration.

3.4 Board Meetings

- (a) The chair of a Board Meeting will appoint one of the Directors present to act as meeting secretary.
- (b) Decisions of the Directors, in meetings or by written or electronic resolution, shall be entered within one day of being made into the Minute Book of the Company and notified by email to the Directors. The contents of the Minute Book shall at all times be reflected in the archive of the Board of Directors referred to in Article 1.1(d).

3.5 Arbitration

In the event of a dispute among the members with respect to any provision of these Byelaws, or the application of these Byelaws to the business conducted by the Company, such dispute shall be settled shall be determined by the appointment of a single arbitrator to be agreed between the parties, or failing agreement within fourteen days, after either party has given to the other a written request to concur in the appointment of an arbitrator, by an arbitrator to be appointed by the President or a Deputy President of the Chartered Institute of Arbitrators. The arbitrator will apply English law to this arbitration and this arbitration will take place in London, or such other place as the parties may agree. Written notice of any arbitration hearing will be given to all members at least 10 business days prior to commencement of arbitration.

Article 4 — Task Forces

4.1 Task Force Scope

- (a) The Company undertakes to define high-quality benchmarks relevant to specific application scenarios. A Task Force coordinates technical development activities in a well-defined direction, typically having to do with
- (b) the development of a benchmark inclusive auditing rules, as well as to

- (c) training and qualification of auditors for a particular benchmark, as well as to perform
- (d) maintenance on an already existing benchmark, as well as to
- (e) arbitrate on disagreements over the validity of benchmark results and practices¹

Further:

- (f) A Task Force may be working on multiple benchmarks at different stages of their lifecycles.
- (g) Each benchmark that has been adopted (and not retracted) by the Company shall have one Task Force responsible for it.

4.2 Task Force Organization

- (a) The decision to start or disband a Task Force is made by the Board of Directors.
- (b) All Company members have the right to appoint a person as member to a Task Force. These are called Appointed Members. Task Force members do not need to be Directors and do not need to be employees of Company member organizations or be affiliated with these. Task Forces may by simple majority vote among themselves to appoint or remove additional Task Force members beyond the Appointed Members.
- (c) At least annually, each Task Force elects a Task Force Leader by simple majority.
- (d) The actual member list of each Task Force (names and contact details) are kept up-to-date within ten business date after each change on a web page specified in Article 1.1 This list should include by which member (if any) they are appointed and also list the Task Force Leader.
- (e) Task Forces should meet at least once a quarter physically, or by electronic means (conference telephone call or by internet). For each of these (potentially virtual) meetings, the Task Force Leader ensures that on the web page named in Article 1.1 (e), within ten business days written meeting minutes are posted and kept that show (at least) which Task Force Members were present in the meeting as well as contain its minutes and action points.

4.3 Creating and Disbanding Task Forces

The proposal for creating a Task Force, typically with a mission statement, introductory materials or proposals, shall be brought forward in a Board Meeting.

The decision to create or disband a Task Force requires a Super Majority.

Article 5 — Benchmark Adoption, Retraction and Maintenance

5.1 Minimum Benchmark Adoption Requirements

A benchmark specification in the form of a single readable document shall satisfy the following criteria before it is eligible for adoption:

- (a) It defines a primary metric and a price-performance metric.
- (b) It defines a scaling rule that defines how results at different size are to be reported.
- (c) It defines a validation dataset that allows checking that an implementation produces correct results.
- (d) It defines an Executive Summary for result disclosure
- (e) It defines a Full Disclosure Report, including a set of files and run logs that must be disclosed along with a result.
- (f) It defines a set of auditing requirements that apply to a benchmark execution and can be validated by an auditor.

The software components of the benchmark (e.g. data generators, work load generators, and non-vendor specific drivers) have the following requirements:

- (g) have been reasonably tested.
- (h) their use is reasonably documented and this documentation is publicly available.
- (i) the source code is publicly available in a version control system.
- (j) the code is released an open-source license.
- (k) there is a public system for reporting and tracking software issues.

The benchmark has been successfully implemented:

- (l) the benchmark has been implemented, run, validated and audited on at least two different software systems.

5.2 Maintenance of Benchmarks

After a benchmark has first been adopted, the Task Force which has produced it will be initially responsible for its ongoing maintenance and for review of results and resolution of challenges relating to the benchmark.

Maintenance comprises:

- (a) Overseeing the auditing process and accepting new benchmark results, and posting these on the Company website.
- (b) Retracting outdated or challenged results from the Company website.
- (c) Defining and Changing auditing materials and guidelines.
- (d) Training and Qualifying Benchmark Auditors.
- (e) Developing extensions and changes to an existing benchmark specifications.
- (f) Developing and changing benchmark software.

Article 6 — Benchmark Results

6.1 System Under Test

The totality of hardware and software used for obtaining a benchmark result is called the System Under Test (SUT). This is the set of items that is priced for obtaining a price/performance metric, with a single or otherwise reasonably uniform interface.

6.2 Price Metrics

The price/performance metric of LDBC benchmarks is based on the concept of Total Cost of Ownership during three years, covering both direct hardware and software as well as support on these, needed for reliable and continuous operation of the System Under Test of the benchmark workload.

In particular, the cost metric of official LDBC benchmark results must be computed using the TPC pricing specification version v2.0 as available via the Transaction Processing Council (<http://www.tpc.org/pricing/>).

6.3 Test Sponsor

Test Sponsor is the legal entity which submits a result. This will usually be a company but may also be an individual, especially in instances where a research organization submits a result.

6.4 Benchmark Result Generation

- (a) Any party may act as Test Sponsor, running an LDBC benchmark at any time of its choice.
- (b) For a result to be labeled as an LDBC result, this result must successfully pass auditing by an LDBC approved auditor. Once the auditor has approved a result, including all required supporting documentation, the Steering Committee and the Task Force responsible for the benchmark will be notified.

The Steering Committee will have the result added to the LDBC web site as follows:²

- (c) LDBC members will receive notification of the result via email to their designated contacts within five business days of LDBC receiving the notification.
- (d) Within five business days of this notice, the LDBC administrator will post the result on the LDBC web site unless the result is withdrawn by the test sponsor in the meantime.
- (e) A result may be challenged and subsequently be withdrawn by the LDBC following a review process as described in Article 6.6.
- (f) A result that is not challenged within 60 days of its publication will be automatically considered valid and may not be challenged after this time.

6.5 Third Party Result Generation

If the test sponsor is not the vendor or creator of one of the main parts of the SUT, an additional procedure will apply before a result is posted:

- (a) The vendor/creator of the tested software (the “Reviewing Party”) will be notified and asked to review the result.³ It is up to the Task Force which is responsible for maintenance of the benchmark to decide, by simple majority in the Task Force, whether a result is a Third Party Result and which entity is the Reviewing Party.
- (b) The review by the Reviewing Party should be provided by it to the Task Force within 20 business days of the original request. This review may contain requests for changes to the configuration of the software and hardware.
- (c) The Task Force responsible for the benchmark examines this review within 10 business days and decides per simple majority in the Task Force whether it provides sufficient arguments for rejecting the benchmark result.
- (d) If the Task Force decides to accept the result, it is a right of the Reviewing Party to request that its review be added to the benchmark Full Disclosure Report as an appendix.

6.6 Challenging Benchmark Results

- (a) To initiate a Benchmark Result Challenge, the alleged policy violation must be submitted to the Task Force via email, copying the original Test Sponsor. The submission must include a precise description of the alleged violation.
- (b) Both parties, the original Test Sponsor and the Challenger, are encouraged to resolve the issue among themselves at this point. If the Challenger has not withdrawn the challenge after a waiting period of fifteen business days, the Task Force will put the issue on its agenda. The Test Sponsor is asked to write a rebuttal of the Benchmark Result Challenge to the Task Force, copying the Challenger.
- (c) The Task Force will review the issue, and determine by simple majority vote whether a violation has occurred and its severity. Besides technical issues, the Task Force will also take into account the degree of severity (insignificant, minor or major) in formulating its response, as well as any history or a recent pattern of violations by the same Test Sponsor. The Technical Area Committee will organize meetings until a decision is made.
- (d) The Challenge Response formulated by the Task Force is a binding decision within the LDBC for which no further appeal process exists.

The response measures outlined below are the expected outcome in most circumstances. However, the Task Force retains the right to take other response measures if necessary under extra-ordinary circumstances. In all cases the response measures will seek to be fair, reasonable, and appropriate.

- (e) For insignificant violations the Task Force will send a response to the involved parties and take no further action.
- (f) For minor violations, the Task Force will inform the Steering Committee that a minor violation has occurred. It is assumed that the Test Sponsor has already taken correction actions which are reflected in an updated result posting. If not, the Steering Committee sends the Test Sponsor a letter outlining the nature of the violation, asking for appropriate corrective actions that should lead to an updated re-audited result within fifteen business days. If the corrective actions have not led to an updated result after that time period, the challenged result is removed by the Steering Committee from the LDBC website.
- (g) For major violations, the Task Force will inform the Steering Committee that a major violation has occurred. The Steering Committee then must remove the challenged result from the LDBC website and sends the Test Sponsor a letter outlining the nature of the violation. In addition, the Task Force may issue a fine (limited to maximally 3 years of Company Member Dues) or remove all

other results from the Test Sponsor from the LDBC website. According to the seriousness of the issue, it may instruct the Steering Committee to issue a press release outlining the nature of the policy violation, and, in extreme cases, might initiate expulsion proceedings.

Article 7 — Benchmark Auditing

7.1 Benchmark Auditors

An Auditor is an individual authorized by a Task Force to audit a benchmark for which that Task Force is responsible. The authorized Auditors must be listed on the Company website and when changes occur this must be reflected there within ten business days.

7.2 Auditor Compensation

A Test Sponsor will engage an Auditor to verify the compliance of a result before submitting said result. The compensation of the Auditor is agreed upon between the test sponsor and the auditor.

7.3 Auditor Qualification

An individual may apply with the Company to be approved as an auditor for one or more benchmarks maintained by it.

The Task Force will interview the auditor and based on the interview and hold a written examination where the auditor answers questions relevant to the benchmark in question and general issues of system performance evaluation. Having reviewed these, the Task Force can approve the auditor by simple majority within the Task Force.

7.4 Auditing by the Task Force itself

As a special case, which applies for instance if there are no qualified Auditors yet for a particular benchmark, the Task Force may again by simple majority, as set forth above, decide that the Task Force collectively or a designated individual member of the Task Force will audit a result.

7.5 Auditor Independence

The auditor of a Benchmark Result may not be affiliated to the test sponsor and must otherwise be independent of the test sponsor. The conditions of payment between the Test Sponsor and Auditor

- (a) must be based on an hourly tariff and,
- (b) must be disclosed to the Steering Committee and
- (c) may not depend on the outcome of the benchmark audit.

7.6 Audit Requirements

- (a) In order to limit the cost of auditing, an audit should be possible via remote access to the SUT. The remote access must grant the auditor administrator privileges, preferably a remote console via IPMI⁴ or equivalent. This makes it possible to simulate an instantaneous failure such as a power outage by remotely powering down a system.
- (b) The specific requirements for storage durability and other concerns are defined in the audit rules section of each benchmark.
- (c) The auditor shall be present via remote access and teleconference during the test execution by the test sponsor. If the test execution takes a long time, e.g. more than a day, the auditor shall verify that the test actually completed in a manner decided by the auditor.
- (d) A benchmark result is not a valid LDBC result unless the audit is completed and the required supporting material is made publicly available in electronic form.
- (e) An attestation letter by the auditor will be published as part of the full disclosure report. This is a signed document which specifies the date of the audit and states that the result is compliant to the best knowledge of the auditor after due review. The attestation letter can be linked to the executive summary by electronic signature to prevent later tampering.

Article 8 — Communications

8.1 Confidentiality

All internal communication between LDBC members that the Board of Directors has marked confidential must be treated as LDBC confidential. LDBC confidential information must not be disclosed to any non-member without prior approval by the Steering Committee.

No Member may speak to the press or the public at large on behalf of the LDBC other than the Steering Committee and its designed representatives.

8.2 Fair Use

LDBC benchmark results are potentially important marketing assets. For these results to be publicly used, their use must satisfy the following criteria:

- (a) A result may not be designated as an LDBC benchmark result unless it is an official result_ listed on the LDBC website at the time of the communication.
- (b) A result may not be designated as an LDBC result if the result has been challenged and removed.
- (c) The LDBC name, logo, or LDBC metrics may not be used in reference to qualitative statements in reference to a product, unless this is a mention of a currently listed official result on the LDBC website.

Article 9 — Intellectual Property Rights

9.1 IPR Assets

The IPR management for LDBC covers the asset types:

- (a) Benchmark Software Components.
- (b) Benchmark Specification documents.
- (c) Benchmark Auditing Rules.
- (d) Benchmark Results, both Executive Summaries and Full Disclosure Reports.
- (e) Brands, are names related to benchmarking activities of the LDBC, such as its own name, its benchmarks, the benchmark metrics.

9.2 Copyright

The copyright on the IPR Assets defined in Article 9.1 (a) and (d) are allowed to remain with their original copyright holder. When (employees of) members of the LDBC make contributions to documents as defined in Article 9.1 (b) and (c) they automatically assign the copyright on these contributions to LDBC.

9.3 Licenses

The materials describing Benchmarks, Benchmarking Practices and Benchmark results must be open to the public. For this purpose, two licenses have been adopted:

- (a) For all Benchmark Software Components of LDBC Benchmarks, the “simplified BSD license” should be used, as provided in full hereby:

```
Copyright (c) <year>, <copyright holder>
```

```
All rights reserved.
```

```
Redistribution and use in source and binary forms, with or without  
modification, are permitted provided that the following conditions are met:
```

1. Redistributions of source code must retain the above copyright notice, this list of conditions and the following disclaimer.
2. Redistributions in binary form must reproduce the above copyright notice, this list of conditions and the following disclaimer in the documentation and/or other materials provided with the distribution.

```
THIS SOFTWARE IS PROVIDED BY THE COPYRIGHT HOLDERS AND CONTRIBUTORS "AS IS" AND  
ANY EXPRESS OR IMPLIED WARRANTIES, INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, THE IMPLIED  
WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY AND FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE ARE  
DISCLAIMED. IN NO EVENT SHALL THE COPYRIGHT OWNER OR CONTRIBUTORS BE LIABLE FOR  
ANY DIRECT, INDIRECT, INCIDENTAL, SPECIAL, EXEMPLARY, OR CONSEQUENTIAL DAMAGES  
(INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, PROCUREMENT OF SUBSTITUTE GOODS OR SERVICES;  
LOSS OF USE, DATA, OR PROFITS; OR BUSINESS INTERRUPTION) HOWEVER CAUSED AND  
ON ANY THEORY OF LIABILITY, WHETHER IN CONTRACT, STRICT LIABILITY, OR TORT  
(INCLUDING NEGLIGENCE OR OTHERWISE) ARISING IN ANY WAY OUT OF THE USE OF THIS  
SOFTWARE, EVEN IF ADVISED OF THE POSSIBILITY OF SUCH DAMAGE.
```

The LDBC will take adequate and specific measures to ensure that the software it releases in its public repository as specified in Article 1 (f) properly complies with this intention while protecting the IPR rights of LDBC.

- (b) The Creative Commons Attribution-NoDerivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-ND 4.0) License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nd/4.0/>) must be used for all IPR Assets listed under 9.1 (b), 9.1 (c), and 9.1 (d).

9.4 Trademarks

LDBC may trademark names related to its core mission, such as its own name, its benchmarks, and its benchmark metrics.

¹ The rationale for organizing arbitration of issues of interpretation and compliance under a Task Force is that the Task Force responsible for the benchmark in question is the most likely place where both competent and concerned parties may be found.

² The rationale for this procedure is that benchmark results may be important tools for marketing and may have to be timed to coincide with other activity. Hence the publication delay must be predictable and potential competitors must not be in a position to preempt a result publication. The challenge procedure may however bring to light non-compliance.

³ The rationale is that a result may not be a bona fide attempt at obtaining the best performance possible, or the test may be carried out in a less than optimal manner, e.g. by erroneous configuration.

⁴ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Intelligent_Platform_Management_Interface