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Introduction

This document describes the set of fair and competitive practices for the publication of information related to SAP® Standard Application Benchmarks. This set of rules is geared at maintaining the high standard of the SAP Standard Application Benchmarks and technology in the industry. It is maintained by the Publication workgroup, a permanent sub-group of the SAP Benchmark Council, which acts on behalf of the SAP Benchmark Council. Each of the workgroup members involved in the development of these rules is committed to support this defined framework for the publication of benchmark results.

The Publication Guidelines are applicable to all benchmarking partners. These include all Benchmark Council member as listed in the To: Field of the Benchmark Council Meeting invitation) and partners submitting SAP standard application benchmarks for certification.

This document was created by the workgroup on a volunteer basis. The following companies participated in the initial effort of setting up these guidelines: Compaq Computer Corp., Fujitsu Siemens Computers GmbH, Hewlett-Packard Company, IBM Corp., Intel Corp., Microsoft Corp., Oracle Corp., SAP SE, and Sun Microsystems, Inc. The document is based on an initiative presented at the SAP Benchmark Council meeting held in December 2000. The workgroup held its initial meeting on February 1, 2001. On May 23, 2001, the policy was empowered by the SAP Benchmark Publication Workgroup (henceforth referred to as “Workgroup”), and on June 6, 2001, it was authorized by the SAP Benchmark Council (referred to throughout as “Council”).

The following information is contained in this document:

- Definition of a minimum set of data that must be contained in any publication and/or comparison of certified benchmark results
- Description of the public Web site for certified SAP Standard Application Benchmark results
- Guidelines for publishing and/or comparing certified benchmark results, and for claiming a world record benchmark result
- Definition of the challenge process to allow partners to contest or defend the publication of SAP Standard Application Benchmark results
- Terms for the Workgroup to withdraw a certified benchmark result from the common Web site
- Description of the logistics of the Workgroup and conference calls
- Rules for company representation
- Copyright request handling
- Openness statement

SAP customers and partners can view the change history of this document at http://service.sap.com/benchmark --> Documentation.

These Publication guidelines complement the policies and guidelines defined in the Communications Toolkit for SAP Partners, in particular the PR Policies for SAP Partners. Partners are requested to ensure they are familiar with these policies.
1. Web Site Dedicated to SAP Standard Application Benchmarks

All available certified benchmarks are listed at http://www.sap.com/benchmark. This public Web site is maintained by SAP’s Performance & Scalability group in cooperation with SAP Global Communications.

For SD benchmarks, the Web page will usually be updated within two working days after a certification has been issued; other benchmarks may take longer.

The default sort order of the benchmark results tables is by certification date of the benchmark, in descending order.

Other information provided on the SAP benchmark Web site is:
- The SAP benchmark Publication guidelines (i.e. this document)
- Violations of these guidelines
- Benchmark withdrawals
- Configuration defaults
- Glossary of terms
- Benchmarking News

2. Publication Definition

A publication subject to the rules and requirements in this document is defined as any written or recorded document that is authored by SAP or its benchmarking partners (as defined in the introduction), and that:

2.1 Contains references to certified benchmark results
2.2 Or contains the word "benchmark" in an SAP context
2.3 Or could be confused with SAP standard application benchmarks
2.4 And is communicated outside one's own company

All such publications must be reviewed and approved by SAP partner communications (as per regular partner communication guidelines).

The additional check for adherence to the Benchmark Publication guidelines is a service provided by SAP’s Performance & Scalability group on a voluntary basis. Note, however, that the responsibility for the correctness of the benchmark-related content of the publication remains with the authoring partner.

SAP reserves the right to discuss certain partner publications in a bilateral method due to legal contracts.
3. **Definition of Two-/Three-Tier and Single-/Multi-DB-Node Benchmarks**

In general, benchmarks are run in:
- **two-tier or three-tier configurations**: Relates to the distribution of DB- and SAP-Instances across servers
- **single-DB-node or multi-DB-node configurations**: Relates to the distribution of DB-Instances across servers

3.1. **Definition of "One server" and "One operating system image"**

- **One server**: What constitutes one server is defined by the individual hardware vendor or cloud provider.
- **One operating system image**: A running operating system is one operating system image if, during the benchmark run, all processes used by the SAP application and the database theoretically are able to communicate with each other via shared memory and semaphore.

3.2. **Definition of Two-Tier Benchmark**

An SAP Standard Application Benchmark can be termed two-tier if it is executed on one server running the SAP application and the database on one operating system image.

3.3. **Definition of Three-Tier Benchmark**

Any benchmark configuration that is not a two-tier benchmark as defined in section 3.2 is considered a three-tier benchmark.

3.4 **Definition of single-DB-node Benchmark**

An SAP Standard Application Benchmark can be termed single-DB-node if the database is executed on one server running one operating system image.

3.5 **Definition of multi-DB-node Benchmark**

Any benchmark configuration that is not a single-DB-node benchmark as defined in section 3.4 is considered a multi-DB-node benchmark.

3.6. **Examples of one server running one operating system image**

- A system with NUMA architecture running one OS, using process binding, processor sets and so on
- An SMP system running one OS
- If considered to be one server by the hardware vendor: One shelf with 10 blade servers and the OS running as one image on all blades.
- A server running with one virtual machine
- A server (virtualized or bare metal) sold as a service by an IaaS provider who defines the offering as one server.
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4. Publication Rules and Benchmark Requirements

The following requirements must be fulfilled for any publication that mentions SAP Standard Application Benchmarks.

4.1 Minimum Required Data for Publication of Benchmark Results

For all publications or references to SAP Standard Application Benchmark results, the data described in this section is required for each benchmark mentioned in the publication.

4.1.1 SAP Business Software and Release

The exact name of the SAP business software and release number used in the benchmark certificate must be included. For example, SAP enhancement package 5 for SAP ERP 6.0, SAP enhancement package 4 for SAP ERP 6.0, SAP ERP 2005, SAP NetWeaver 2004, etc. If the benchmark certificate includes the term Unicode, it also must be included (note, however, that as from June 2010 onwards, all SAP standard application benchmarks use Unicode).

4.1.2 Configuration

The configuration of the system tested must also be specified, including:
- "Two-tier" with central server name or “three-tier” with database server name
- RDBMS (except for EP-ESS)
- Operating system
- The number of processors, cores and threads, if one of the following is mentioned: number of processors, cores, threads, CPU, n-way or any equivalent statement
- For cloud benchmarks the deployment type has to be mentioned

4.1.3 Key Performance Indicators

The minimum required data must include the key performance indicator (KPI) for each benchmark mentioned, as shown in the table below.

The KPI refers to the metric for which a leadership statement can be claimed (see section 4.3).
Table 1: Key Performance Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAP Benchmark</th>
<th>Key performance indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APO DP</td>
<td>Number of characteristic combinations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APO PP-DS</td>
<td>Number of transport &amp; production orders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APO SNP</td>
<td>Number of transport &amp; production orders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATO</td>
<td>Number of assembly orders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCA</td>
<td>Day: Number of postings to account</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Night: Number of balanced accounts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BW (&lt;3.0)</td>
<td>Load Phase: Number of rows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Realignment: Number of balanced accounts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Query Phase: Number of navigation steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BW (≥3.0)</td>
<td>Load Phase: Total number of rows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Analysis Phase: No. of query navigation steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BI-D</td>
<td>Number of query navigation steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BI-MXL</td>
<td>Number of query navigation steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BW-EML</td>
<td>Number of ad-hoc navigation steps per hour at number of initial records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BW-AML</td>
<td>Number of advanced navigation steps per hour at number of initial records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Normalized mean runtime single query test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total runtime delta load/transformation test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATS</td>
<td>Number of activity reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP-ESS</td>
<td>Number of benchmark users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP-PCC</td>
<td>Number of benchmark users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Selling</td>
<td>Number of benchmark users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI</td>
<td>Number of benchmark users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>Number of processed periods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC</td>
<td>Number of benchmark users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU/CCS</td>
<td>Utility Reference Customers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM</td>
<td>Number of benchmark users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>Number of benchmark users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>Number of projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail (POS inbound)</td>
<td>Number of sales data line items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail (Replenishment)</td>
<td>Number of replenished stores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD / SD Parallel</td>
<td>Number of benchmark users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEP (SAP server power)</td>
<td>Power efficiency indicator Watts/kSAPS*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYP (SAP system power)</td>
<td>Power efficiency indicator (tbd)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRBK</td>
<td>Day: Number of postings to bank accounts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Night: Number of balanced accounts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
*For the SAP power benchmarks, the average throughput for all load levels achieved must also be added.

4.1.4 Certification Number and Link to Public Web Page
A reference to SAP’s public benchmarking Web site such as the following needs to be included: “For more details see http://www.sap.com/benchmark.”

4.1.5 Disclaimer Sentence if Required
Publications referencing a new SAP Standard Application Benchmark result may be released without the certification number on the certification day and during the following 10 business days. In this case, the publication must include all benchmark data mentioned in the “official request for approval” e-mail sent by SAP to the other technology partners involved in the benchmark and the following sentence:

“The SAP certification number was not available at press time and can be found at the following Web page: www.sap.com/benchmark.”

All other referenced SAP Standard Application Benchmarks must follow the minimum data requirements as stated in sections 4.1 – 1.4.

4.1.6 Concurrent Benchmarks
For Concurrent Benchmarks the number and type of individual benchmarks with all the KPIs from each individual benchmark must be mentioned in the publication. Additionally, the definition / purpose of the Concurrent Benchmark must be described in the publication.

Shared resources
The shared resources of a Concurrent Benchmark must be contained in the publication. The Shared resources must be prominently mentioned in the publication, preferably in the header /sub-header.

4.1.7 Cloud Benchmarks
In a publication for cloud benchmarks the deployment type “cloud” has to be part of the minimum data.

If a cloud vendor fully discloses all necessary data, he can also be listed in the regular benchmark results tables as a virtualized benchmark.

Cloud Awareness List
A link to the awareness list for cloud benchmarks has to be included in the publication. Link: http://global.sap.com/campaigns/benchmark/appbm_cloud_awareness.epx

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WM</th>
<th>Number of stock movements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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4.2 Publication Content Rules

4.2.1. For each of the certified benchmarks mentioned, all of the minimum data specified in section 4.1 must be included in the publication.

4.2.2. Any publication may only include numbers that refer to published benchmark results. It is not allowed to adjust any published number or to make estimates. For Concurrent Benchmarks only it is allowed to sum / average KPIs under certain conditions. In benchmark publications for Concurrent Benchmarks it is allowed to sum up / weighted averaging of benchmark KPIs under following circumstances:

Only benchmarks of the same benchmark type are allowed to be summed up/averaged.

The largest single benchmark result identifier and shared resource(s) has/have to be prominently visible when a summed/average result is used.

The following disclaimer has to be part of the publication: The calculated results may not be compared to certified 2-tier/3-tier single benchmark results.

4.2.3. Statements on the publication must be accurate and can only refer to certified benchmark data that is presented in the publication. For example, when comparing two two-tier benchmarks, you may state “highest of these two-tier SAP SD Standard Application Benchmark results” if it is true, but not the generic phrase “highest SAP SD Standard Application Benchmark result.”

4.2.4. It is permitted to point out that there is no certified benchmark result available from one or multiple SAP technology partners for a certain SAP benchmark.

4.2.5. The type and number of processing units and other system configuration options is defined by the publicly available system description. It is the responsibility of the vendor to include this information and ensure its accuracy.

4.2.6. Publications may compare certified benchmark results across all SAP release versions for each type, however, each version (as specified in the minimum data requirements) must be prominently visible in the publication.

4.2.7. “Compare” means to set results side by side in order to show differences and likenesses. To compare a result (or results) aims at showing relative values or excellences by bringing out characteristic qualities, whether similar or divergent. The level of detail with regard to number of processors, cores, threads etc (see section 4.1.2) must be identical for all benchmarks included in the comparison.

4.2.8. Price/performance is not a metric of certified SAP Standard Application Benchmarks. It is not permitted to release and/or compare any price information of hardware, software and service in conjunction with a SAP Standard Application Benchmark result. A price reference based on other benchmark organizations (e.g., TPC, SPEC, etc.) is permitted, as long as
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price is part of the benchmark metric and the benchmark disclosure is publicly available.

4.2.9. The publication may only compare certified benchmarks of the same type, such as two ATO benchmarks or two SD benchmarks. Business transactions are the same for SD and SD parallel benchmarks, therefore, comparisons across these benchmarks are permitted.

4.2.10. It is not allowed to compare SAP Standard Application Benchmarks for SAP BW Releases <3.0 and >= 3.0.

4.2.11. In a comparison of Concurrent Benchmarks it is allowed to say one benchmark is better than the other, if the following criteria is met:
The summed up results of the benchmarks that the Concurrent Benchmark consists of AND the single largest benchmark result identifier that is part of the Concurrent Benchmark is better than the compared Concurrent Benchmark. If the above is not true than only single benchmark KPIs can be compared only stating the KPI in one benchmark is higher than in the other. It is not allowed to compare Concurrent Benchmarks with other benchmarks. It is allowed to set results side by side with all required minimum data including benchmark type and shared resources (if applicable).

4.2.12 Cloud benchmarks can only be compared with on-premise benchmarks if the CPU utilization level on hardware/hypervisor on the cloud instance is part of the published data.

4.2.13. In a comparison of BW-EML Benchmarks it is allowed to say one benchmark is better than the other, if the following criterion is met:
The number of ad-hoc navigation steps is equal to the Baseline and the number of initial records is greater than the Baseline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ad-hoc Steps</th>
<th>Navigation</th>
<th>Number of Initial Records</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000,000,000</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,000,000,000</td>
<td>Better Result</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of ad-hoc navigation steps is greater than the Baseline and the number of initial records is equal to the Baseline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ad-hoc Steps</th>
<th>Navigation</th>
<th>Number of Initial Records</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000,000,000</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000,000,000</td>
<td>Better Result</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both the number of ad-hoc navigation steps and number of initial records are greater than the Baseline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ad-hoc Steps</th>
<th>Navigation</th>
<th>Number of Initial Records</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000,000,000</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,000,000,000</td>
<td>Better Result</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.14 In a comparison of BW-AML Benchmarks it is allowed to say one benchmark is better than the other as follows:

- All 3 KPIs of the first BW-AML benchmark are better than the second Benchmark’s KPIs. Both Benchmarks have the same number of initial records.
- Making a statement that one KPI is better/best. One of the KPIs of the first BW-AML benchmark is better than the second Benchmark’s same KPI. Both Benchmarks have the same number of initial records.

It is not allowed to state that one benchmark is better than the other if both are in different categories concerning the number of initial records.

4.3 Fence Claims

In a publication, it is allowed to include so-called fence claims, which indicate segmentation. In a fence claim, a leadership/world record result is claimed for one or more segments (fences). Non-leadership claims require ranking prominently visible in the publication.

The leadership statement refers to the appropriate KPI as specified in Table 1 in Chapter 4.

For benchmarks with more than one throughput number (currently only TRBK) the leadership statement has to be specified in case the published benchmark is not leading in all areas (i.e. TRBK Day processing, TRBK Night processing).

The segment for which leadership is claimed must be mentioned fully in the title or subtitle of the publication, with the following exception:

If a publication deals with multiple world record benchmarks - either multiple world record SAP benchmarks or multiple world record benchmarks of different standards bodies (e.g. SAP, TPC and SPEC) - the world record statement in the title or subtitle does not need to specify the fences for which the records are claimed. For example, it is permitted to say „Server XYZ achieves new world record results on standard benchmarks“ if the publication describes SAP and TPC world record benchmarks.

However, in the main body text, the fence claims on SAP benchmarks must adhere to the publication rules for fence claims, as described below.

4.3.1 All Benchmarks apart from Concurrent Benchmarks and Cloud Benchmarks segmentation is permitted for the following categories:

4.3.1.1 Two-tier or three-tier configurations

4.3.1.2 Fence claims will be allowed for the following configurations, as shown in the benchmark certificate (two-tier: central system; three-tier: database system):
• Number of processors only
• Number of cores only
• Both the number of processors and cores

If the number of processors and/or cores is used for segmentation purposes, the two-tier or three-tier fence is mandatory. The number of processors and cores and threads must be included in the main body text. If one of the following: processor, core, thread, CPU, n-way or any equivalent statement is mentioned in the publication then processor and cores and threads must be included.

4.3.1.3 Operating system platforms as follows:
• Linux
• OS/400
• Unix
• Windows
• z/OS

4.3.1.4 Single-DB-Node/Multi-DB-Node

4.3.2 ERP and SAP Power Benchmarks
Segmentation is permitted for the following categories

4.3.2.1 The categories listed in section 4.3.1.1, section 4.3.1.2 and section 4.3.1.3 above

4.3.2.2 The SAP Release as stated in the SAP Standard Application Benchmark Certificate
• SAP enhancement package 5 for SAP ERP 6.0
• SAP enhancement package 4 for SAP ERP 6.0
• SAP ERP 6.0 (2005)
• SAP ERP 5.0 (2004)
• SAP R/3 Enterprise 4.70
• SAP R/3 4.6C

4.3.3 BI-MXL Benchmark
In addition to the above segmentation is permitted for the following categories:

4.3.3.1 With BI-Accelerator and without BI-Accelerator configurations

4.3.3.2 Number of records as follows:

* Considered to be a release for purpose of SAP Standard Application Benchmarks and associated publications. For more details visit www.sap.com/benchmark.
4.3.4 BW-EML Benchmark
In addition to the above segmentation is permitted for the following categories:

4.3.4.1 With BI-Accelerator and without BI-Accelerator configurations

4.3.4.2 Number of records as follows:
- 500 million
- 1 billion
- 2 billion
- Further configurations in steps of 1,000 million records

4.3.5 BW-AML Benchmark
In addition to the above segmentation is permitted for the following categories:

4.3.5.1 Number of records as follows:
- 2 billion
- 4 billion
- 8 billion
- 16 billion

4.3.6 For Concurrent Benchmarks there are no fence claims defined. Fence claims cannot be used for concurrent benchmarks.

4.3.7 For Cloud Benchmarks valid fence claims are:
- Deployment Type Cloud
- 2-tier / 3-tier (see chapter 4.3.1.1)
- Operating system platform (see chapter 4.3.1.3)
- SAP Release (see chapter 4.3.2.2)
- For BI-MXL, BW-EML and BW-AML number of records (see chapters 4.3.3 and 4.3.4)
- Single-DB-Node/Multi-DB-Node (see chapter 3)

4.3.8 Any combination of the above segmentation categories (within sections 4.3.1 and 4.3.2) with regard to an SAP Standard Application Benchmark is permitted in a fence claim.

4.3.9 For a fence claim, it is mandatory to include the “As-Of-Date” and the specific name of the SAP Standard Application Benchmark conducted (e.g., SD / SD-Parallel, ATO, MM, etc.).

An “As-Of-Date” indicates the point in time when a certain fence claim statement made in a publication is valid. The “As-Of-Date” has to be explicitly written in the publication. An implicit date such as “date of publication” is not sufficient. The exact wording is not defined, but it must be clearly identifiable as an “As-Of-Date.”

4.3.10 Examples
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It is allowed to use common wording such as “record,” “world record,” and so
on, provided it is a true statement at the time of the “As-Of-Date.”

Examples are:

- Best 32 processor, three-tier SAP SD Standard Application
  Benchmark result on Windows
- Best 36 processor and 72 cores, two-tier SAP ATO Standard
  Application Benchmark result on UNIX as of July 14, 2003
- Best in class up to 16 cores, two-tier SAP SD Standard
  Application Benchmark result
- Leading 4 processor, two-tier SAP TRBK Standard Application
  Benchmark Day processing result
- Best three-tier, SAP MM Standard Application Benchmark
  result on Windows
- Four processor performance leader on two-tier SAP ATO
  Standard Application Benchmark

Specific examples for the BI-MXL benchmark are:

- Best SAP BI Mixed Load Standard Application benchmark result
  using BI Accelerator based on a 1 billion initial records loaded
- Top SAP BI Mixed Load Standard Application benchmark result for
  initial record load of 300 million

Specific examples for the BW-EML benchmark are:

- Out front SAP BW Enhanced Mixed Load Standard Application
  benchmark result using BI Accelerator based on a 1 billion initial
  records loaded
- Best SAP BW Enhanced Mixed Load Standard Application
  benchmark result for initial record load of 1 billion

Specific examples for the BW-AML benchmark are:

- Out front SAP BW Advanced Mixed Load Standard Application
  benchmark result based on a 2 billion initial records loaded
- Best SAP BW Advanced Mixed Load Standard Application
  benchmark result for initial record load of 2 billion

For non-record results to be compared it is required ranking within the Fence
Claim category be specified.

Examples are:

- 2nd Best 2 processor, two-tier SAP SD Standard Application
  Benchmark result on Windows as of July 14, 2014
- 8 processor, three-Tier SAP SD Standard Application Benchmark
  result ranking 3rd on Linux as of July 14, 2014
5. Challenge Process

In general, technology partners or involved parties are encouraged to solve possible issues regarding the publication of SAP benchmark results among themselves (self-governance principle). The involvement of the Workgroup should not be the standard procedure.

However, if an issue cannot be resolved in this manner, then a challenge can be officially submitted to the Workgroup. The following section describes this challenge process.

5.1. Submitting a Challenge
The challenging party (challenger) sends an e-mail to the chairperson of the Workgroup and the challenged party (company representatives in Workgroup). The e-mail must include:

5.1.1. A description of the violation
5.1.2. A reference or document to which the violation refers
5.1.3. An e-mail address and phone number of the challenger

5.2. Challenge Timeline

5.2.1 The challenged party must respond to the challenging party and chairperson of the Workgroup within three business days indicating they have seen the challenge and propose a timeline over the following four business days to resolve the challenge which needs to be agreed to by the challenging party. Each company in the workgroup must have coverage during all business days.

5.2.2 The challenge must be submitted at least seven business days prior to the next Workgroup conference call meeting (regular monthly or special session) for voting to take place, whereby the sent date of the e-mail is the start date of the challenge. If the seven-business-day deadline cannot be adhered to, the challenge will be presented during the next scheduled Workgroup conference call (regular monthly or special session).

During the time until the relevant conference call, the involved parties can still resolve the challenge on their own. If the issue is successfully resolved during this time, all parties involved must send a confirmation e-mail to the chair of the Workgroup.
5.3. **Workgroup Conference Call**

5.3.1. If the parties were able to resolve the issue after the challenge was submitted, then the challenge is closed and not brought up during the next scheduled Workgroup conference call.

5.3.2. If the parties were not able to resolve the issue, the challenge will be decided by the Workgroup. Each party has a maximum of 10 minutes to present his or her case. After discussion, the Workgroup votes on the challenge.

5.4. **Workgroup Vote**

5.4.1. If the Workgroup votes that the submitted challenge is not valid, the case is closed from the Workgroup perspective.

5.4.2. If the Workgroup confirms that a party violated a benchmark publication rule, the violation will be posted on the public benchmark Web site. The entry in the violation list will usually be available on the Web page within two business days after the Workgroup ruling.

The violation list includes:

- 5.4.2.1. Date of the Workgroup vote
- 5.4.2.2. Company name of the challenged party
- 5.4.2.3. Description of the violation
- 5.4.2.4. Corrective actions
- 5.4.2.5. Clarification from the Workgroup

5.5. **Corrective Action**

In the case of a confirmed challenge, the Workgroup expects the challenged company in violation to execute corrective action as soon as possible.

6. **Withdrawal of a Certified Benchmark Result**

The benchmark council has the right to withdraw a certified benchmark in certain instances, such as when the 6-months rule is violated (Hardware and system software components must be available or must become generally available within the next six months after certification). After the result is withdrawn, it will be removed from the benchmark list on the SAP benchmark Web page ideally within two working days.

In addition, an entry on the SAP benchmark violation list will be created within two working days after the Council has withdrawn the result. The entry in the violation list includes a description of the violation.

The partner that must withdraw a benchmark result and all other companies that refer to the withdrawn result are asked to remove all mentions of the result from their Web pages and all other publications and sources under their control within 10 business days.
7. **Temporary De-Listing**

In certain circumstances a certified SAP benchmark result can be de-listed from the Web site. These are situations where the partner needs to limit publication to only the certification notification e-mail from SAP (e.g., marketing launch delay, clarification required, partner synchronization, etc.).

The partner must officially request the de-listing from the Web site by contacting Tobias Kutning of the SAP Benchmark Council at tobias.kutning@sap.com, and including a detailed justification in the e-mail. The de-listing will last for a maximum of 20 working days from sending the original e-mail to Tobias Kutning, at which time it will be reposted to the Web site at the latest point in time possible. A benchmark can be de-listed only once.

8. **Workgroup Conference Calls**

The Publication Workgroup holds regular monthly conference call meetings on the Thursday before the Benchmark Council meeting (9 a.m. to 11 a.m. Pacific Time, 6 p.m. to 8 p.m. Central Europe Time). SAP Benchmark Council meetings are held on the second Wednesday of each month without fail.

The Publication Workgroup holds special session conference call meetings as need arises and is requested by a Workgroup member(s). Scheduling is handled by the Chairperson.

If, at the official starting time of the meeting, a simple majority of the workgroup members is present, the conference call begins immediately. If this is not the case the meeting begins when enough members have dialed in to constitute a simple majority, but no later than 10 minutes after the official starting time. If there are no points on the agenda, the meeting automatically ends 10 minutes after the official starting time. Members who were not in the call at this point in time are counted as absent.

8.1. **Chairperson of the Workgroup Conference Call**

The Workgroup’s conference call is chaired by one person. The chairperson is a company’s representative and hosts four consecutive regular monthly conference calls. After that, the chair goes to the representative of the company that is next in alphabetical order.

8.2. **Responsibilities of the Chairperson**

The chairperson sends out the agenda and conference call dial-in information to the Workgroup members via e-mail at the latest three business day before the Workgroup regular monthly conference call and one business day before the Workgroup special session conference call.

The chairperson writes the meeting minutes and distributes them via e-mail to the Workgroup members within five business days of the conference call.

The chairperson regularly checks the sapbenchmarkchair@yahoo.com mailbox for new agenda items or other communications from workgroup team members.
The chairperson is responsible for maintaining the spreadsheet with member contact information and company call attendance. At the end of a chairperson’s term, the chairperson is responsible for forwarding the updated spreadsheet and mailbox password on to the new chairperson.

9. **Company Representation in the Workgroup**

9.1. **Workgroup Member Companies**
The current list of member companies can be found on the benchmark Web page, where company names are listed in alphabetical order.

A company qualifies as a full member of the Publication Workgroup if it has gained the right to vote at least once (see section 9.4). If, after having obtained full membership, a company fails to participate in the publication calls more than 6 times in a row, full membership is lost and will have to be regained, as described.

For more information on member companies and contact information, contact Tobias Kutning at tobias.kutning@sap.com.

9.2. **Company Representative**
Each qualified company may provide up to two representatives for the Workgroup.

9.3. **Change of Company Representative(s)**
In case of a change of representative(s), the company must send an e-mail to the current chairperson of the Workgroup conference calls alerting him or her of the change.

9.4. **Voting Rights of the Company Representative**
The company representative(s) participate in Workgroup conference call meetings on behalf of their companies. Each company has one vote.

The member company loses the right to vote if none of the company’s representative(s) participated in the workgroup regular monthly conference call three times in a row. This automatically changes the member status of the company from active to passive.

The member company regains the right to vote immediately after participating in two consecutive Workgroup regular monthly conference calls. This automatically changes the member status of the company from passive to active.

9.5. **Quorum**
In Workgroup calls, at least a simple majority of the voting members must be present to constitute a quorum.

9.6. **Motions**
The outcome of a vote on a motion is based on a simple majority. The possible votes are yes, no and abstain.

Examples:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Abstain</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Motion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>passes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>does not pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>does not pass</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Copyright Handling of the Benchmark Policy

10.1. Submitting a Copyright Request
A copyright request must be submitted via e-mail to the Workgroup chairperson e-mail account sapbenchmarkchair@yahoo.com, at least two business days prior to the next Workgroup regular monthly conference-call meeting. The request must include:

10.1.1. All sections and paragraphs that are to be covered by the copyright
10.1.2. A description and purpose of why the copyright is being requested

10.2. Approval of a Copyright Request
A copyright request will be presented by the chairperson and will be followed by:

10.2.1. A discussion of the Workgroup
10.2.2. A motion to accept a request

The requesting party will be notified of the status of the request and the outcome of the motion by the chairperson. If the Workgroup needs more information about this request, they can defer a decision until the next conference call.

11. Feedback, Comments, Openness Statement
The Workgroup invites all interested companies to use and refer to the rules defined in this paper. This document emphasizes the self-governing practices of the Workgroup and their attempts to evolve application benchmarks and technology to a higher and common standard in the industry. Comments and feedback are appreciated. Please feel free to contact the Workgroup via e-mail at sapbenchmarkchair@yahoo.com.

# # #
Appendix: General Terminology Recommendations

The following recommendations have been provided by SAP Global Communications:

**SAP Standard Application Benchmarks**
- Capitalize "SAP Standard Application Benchmarks" in titles, headings and subheads, PPT titles, and other places where title case is required only
- Lowercase “SAP standard application benchmarks” in body text

**SAP Application Performance Standard (SAPS)**
- Upon first mention, fully write the term “SAP Application Performance Standard (SAPS)”
- You may optionally follow SAPS immediately with the lowercase descriptor “values” or “unit of measurement”
- Do not precede “SAPS” with “the” unless a descriptor (e.g. “value”) immediately follows the name

No part of this document may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or for any purpose without the express permission of the SAP Benchmark Publication Workgroup. The information contained herein may be changed without prior notice.

SAP, R/3, mySAP, the SAP logo and all other SAP product and service names mentioned herein are trademarks or registered trademarks of SAP SE in Germany and in several other countries all over the world.

All other product and service names mentioned are the trademarks of their respective companies.

Data contained in this document serves informational purposes only. National product specifications may vary.