Ballot Review Summary

2014 Cycle 4

REGION: North America

COMMITTEE: 3DS-IC

EVENT: SEMICON West 2014

DATE OF MEETING: July 8, 2014

PLACE OF MEETING: San Francisco Marriott Marquis Hotel in San Francisco, California

COMMITTEE CO-CHAIRS: Rich Allen/NIST, Chris Moore/BayTech-Resor, Sesh Ramaswami/Applied Materials, Urmi Ray/Qualcomm

SEMI STAFF: Paul Trio

I. Document Number & Title

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Document 5506** | **New Standard: Guide for Measuring Warp, Bow and TTV on Low Stiffness Wafers** |

II. Tally (Staff to fill in)

**Voting Tally: As-cast tally after close of voting period**

A minimum of 60% of the voting interests that have voting members within the technical committee must return votes. (Regulations ¶ 9.6.1)



III. Rejects

Reject 1 (Yoshise Consulting: Masanori Yoshise)

Negative 1 of Reject 1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Negative** | **Referenced Section** | **\*TF/Committee to fill in if necessary** | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | |
| **Reason** | **\*Original negative comment and justification should be included.** | | | | | | | | | |
| Draft 5506  6.1.1 Bow description is different from 5.34 of M59  Doc 5506 specify “least square spherical fit” but M1 Appendix Shape decision tree and M59 specify ref plane with three points.    Doc 5506  The reported bow, A, is the difference between the center point of a least square spherical fit to the median surface of the wafer B and center point of the intersecting plane C as shown in Fig 1.  M59  5.43 *bow* the deviation of the center point of the median surface of a free, unclamped from a median surface reference plane established by three points equally spaced on circle with diameter a specified amount less than the nominal diameter of the wafer.  If Doc 5506 is really need description as it is, I suggest to use other words such as 3D Bow etc. Need clarify different definition. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Withdrawal** | | x | | No withdrawal made | | | | | | **GO TO** “**Related” section** | |
|  | | Withdrawal document received by staff on XXXX | | | | | | **GO TO “Final” 🡪 (A)** | |
| **Related** | **Motion and Reason** | x | | “Related” is mutually agreed upon. | | | | | | | |
| **\*This motion can be appended to the motion for Persuasive (See Persuasive Section)** | | | | | | | |
|  | | Negative is related **(needs over 1/3 votes to pass)** | | | | | | | |
|  | | Negative is not related **(needs 2/3 or more votes to pass)** | | | | | | | |
|  | | Reason | | XXXX | | | | | |
| **Motion by/2nd by** | Name (Company)/Name (Company) | | | | | | | | | |
| **Discussion** |  | | | | | | | | | |
| **Result of Vote (check ONE)** | XX-XX | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | [Negative is related] > 1/3 | | | | **GO TO “Persuasive”** | | | |
|  | | [Negative is not related] < 2/3 | | | |
|  | | 2/3=< [Negative is not related] | | | | **GO TO “Final”** 🡪 **(B)** | | | |
|  | |  | | | |  | | | |
| **Persuasive** | **Motion and Reason** | x | | Negative is related and persuasive **(needs over 1/3 votes to pass)** | | | | | | | |
|  | | Negative is related and not persuasive **(needs 2/3 or more votes to pass)** | | | | | | | |
|  | | Reason | | XXXX | | | | | |
| **Motion by/2nd by** | Chris Moore (BayTech-Resor) / Steve Martell (Sonoscan) | | | | | | | | | |
| **Discussion** | None | | | | | | | | | |
| **Result of Vote (check ONE)** | 9-0 | | | | | | | | | |
| x | | [Negative is related and persuasive] > 1/3 | | | | | | **GO TO “Final” 🡪 (E)** | |
|  | | [Negative is related and not persuasive] < 2/3 | | | | | |
|  | | 2/3=<[Negative is related and not persuasive] <90% | | | | | | **GO TO “Final” 🡪 (C)** | |
|  | | 90% =< [Negative is related and not persuasive] | | | | | | **GO TO** “**Not Significant Finding Option”** | |
| **Not Significant Finding Option** | **This option can only be used “if the committee finds a negative not persuasive by a vote equal to or greater than 90% of the persons voting on the action”. (Regulations ¶ 9.5.3.3.2)** | | | | | | | | | | |
|  |  | | It is mutually agreed upon to term the negative “not significant” | | | | | | | **GO TO** 🡪 **(D)** |
|  |  | | It is mutually agreed upon to term the negative “significant” | | | | | | | **GO TO 🡪 (C)** |
| **Motion** |  | | The negative is “not significant”. | | | | | | | |
| **Motion by/2nd by** | Name (Company)/Name (Company) | | | | | | | | | |
| **Vote** |  | XX-XX Motion passed with simple majority | | | | | | **GO TO 🡪 (D)** | | |
|  | XX-XX Motion failed with simple majority | | | | | | **GO TO 🡪 (C)** | | |
| **Final** | | Negative is: | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | **(A)** | withdrawn (counted under **h** in disposition) | | | | | | |
|  | | **(B)** | not related (counted under **i** in disposition) | | | | | | |
|  | | **(C)** | related and not persuasive (significant) | | | | | | |
|  | | **(D)** | not significant (counted under **j** in disposition) | | | | | | |
| x | | **(E)** | related and persuasive | | **DOCUMENT FAILS** | | | | |
|  | | Comment generated. See comment #x | | | | | | | |

IV. Comments

Comments were received from the following voters:

* David Marx (Rudolph Technologies)
* Haruo Shimamoto (Renesas Electronics)

IX. Action for this document

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Motion** |  | This document passed committee review as balloted and will be forwarded to the A&R for procedural review. | | |
|  | This document passed committee review with editorial changes and will be forwarded to the A&R for procedural review. | | |
| **x** | This document failed committee review and will be returned to the task force for rework. | | |
|  | This document failed committee review and work will be discontinued. | | |
| **Motion by/2nd by** | | | Chris Moore (BayTech-Resor) / Steve Martell (Sonoscan) | |
| **Discussion** | | | None | |
| **Vote** | | | 9-0 | |
| **Final Action** | | | x | Motion passed |
|  | Motion failed |