

BenchmarkCards: Large Language Model and Risk Reporting

Anna Sokol¹, Nuno Moniz¹, Elizabeth Daly², Michael Hind³, Nitesh Chawla¹

¹University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, USA

²IBM Research, Ireland

³IBM Research, NY, USA

Abstract

Large language models (LLMs) offer powerful capabilities but also introduce significant risks. One way to mitigate these risks is through comprehensive pre-deployment evaluations using benchmarks designed to test for specific vulnerabilities. However, the rapidly expanding body of LLM benchmark literature lacks a standardized method for documenting crucial benchmark details, hindering consistent use and informed selection. BenchmarkCards addresses this gap by providing a structured framework specifically for documenting LLM benchmark properties rather than defining the entire evaluation process itself. BenchmarkCards do not prescribe how to measure or interpret benchmark results (e.g., defining “correctness”) but instead offer a standardized way to capture and report critical characteristics like targeted risks and evaluation methodologies, including properties such as bias and fairness. This structured metadata facilitates informed benchmark selection, enabling researchers to choose appropriate benchmarks and promoting transparency and reproducibility in LLM evaluation.

1 Introduction

The rapid development of large language models has opened up new horizons in many fields, such as translation (Brants et al., 2007; Liu et al., 2023), programming (Nijkamp et al., 2022; Chen et al., 2021; Austin et al., 2021), medicine (Thirunavukarasu et al., 2023; Clusmann et al., 2023; Singhal et al., 2023; Yang et al., 2022), law (Chalkidis et al., 2021; Savelka et al., 2023; Hamilton, 2023), or social sciences (Aher et al., 2023; Pellert et al., 2023; Park et al., 2023). This rapid advancement, however, brings significant risks, including the potential for generating biased, harmful, or misleading content, eroding public trust, and facilitating malicious activities like disinformation campaigns and fraud (Weidinger et al., 2021, 2022; Kasneci et al., 2023; Ghosh et al., 2024;

Chen and Shu, 2023; Yang et al., 2024; Yao et al., 2024). These risks often surface only after deployment, underscoring the crucial need for robust pre-deployment evaluation.

A central component of pre-deployment evaluation is the use of standardized benchmarks. In this context, a **benchmark** is defined as a combination of a dataset, evaluation metrics, and associated pre- and post-processing steps used to assess specific aspects of LLM performance (Bandel et al., 2024). **Risk** refers to the potential for LLMs to produce undesirable or harmful outcomes, such as generating biased, misleading, or harmful content.

However, without standardized documentation, it becomes difficult to understand how effectively a benchmark addresses these risks. *This absence of standardization hinders clear communication of crucial information, including the specific risks a benchmark addresses, its objectives, underlying assumptions, risks, data, and pipeline stage.* It can be particularly problematic for high-impact applications, making it difficult for policymakers, researchers, and the public to understand the limitations and potential biases of these benchmarks and, consequently, the LLMs they evaluate.

To address this critical gap, we introduce BenchmarkCards, a framework inspired by similar initiatives like Model Cards (Mitchell et al., 2019), FactSheets (Arnold et al., 2019), Datasheets for Datasets (Gebru et al., 2021), and Risk Cards (Derczynski et al., 2023). Following the conceptualization in (Bandel et al., 2024), we define a benchmark as comprising a dataset, a metric, and associated pre- and post-processing steps. BenchmarkCards provide concise, structured summaries of key benchmark attributes relevant to risk assessment, including details of the dataset, the chosen metric (e.g. robustness, fairness, privacy), and any pre- or post-processing steps.

This research seeks to address the following key research questions:

RQ1 What key elements are necessary for a standardized BenchmarkCard template to effectively describe both the targeted LLM risks *and* the potential limitations/biases of the benchmark itself (e.g., dataset details, metrics, pre/post-processing)?

RQ2 How can BenchmarkCards best communicate the strengths and limitations of LLM risk benchmarks to inform user decisions regarding benchmark selection and result interpretation (e.g., scope, purpose, biases, comparison with related benchmarks)?

2 Motivation

The growing body of literature on LLM benchmarks highlights the challenge of identifying appropriate benchmarks for assessing specific risks or performance aspects. Benchmarks often differ significantly in their objectives, assessment metrics, and the risks they address, making selection and comparison difficult.

A lack of standardized documentation further exacerbates the problem, as key information—such as benchmark assumptions, methodologies, and limitations—is not consistently communicated. This can lead to uninformed decision-making and may obscure important model flaws, such as biases or vulnerabilities until they appear in real-world applications with high stakes.

It is important to add that it is difficult to track which risks have been thoroughly evaluated and which remain under-explored. This lack of clarity may prevent the identification of critical blind spots in existing benchmarks, particularly in areas like societal impacts or ethical concerns. To demonstrate it, we reviewed benchmark literature to better understand how they address different risks associated with LLMs. Figure 1 in the appendix provides a detailed visualization and shows the complexity. Furthermore, without a unified documentation standard, it becomes challenging to build on previous work, slowing progress in improving LLM evaluation practices.

BenchmarkCards address these challenges by offering a structured, standardized format for documenting benchmarks. They provide comprehensive information that is accessible to developers, evaluators, and decision-makers, facilitating informed benchmark selection, consistent interpretation of evaluation results, and better comparisons across studies.

3 Related Work

Recognizing the potential for unintended consequences and ethical challenges posed by LLMs, researchers have actively developed various documentation frameworks for data and models. However, the documentation frameworks described below are not specifically tailored to LLMs. This highlights one of the main points of novelty for our work: there are no standardized LLM risk assessment documentation frameworks currently proposed.

3.1 Documentation Frameworks

Gebru et al. (2021), introduced Datasheets for Datasets, providing a structured framework for documenting datasets' creation, composition, and intended uses. This approach encourages careful reflection on data provenance and potential biases, promoting greater transparency and enabling researchers to make more informed decisions about dataset use.

Bender and Friedman (2018) introduced Data Statements for Natural Language Processing for documenting datasets, specifically highlighting the potential for biases embedded in linguistic data to negatively impact model performance and fairness. Their framework characterizes datasets based on language variety, speaker demographics, annotation details, and potential ethical considerations, encouraging developers to carefully consider the representativeness of their data. Later, Pushkarna et al. (2022) introduced "Data Cards" as a framework for human-centric and purposeful dataset documentation. Data Cards provide structured summaries of essential facts about ML datasets, covering aspects like data provenance, collection methods, intended use cases, fairness considerations, and potential risks.

Building on the concept of thorough documentation, Arnold et al. (2019) developed FactSheets to comprehensively document AI services. FactSheets detail the purpose, performance, safety, and ethical considerations of AI services. Authors claim that their approach is helping to build trust between AI service providers and consumers.

In the same year, Mitchell et al. (2019) proposed Model Cards, which focus on documenting machine learning models. Model Cards provide information on a model's intended use, performance metrics, and ethical considerations. They can help users understand a model's strengths and weak-

nesses to support responsible and effective AI deployment. One of the latest model and system card (Alsallakh et al., 2022) examples are GPT-4 System Card and GPT-4o System Card shows the overview of the model capabilities, limitations, and safety evaluations. The CLEAR Documentation Framework provides recommendations for AI transparency to both practitioners and policy-makers by encouraging thorough documentation through structured templates. (Chmielinski, 2024)

Extending the focus to the ethical implications of the models, Derczynski et al. (2023) introduced Risk Cards to assess the potential risks associated with deploying models. Risk Cards identify and document various harms that could arise from model misuse, highlighting the importance of considering ethical implications during deployment.

However, there are no standardized LLM risk documentation frameworks yet, emphasizing the novelty of our work.

3.2 LLM Risk Assessment

Evaluating the risks associated with LLMs requires a comprehensive approach that takes into account various factors, such as the model’s lifecycle stages, data inputs, and outputs. Several frameworks have been developed to categorize these risks systematically. LM Eval Harness is a popular evaluation framework which contains 100s of benchmark tasks¹, however how to interpret each benchmark and identifying what is being measured by these tasks is left to the practitioner to uncover (Gao et al., 2024). The burden to communicate the significance of what scores associated with selected tasks is also left to the practitioner when taking into account other stakeholders in the AI lifecycle (Richards et al., 2020; Cihon et al., 2021).

By mapping current LLM benchmarks to the risks taxonomies — such as the OWASP Generative AI Security Risk List (Project, 2024), the MIT AI Risk Taxonomy (for Deployable Machine Learning, 2024), and the NIST AI Risk Management Framework (of Standards and Technology, 2023) — we can reveal significant gaps in how existing benchmarks cover critical risks. This process helps highlight areas where more attention is needed to ensure comprehensive risk assessment and mitigation. For instance, the IBM AI Risk Atlas (2024)

offers a taxonomy that classifies risks based on data inputs, model outputs, and the different phases of the model lifecycle (training, tuning, and inference).

For example, despite the severe potential consequences of *harmful code generation*—where malicious code execution could compromise IT systems and lead to legal and financial repercussions—we identified no existing benchmarks specifically designed to evaluate this risk. This underscores the urgent need for developing and documenting benchmarks that address the full spectrum of LLM risks, particularly those with potentially high real-world impact. Additionally, these benchmark cards can enable practitioners to more consistently communicate to non-technical stakeholders how to interpret results from these benchmarks.

For the purposes of this paper, and to illustrate the Benchmark card concept, we focus on a subset of risks, specifically those related to bias and fairness. To illustrate the complexity issue, we examine several benchmarks designed to assess these risks. For example, Winogrande (Sakaguchi et al., 2021) focuses on general common-sense reasoning and pronoun resolution, Winogender (Gallegos et al., 2024), WinoBias (Zhao et al., 2018) and Winopron (Gautam et al., 2024) focuses on gender bias by evaluating how models handle gender-specific pronouns and roles in sentences. It checks whether the model can accurately predict the gender of a person based on context without falling into stereotypes. Additionally, WinoQueer (Felkner et al., 2023) assesses biases in LGBTQ+ contexts. This dataset evaluates how models handle sentences involving sexual orientation and gender identity, checking for any presence of bias or derogatory language.

Similarly, RealToxicityPrompts (Gehman et al., 2020) identifies toxic language, especially related to targeting marginalized groups. It measures how likely a model is to generate harmful or offensive content when given prompts related to these groups, ensuring that the model does not propagate derogatory language.

Moreover, BBQ (Park et al., 2023) evaluates fairness in responses concerning age, physical appearance, race, ethnicity, gender identity, sexual orientation, religion, disability, and socioeconomic status. It tests how models respond to questions about these attributes, ensuring that answers are unbiased and do not reinforce harmful stereotypes.

Other examples include Bias NLI (Dev et al.,

¹https://github.com/EleutherAI/lm-evaluation-harness/tree/0845b588303f1f59af98dd1c5bdbd78a9e75a1e2/lm_eval/tasks

2020), which focuses on biases arising from linguistic nuances in natural language inference tasks; StereoSet (Nadeem et al., 2020), which measures stereotypical biases across multiple demographic groups; TrustGPT (Huang et al., 2023), designed to evaluate various aspects of trustworthiness, including bias, toxicity and value-alignment; and HolisticBias (Smith et al., 2022), a large-scale dataset for measuring a wide range of biases across different social groups. . Furthermore, benchmarks like CrowS-Pairs (Nangia et al., 2020) address social biases in masked language models, and datasets such as ToxiGen (Hartvigsen et al., 2022), Ethos (Mollas et al., 2020), and HateCheck (Röttger et al., 2020) provide resources for evaluating toxicity and hate speech detection.

Evaluating the risks associated with LLMs is a complex task requiring an in-depth perspective. Benchmarking efforts must go beyond traditional performance metrics and systematically assess these multifaceted risks. It is important to note that benchmarks vary in their structure and components.

4 BenchmarkCards

BenchmarkCards serve to comprehensively document information about an LLM benchmark, including its objectives, underlying assumptions, interaction paradigms, data coverage, pipeline stage and the risks it measures. This includes how it was built, what assumptions were made during its development, and an evaluation of how well the benchmark performs. Here, we propose a set of sections that BenchmarkCards should have. To address **RQ1**, we propose a standardized template for BenchmarkCards (Table 1) that effectively captures the performance metrics and risks of LLMs by incorporating key elements.

The proposed set of sections below are intended to provide relevant details to consider but are not intended to be complete or exhaustive and may be tailored depending on the benchmark, context, and stakeholders. Additional details may include, for example, interpretability approaches, stakeholder-relevant explanations, and privacy approaches used in benchmark development and evaluation. The structure of BenchmarkCards ensures that users have access to critical information needed to understand the benchmark’s objectives, applicability, data quality, evaluation methods, potential risks, and ethical considerations. By focusing on these

key areas, BenchmarkCards facilitate informed decision-making, helping users select appropriate benchmarks and accurately interpret results, thus promoting transparency and accountability in LLM risk assessment.

4.1 Benchmark Details

This section of a BenchmarkCard provides basic information about the benchmark, including its name, a brief overview of its purpose and scope, the type of data used (e.g., text, code, question-answer pairs), relevant application domains, and the languages represented in the benchmark data, and similar benchmarks.

4.2 Purpose and Intended Users

This section describes the benchmark’s primary objective, intended applications, target users, and specific tasks evaluated. It clarifies appropriate and inappropriate uses, providing context and highlighting limitations and out-of-scope applications to prevent misinterpretations and misuse. This helps users understand the benchmark’s strengths and limitations in context, aiding benchmark selection and result interpretation (**RQ2**).

Beyond identifying the risks a benchmark addresses, the card clarifies its broader goals, evaluation metrics, and interaction mode assumptions. This systemic approach provides a deeper understanding of what constitutes good or poor performance within the benchmark’s specific context. By clarifying the limitations of the assessment metrics themselves, BenchmarkCards empowers users to accurately interpret results, avoiding superficial interpretations based solely on numerical scores.

4.3 Data

This section provides comprehensive information about the data used in the benchmark and the evaluation process. It includes the origin of the data, the scale, and its representation. If applicable, it also details the method used for data annotation. This section is important because data quality, representativeness, and potential biases directly impact the benchmark’s effectiveness in evaluating models. By documenting these aspects, users can make informed decisions about the applicability of the benchmark to their models and identify any limitations that may affect their evaluations. Knowing about the data helps users assess if the benchmark is suitable for their models and understand any data-related issues that could affect results.

BenchmarkCard
<p>Benchmark Details</p> <p>Name: The official name of the benchmark.</p> <p>Overview: A brief description of the benchmark’s main goals and scope.</p> <p>Data Type: The type of data used in the benchmark (e.g., text, images, or multi-modal).</p> <p>Domains: The specific domains or areas where the benchmark is applied (e.g., natural language processing, computer vision).</p> <p>Languages: The languages included in the dataset used by the benchmark (e.g., English, multilingual).</p> <p>Similar Benchmarks: Benchmarks that are closely related in terms of goals or data type.</p> <p>Resources: Links to relevant resources, such as repositories or papers related to the benchmark.</p>
<p>Purpose and Intended Users</p> <p>Goal: The specific goal or primary use case the benchmark is designed for.</p> <p>Audience: The intended audience, such as researchers, developers, policymakers, etc.</p> <p>Tasks: The tasks or evaluations the benchmark is intended to assess.</p> <p>Out-of-Scope Uses: Use cases where the benchmark is not designed to be applied and could give misleading results.</p>
<p>Data</p> <p>Source: The origin or source of the data used in the benchmark (e.g., curated datasets, user submissions).</p> <p>Size: The size of the dataset, including the number of data points or examples.</p> <p>Format: The structure and modality of the data (e.g., sentence pairs, question-answer format, tabular data).</p> <p>Annotation: The process used to annotate or label the dataset, including who or what performed the annotations (e.g., human annotators, automated processes).</p>
<p>Methodology</p> <p>Methods: The evaluation techniques applied within the benchmark.</p> <p>Metrics: The specific performance metrics used to assess models (e.g., accuracy, F1 score, precision, recall).</p> <p>Calculation: The way metrics are computed based on model outputs and the benchmark data.</p> <p>Interpretation: How users should interpret the scores or results from the metrics.</p> <p>Baseline Results: The results of well-known or widely used models to give context to new performance scores.</p> <p>Validation: Measures taken to ensure that the benchmark provides valid and reliable evaluations.</p>
<p>Risks</p> <p>Risk Categories: Specific risks of LLMs the benchmark assesses</p> <p>Limitations: Limitations in evaluating or addressing risks, such as gaps in demographic coverage or specific domains.</p> <p>Demographic Analysis: How the benchmark evaluates performance across different demographic groups (e.g., gender, race).</p> <p>Harm: The types of harm assessed (e.g., offensive content, perpetuation of stereotypes).</p>
<p>Ethical and Legal Considerations</p> <p>Privacy and Anonymity: How any personal or sensitive data is handled and whether any anonymization techniques are applied.</p> <p>Data Licensing: The terms under which the data can be used, including licenses and any restrictions.</p> <p>Consent Procedures: Information on how consent was obtained (if applicable), especially for datasets involving personal data.</p> <p>Compliance with Regulations: Compliance with relevant legal or ethical regulations (if applicable).</p>

Table 1: Summary of BenchmarkCard sections with accurate descriptions.

	BBQ (Parrish et al., 2021)	RealToxicityPrompts (Gehman et al., 2020)
Benchmark Details		
Name	Bias Benchmark for Question Answering	RealToxicityPrompts
Overview	Assessing social biases in QA systems	Evaluating toxicity in language generation
Data Type	Text (QA pairs and contexts)	Text (prompts and continuations)
Domains	Social Bias, Fairness, QA	Toxicity Detection, Language Modeling, Controllable Generation
Languages	English	English
Similar Benchmarks	WINO-Bias (Zhao et al., 2018), StereoSet (Nadeem et al., 2020), CrowS-Pairs (Nangia et al., 2020)	ToxiGen (Hartvigsen et al., 2022), Ethos (Mollas et al., 2020), HateCheck (Röttger et al., 2020)
Resources	https://github.com/nyu-ml1/BBQ	http://toxicdegeneration.allenai.org/
Purpose and Intended Users		
Goal	Measure social biases in QA models	Measure and mitigate toxic degeneration in language models
Audience	NLP researchers, developers, ethics experts	NLP researchers, developers, AI safety experts
Tasks	QA with ambiguous and disambiguated contexts	Conditional text generation
Limitations	Focuses on US English, limited social bias categories	Reliance on automated toxicity detection which may exhibit biases
Out-of-Scope Uses	Deploying models without addressing biases	Using generated text without review/filtering
Data		
Source	Hand-crafted templates based on social biases	OpenWebText Corpus, Reddit
Size	58,492 unique examples	100K sentence-level prompts
Format	Textual QA pairs with contexts	Textual prompts with toxicity scores
Annotation	Crowdsourced validation	Toxicity scores generated by Perspective API
Methodology		
Methods	Evaluating responses in ambiguous and disambiguated contexts	Nucleus sampling for text generation. Detoxification through pretraining, attribute conditioning, and word filtering
Pipeline Stage	Inference, potential deployment if used for training	Inference, deployment in downstream applications
Metrics	Accuracy, Bias Score (sDIS, sAMB)	Expected maximum toxicity, toxicity probability
Calculation	Accuracy = % of correct answers. Bias Score = % of non-UNKNOWN answers that align with a social bias	Expected maximum toxicity estimated via bootstrap sampling. Toxicity probability = chance of generating toxic text at least once
Interpretation	Higher accuracy = better performance. Higher bias score = stronger reliance on social biases	Higher scores = greater tendency to generate toxic text
Results	Results for UnifiedQA, RoBERTa, DeBERTaV3	Results for GPT-1, GPT-2, GPT-3, CTRL, CTRL-WIKI
Validation	Human evaluation on MTurk	Toxicity evaluation via PERSPECTIVE API
Risks		
Risk Categories	Biases related to age, gender, race, religion and other protected groups in question answering	Risk of generating toxic or harmful language
Limitations	Limited to certain social bias categories and US English	Heavily reliant on automated toxicity detection, potential for misclassification
Demographic Analysis	Assesses bias across demographic groups	Evaluates toxicity risk across various demographic groups
Harm	Risk of perpetuating harmful stereotypes or biased predictions	Risk of generating offensive or harmful content
Ethical and Legal Considerations		
Privacy and Anonymity	Synthetic data, no personal information	Data from OpenWebText/Reddit; anonymization efforts made
Data Licensing	CC-BY-4.0	Apache-2.0
Consent Procedures	Not applicable	Data from public sources

Table 2: Comparison of BBQ and RealToxicityPrompts Benchmarks.

4.4 Methodology

This section details the methodology of using the benchmark to evaluate the LLM. It includes the evaluation techniques, the performance metrics applied, how these metrics are computed, and guidelines for interpreting them. Additional information, such as settings and prompting strategies, may also be included. Shortly it demonstrate how the benchmark measures model performance, helping users understand and correctly interpret the results.

For example, the MMLU (Massive Multitask Language Understanding) benchmark aims to assess knowledge across a number of subjects via multiple-choice questions. As a result, the performance of a model is not just based on its internal knowledge but also on its ability to follow instructions for formatting results, presence of positional bias (Wang et al., 2023), token bias (Zheng et al., 2023), etc. This illustrates the importance of the Methodology section in BenchmarkCards. By detailing the evaluation techniques, metrics, and potential confounding factors, the Methodology section allows developers and users to understand how to interpret the benchmark results accurately. Documenting these methodological details ensures that benchmark evaluations are understood in context and that models are assessed fairly and comprehensively.

It is important to mention that sometimes benchmarks include a set of prompts or tasks along with expected outputs, enabling the evaluation of model performance against predefined metrics. However, not all benchmarks incorporate explicit quantitative metrics or focus solely on qualitative assessments. For instance, some benchmarks emphasize human evaluations to assess aspects like coherence, relevance, or ethical considerations without predefined numerical scores. BenchmarkCards accommodate these variations by including sections that describe the evaluation methods, whether quantitative, qualitative, or a combination of both, ensuring comprehensive documentation of how each benchmark assesses LLM risks.

By maintaining a clear and consistent definition of benchmarks and emphasizing the inclusion of both quantitative and qualitative evaluation methods, BenchmarkCards provide a robust framework for documenting and assessing the multifaceted risks associated with large language models. This dual approach allows for a more nuanced understanding of model capabilities and limitations, fa-

cilitating more informed decision-making for researchers, developers, and policymakers.

4.5 Risks

This section is key because it outlines the specific risks the benchmark evaluates, helping users understand potential issues the model may have. To address **RQ2**, BenchmarkCards include this section that helps clarify the target risks a benchmark is designed to assess. We use an existing risk taxonomy selecting the IBM AI Risk Atlas to organize risks, such as the possibility of LLMs creating harmful content, and whether the benchmark data could be misused for purposes like generating spam or writing unsafe code. This section details how the benchmark accounts for each identified risk and specific potential harm.

4.6 Ethical and Legal Considerations

This section covers important ethical and legal aspects of the LLM benchmark, such as privacy and anonymity, data licensing, and consent procedures. By addressing these considerations, users are made aware of any ethical implications and potential risks associated with the benchmark, including biases, harmful content, or misuse, without creating a separate risks section.

In compliance with regulations like the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), BenchmarkCards should document how personal data is handled within the benchmark. This includes outlining any measures taken to anonymize data, obtain consent from data subjects, and ensure data minimization. Benchmarks involving user-generated content or personal information must detail their adherence to privacy laws and ethical guidelines, providing transparency about data collection and processing practices. This important is because it ensures the benchmark follows ethical standards and legal rules.

5 Case Studies

We present two case studies demonstrating how BenchmarkCards highlight key differences between benchmarks, aiding researchers in selecting appropriate evaluation tools for their specific objectives. Rather than directly comparing the benchmarks, we focus on their unique properties and intended use cases. Table 2 provides a structured summary of these properties.

Case Study 1: BBQ (Parrish et al., 2021) The BBQ benchmark (available under CC-BY-4.0) focuses on evaluating social biases in question-answering systems. It uses a dataset of question-answer pairs designed to probe for biases related to sensitive attributes like race, gender, religion, and others. The benchmark measures how likely a model is to provide different answers to the same question depending on the social group mentioned in the context. A BenchmarkCard for BBQ would highlight its focus on question answering, the specific types of biases it targets, its coverage of various demographic groups, and the metrics used.

Case Study 2: RealToxicityPrompts (Gehman et al., 2020) RealToxicityPrompts (available under Apache-2.0) is designed for evaluating the risk of toxic language generation in LLMs. It provides a dataset of prompts and uses automated methods to measure the toxicity of model-generated text. A BenchmarkCard for RealToxicityPrompts would emphasize its focus on language generation, the specific types of toxicity it assesses.

While both BBQ and RealToxicityPrompts address bias, they differ in their core application context. BBQ targets social biases within question-answering systems, whereas RealToxicityPrompts focuses on preventing the generation of toxic language in broader contexts. This distinction highlights the importance of providing clear examples and context within BenchmarkCards.

6 Discussion and Future Work

This paper introduces BenchmarkCards, a structured framework for documenting and evaluating LLM benchmarks, with particular consideration of the risks they target. However, developing a truly comprehensive and meaningful framework poses significant challenges. BenchmarkCards must consider the diverse linguistic landscape of LLMs, recognizing that different languages have unique characteristics and vulnerabilities. Existing benchmarks often reflect Western, English-speaking norms, potentially overlooking biases prevalent in other cultural contexts.

Evaluating benchmarks for specific risks, such as generating harmful code, presents challenges in determining suitable datasets and metrics, especially when the data is scarce or emerging risks are not yet well-defined. Additionally, the evolving nature of LLM benchmarks makes scalability and compre-

hensiveness difficult. Ensuring BenchmarkCards address the full spectrum of risks across numerous benchmarks, including those not fully disclosed or related to evolving capabilities, necessitates ongoing research and community collaboration.

Creating a BenchmarkCard template that can adapt to the evolving landscape of LLM risks is crucial. While it's impractical to expect benchmarks to cover every potential risk given the rapid pace of AI development, the template must be flexible enough to document both existing and emerging risks. This adaptability ensures that BenchmarkCards remain relevant and useful despite unforeseen model behaviors and evolving LLM capabilities.

One potential challenge associated with LLM benchmarks is the inherent subjectivity in certain aspects of their design and evaluation, such as dataset selection, metric definition, and evaluation criteria. BenchmarkCards aim to mitigate this subjectivity by providing a structured framework for transparently documenting these design choices and evaluation methodologies. These choices can be influenced by individual interpretations, biases, and assumptions. This documentation should include details about the rationale behind the chosen dataset, the specific metrics used (and why), the evaluation process, and any measures taken to address potential biases (e.g., standardized criteria and guidelines, inter-annotator agreement checks, annotator training, use of automated tools). By making these design choices and evaluation procedures explicit, BenchmarkCards promote greater understanding, scrutiny, and comparability of different benchmarks.

7 Conclusion

This paper presents BenchmarkCards, a framework for documenting LLM benchmarks, particularly with regard to the risks they address. This standardized approach aims to clarify benchmark properties and facilitate comparison, allowing researchers to make more informed choices about which benchmarks best suit their needs. While challenges remain, BenchmarkCards offer a valuable first step towards more transparent and accountable LLM evaluation, supporting responsible AI development and better understanding of LLMs.

8 Limitations

Sustainability and Maintenance: One challenge with BenchmarkCards is deciding who is responsi-

ble for creating and updating them. Many different individuals and organizations develop benchmarks. There is no single owner or manager of all benchmarks. We suggest hosting BenchmarkCards in a public repository - <https://anonymous.4open.science/r/BenchmarkCards-8A03/>. This way, the community can contribute, update, and improve them together. However, this relies on community participation and the oversight of repository maintainers.

Distributed Responsibility: The LLM ecosystem involves many stakeholders—benchmark creators, model developers, and users. This diversity makes it hard to assign responsibility for documenting benchmarks. We encourage benchmark creators to adopt BenchmarkCards. But widespread adoption depends on community norms and incentives.

Risk of Superficial Compliance: There is a risk that BenchmarkCards could become just a formality or a "box-ticking" exercise. This might prevent meaningful reflection or risk mitigation. However, it does not replace the need for active risk management and mitigation strategies.

Resource Constraints: Creating comprehensive BenchmarkCards takes time and effort. This can be a burden for researchers and organizations with limited resources. It might slow down the adoption of BenchmarkCards, especially for smaller teams. In the future, automated tools and community support could help reduce this burden.

Risk of Misuse: Detailed documentation, including limitations and biases, could be exploited by malicious actors. They might use this information to game the benchmarks or amplify harmful outputs. To lessen this risk, we should handle sensitive information carefully. We need to consider how much detail we share publicly.

Evolving Nature of Benchmarks and Risks: LLMs are advancing rapidly, and new risks are emerging. BenchmarkCards must adapt to capture these evolving risks and new evaluation methods. This requires ongoing updates and revisions. Maintaining this over time can be challenging.

References

Gati V Aher, Rosa I Arriaga, and Adam Tauman Kalai. 2023. Using large language models to simulate multiple humans and replicate human subject studies. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 337–371. PMLR.

B Alsallakh, A Cheema, C Procope, D Adkins, E McReynolds, E Wang, G Pehl, N Green, and P Zvyagina. 2022. System-level transparency of machine learning. Technical report, Technical Report.

Matthew Arnold, Rachel KE Bellamy, Michael Hind, Stephanie Houde, Sameep Mehta, Aleksandra Majsilović, Ravi Nair, K Natesan Ramamurthy, Alexandra Olteanu, David Piorkowski, et al. 2019. Fact-sheets: Increasing trust in ai services through supplier’s declarations of conformity. *IBM Journal of Research and Development*, 63(4/5):6–1.

Jacob Austin, Augustus Odena, Maxwell Nye, Maarten Bosma, Henryk Michalewski, David Dohan, Ellen Jiang, Carrie Cai, Michael Terry, Quoc Le, et al. 2021. Program synthesis with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.07732*.

Elron Bandel, Yotam Perlit, Elad Venezian, Roni Friedman-Melamed, Ofir Arviv, Matan Orbach, Shachar Don-Yehyia, Dafna Sheinwald, Ariel Gera, Leshem Choshen, et al. 2024. Unitxt: Flexible, shareable and reusable data preparation and evaluation for generative ai. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.14019*.

Emily M Bender and Batya Friedman. 2018. Data statements for natural language processing: Toward mitigating system bias and enabling better science. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 6:587–604.

Thorsten Brants, Ashok Popat, Peng Xu, Franz Josef Och, and Jeffrey Dean. 2007. Large language models in machine translation. In *Proceedings of the 2007 Joint Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and Computational Natural Language Learning (EMNLP-CoNLL)*, pages 858–867.

Ilias Chalkidis, Abhik Jana, Dirk Hartung, Michael Bommarito, Ion Androutsopoulos, Daniel Martin Katz, and Nikolaos Aletras. 2021. Lexglue: A benchmark dataset for legal language understanding in english. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.00976*.

Canyu Chen and Kai Shu. 2023. Combating misinformation in the age of llms: Opportunities and challenges. *AI Magazine*.

Mark Chen, Jerry Tworek, Heewoo Jun, Qiming Yuan, Henrique Ponde De Oliveira Pinto, Jared Kaplan, Harri Edwards, Yuri Burda, Nicholas Joseph, Greg Brockman, et al. 2021. Evaluating large language models trained on code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.03374*.

Kate Chmielinski. 2024. [The clear documentation framework: Ai transparency recommendations for practitioners in context for policymakers](#). Technical report, Shorenstein Center on Media, Politics and Public Policy, Harvard Kennedy School. Accessed: 2024-10-07.

Peter Cihon, Jonas Schuett, and Seth D Baum. 2021. Corporate governance of artificial intelligence in the public interest. *Information*, 12(7):275.

- Jan Clusmann, Fiona R Kolbinger, Hannah Sophie Muti, Zunamys I Carrero, Jan-Niklas Eckardt, Narmin Ghaffari Laleh, Chiara Maria Lavinia Löffler, Sophie-Caroline Schwarzkopf, Michaela Unger, Gregory P Veldhuizen, et al. 2023. The future landscape of large language models in medicine. *Communications medicine*, 3(1):141.
- Leon Derczynski, Hannah Rose Kirk, Vidhisha Balachandran, Sachin Kumar, Yulia Tsvetkov, Mark R Leiser, and Saif Mohammad. 2023. Assessing language model deployment with risk cards. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.18190*.
- Sunipa Dev, Tao Li, Jeff M Phillips, and Vivek Srikrumar. 2020. On measuring and mitigating biased inferences of word embeddings. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 34, pages 7659–7666.
- Virginia K Felkner, Ho-Chun Herbert Chang, Eugene Jang, and Jonathan May. 2023. Winoqueer: A community-in-the-loop benchmark for anti-lgbtq+ bias in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.15087*.
- MIT Center for Deployable Machine Learning. 2024. [Mit ai risk atlas](#). Accessed: 2024-10-27.
- Isabel O Gallegos, Ryan A Rossi, Joe Barrow, Md Mehrab Tanjim, Sungchul Kim, Franck Dernoncourt, Tong Yu, Ruiyi Zhang, and Nesreen K Ahmed. 2024. Bias and fairness in large language models: A survey. *Computational Linguistics*, pages 1–79.
- Leo Gao, Jonathan Tow, Baber Abbasi, Stella Biderman, Sid Black, Anthony DiPofi, Charles Foster, Laurence Golding, Jeffrey Hsu, Alain Le Noac’h, Haonan Li, Kyle McDonell, Niklas Muennighoff, Chris Ociepa, Jason Phang, Laria Reynolds, Hailey Schoelkopf, Aviya Skowron, Lintang Sutawika, Eric Tang, Anish Thite, Ben Wang, Kevin Wang, and Andy Zou. 2024. [A framework for few-shot language model evaluation](#).
- Vagrant Gautam, Julius Steuer, Eileen Bingert, Ray Johns, Anne Lauscher, and Dietrich Klakow. 2024. Revisiting english winogender schemas for consistency, coverage, and grammatical case. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.05653*.
- Timnit Gebru, Jamie Morgenstern, Briana Vecchione, Jennifer Wortman Vaughan, Hanna Wallach, Hal Daumé III, and Kate Crawford. 2021. Datasheets for datasets. *Communications of the ACM*, 64(12):86–92.
- Samuel Gehman, Suchin Gururangan, Maarten Sap, Yejin Choi, and Noah A Smith. 2020. Realexityprompts: Evaluating neural toxic degeneration in language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.11462*.
- Rudra Chandra Ghosh, Pasi Shailendra, and Ganesh Bahadur Singh. 2024. Large language model in various fields: Opportunities, challenges and risks. In *NIELIT’s International Conference on Communication, Electronics and Digital Technologies*, pages 587–596. Springer.
- Sil Hamilton. 2023. Blind judgement: Agent-based supreme court modelling with gpt. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.05327*.
- Thomas Hartvigsen, Saadia Gabriel, Hamid Palangi, Maarten Sap, Dipankar Ray, and Ece Kamar. 2022. Toxigen: A large-scale machine-generated dataset for adversarial and implicit hate speech detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.09509*.
- Yue Huang, Qihui Zhang, Lichao Sun, et al. 2023. Trustgpt: A benchmark for trustworthy and responsible large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.11507*.
- IBM AI Risk Atlas. 2024. [IBM AI Risk Atlas](#). Watsonx as a Service.
- Enkelejda Kasneci, Kathrin Seßler, Stefan Küchemann, Maria Bannert, Daryna Dementieva, Frank Fischer, Urs Gasser, Georg Groh, Stephan Günemann, Eyke Hüllermeier, et al. 2023. Chatgpt for good? on opportunities and challenges of large language models for education. *Learning and individual differences*, 103:102274.
- Yiheng Liu, Tianle Han, Siyuan Ma, Jiayue Zhang, Yuanyuan Yang, Jiaming Tian, Hao He, Antong Li, Mengshen He, Zhengliang Liu, et al. 2023. Summary of chatgpt-related research and perspective towards the future of large language models. *Meta-Radiology*, page 100017.
- Margaret Mitchell, Simone Wu, Andrew Zaldivar, Parker Barnes, Lucy Vasserman, Ben Hutchinson, Elena Spitzer, Inioluwa Deborah Raji, and Timnit Gebru. 2019. Model cards for model reporting. In *Proceedings of the conference on fairness, accountability, and transparency*, pages 220–229.
- Ioannis Mollas, Zoe Chrysopoulou, Stamatis Karlos, and Grigorios Tsoumakas. 2020. Ethos: an online hate speech detection dataset. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.08328*.
- Moin Nadeem, Anna Bethke, and Siva Reddy. 2020. Stereoset: Measuring stereotypical bias in pretrained language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.09456*.
- Nikita Nangia, Clara Vania, Rasika Bhalerao, and Samuel R Bowman. 2020. Crows-pairs: A challenge dataset for measuring social biases in masked language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.00133*.
- Erik Nijkamp, Bo Pang, Hiroaki Hayashi, Lifu Tu, Huan Wang, Yingbo Zhou, Silvio Savarese, and Caiming Xiong. 2022. Codegen: An open large language model for code with multi-turn program synthesis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.13474*.

- National Institute of Standards and Technology. 2023. [Artificial intelligence risk management framework \(ai rmf 1.0\)](#). Technical Report NIST Special Publication 1270, National Institute of Standards and Technology. Accessed: 2024-10-27.
- Joon Sung Park, Joseph O'Brien, Carrie Jun Cai, Meredith Ringel Morris, Percy Liang, and Michael S Bernstein. 2023. Generative agents: Interactive simulacra of human behavior. In *Proceedings of the 36th annual acm symposium on user interface software and technology*, pages 1–22.
- Alicia Parrish, Angelica Chen, Nikita Nangia, Vishakh Padmakumar, Jason Phang, Jana Thompson, Phu Mon Htut, and Samuel R Bowman. 2021. Bbq: A hand-built bias benchmark for question answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.08193*.
- Max Pellert, Clemens M Lechner, Claudia Wagner, Beatrice Rammstedt, and Markus Strohmaier. 2023. Ai psychometrics: Using psychometric inventories to obtain psychological profiles of large language models. *OSF preprint*.
- OWASP Top 10 Generative AI Security Risks Project. 2024. [Owasp generative ai security risk top 10](#). Accessed: 2024-10-27.
- Mahima Pushkarna, Andrew Zaldivar, and Oddur Kjarntansson. 2022. [Data cards: Purposeful and transparent dataset documentation for responsible ai](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency, FAccT '22*, page 1776–1826, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- John Richards, David Piorkowski, Michael Hind, Stephanie Houde, and Aleksandra Mojsilović. 2020. A methodology for creating ai factsheets. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.13796*.
- Paul Röttger, Bertram Vidgen, Dong Nguyen, Zeerak Waseem, Helen Margetts, and Janet B Pierrehumbert. 2020. Hatecheck: Functional tests for hate speech detection models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.15606*.
- Keisuke Sakaguchi, Ronan Le Bras, Chandra Bhagavatula, and Yejin Choi. 2021. Winogrande: An adversarial winograd schema challenge at scale. *Communications of the ACM*, 64(9):99–106.
- Jaromir Savelka, Kevin D Ashley, Morgan A Gray, Hannes Westermann, and Huihui Xu. 2023. Explaining legal concepts with augmented large language models (gpt-4). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.09525*.
- Karan Singhal, Shekoofeh Azizi, Tao Tu, S Sara Mahdavi, Jason Wei, Hyung Won Chung, Nathan Scales, Ajay Tanwani, Heather Cole-Lewis, Stephen Pfohl, et al. 2023. Large language models encode clinical knowledge. *Nature*, 620(7972):172–180.
- Eric Michael Smith, Melissa Hall, Melanie Kambadur, Eleonora Presani, and Adina Williams. 2022. "i'm sorry to hear that": Finding new biases in language models with a holistic descriptor dataset. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.09209*.
- Arun James Thirunavukarasu, Darren Shu Jeng Ting, Kabilan Elangovan, Laura Gutierrez, Ting Fang Tan, and Daniel Shu Wei Ting. 2023. Large language models in medicine. *Nature medicine*, 29(8):1930–1940.
- Peiyi Wang, Lei Li, Liang Chen, Zefan Cai, Dawei Zhu, Binghuai Lin, Yunbo Cao, Qi Liu, Tianyu Liu, and Zhifang Sui. 2023. Large language models are not fair evaluators. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.17926*.
- Laura Weidinger, John Mellor, Maribeth Rauh, Conor Griffin, Jonathan Uesato, Po-Sen Huang, Myra Cheng, Mia Glaese, Borja Balle, Atoosa Kasirzadeh, et al. 2021. Ethical and social risks of harm from language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.04359*.
- Laura Weidinger, Jonathan Uesato, Maribeth Rauh, Conor Griffin, Po-Sen Huang, John Mellor, Amelia Glaese, Myra Cheng, Borja Balle, Atoosa Kasirzadeh, et al. 2022. Taxonomy of risks posed by language models. In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, pages 214–229.
- Jingfeng Yang, Hongye Jin, Ruixiang Tang, Xiaotian Han, Qizhang Feng, Haoming Jiang, Shaochen Zhong, Bing Yin, and Xia Hu. 2024. Harnessing the power of llms in practice: A survey on chatgpt and beyond. *ACM Transactions on Knowledge Discovery from Data*, 18(6):1–32.
- Xi Yang, Aokun Chen, Nima PourNejatian, Hoo Chang Shin, Kaleb E Smith, Christopher Parisien, Colin Compas, Cheryl Martin, Anthony B Costa, Mona G Flores, et al. 2022. A large language model for electronic health records. *NPJ digital medicine*, 5(1):194.
- Yifan Yao, Jinhao Duan, Kaidi Xu, Yuanfang Cai, Zhibo Sun, and Yue Zhang. 2024. A survey on large language model (llm) security and privacy: The good, the bad, and the ugly. *High-Confidence Computing*, page 100211.
- Jieyu Zhao, Tianlu Wang, Mark Yatskar, Vicente Ordonez, and Kai-Wei Chang. 2018. Gender bias in coreference resolution: Evaluation and debiasing methods. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1804.06876*.
- Chujie Zheng, Hao Zhou, Fandong Meng, Jie Zhou, and Minlie Huang. 2023. Large language models are not robust multiple choice selectors. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.

A Benchmark Network Visualization

In this appendix, we present a detailed visualization of the benchmark network we constructed. This network maps the 130 identified benchmarks to their corresponding risks and sub-risks within

the context of LLMs. Edges in the network indicate the relationships between benchmarks and the risks/sub-risks they address.

The complexity of the network reflects the dense connections in the fairness risk category, revealing that over 40 benchmarks are dedicated to this area alone. Sometimes, there are no names or abbreviations for benchmarks. We mark these with an asterisk.




Figure 1: Network visualization of benchmarks mapped to LLM risks and sub-risks.