

Record of Line-item Letter Ballot Review by TC Chapter for Procedural Review

Region/Locale: **NA**
 Global Technical Committee: **EHS**
 TC Chapter Cochairs: **Sean Larsen (Lam Research), Chris Evanston (Salus Engineering), Bert Planting (ASML)**
 Standards Staff: **Kevin Nguyen**

	Scheduled in Background Statement	Actual
Date	7/13/2017	7/13/2017
Location	San Francisco Marriott Marquis	San Francisco Marriott Marquis
Reason for Change of Date and/or Location (if changed)		

Note: See *Regulations* ¶ 9.5 Exception for allowable reason to change.

Document Information

I. Document Number, Title, Lists of Line Items

Document Number 6172	Document Title Line Item Revision to SEMI S14-1016: Safety Guidelines for Fire Risk Assessment and Mitigation for Semiconductor Manufacturing Equipment (To correct nonconforming title)
<input type="checkbox"/> Line Item 1	Line Item Title Correct title and concomitant texts

Line Item 1 Adjudication

II. Tally

Standards staff to fill in.

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

Note: A minimum of 60% of the Voting Interests that have TC Members within the global technical committee that issued the Letter Ballot must return Votes. (*Regulations* ¶ 9.7.1.1)

Voting Tally:

Voting Interest:	Returned Votes	Distribution	Return Rate	
Letter Ballot	56	÷ 93	= 60.2%	≥60%
Intercommittee Ballot	22			
Voting Interest Reject(s)	1	Total Voters with Rejects		1
Voting Interest Accept(s)	40			

Note: See Regulations § 3.2.1 for definition of Voting Interest.

III. Rejects

Voting Interest Reject 1 (Voting Interest Name: LAM)

Voter Reject 1 (Voter: Sean Larsen/Lam Research)

Negative 1

Negative	Referenced Section/ Paragraph	*TF/TC Chapter to fill in, including text in the ballot if necessary.		
		Whole ballot		
	Negative Text	Regardless of whether this change is rationale or allowable as a line item change (feedback from A&R subcommittee has been very convoluted and confusing), this ballot must fail as it is a revision to a safety guideline that did not include a safety checklist. Suggestion / Justification		
TF input (optional)				
Withdrawal (check one)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Negative withdrawal made by Voter.	GO TO "Related" subsection	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Withdrawal document received by Standards staff on MM/DD/YYYY.	GO TO "Final" subsection → (A)	
Related	Motion and Reason (check one)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	'Related' is mutually agreed upon. (Needs no motion.)	GO TO "Persuasive" subsection
		<input type="checkbox"/>	Negative is not related. (Needs ≥2/3 votes to pass.)	
		Reason	XXXX	
	Motion by/ 2nd by	Name (Company)/Name (Company)		
Discussion				
Result of Vote (check one)	<input type="checkbox"/>	XX Y-XX N; Motion passed/failed.		
	<input type="checkbox"/>	[Negative is not related.] < 2/3	GO TO "Persuasive" subsection	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	2/3 ≤ [Negative is not related.]	GO TO "Final" subsection → (B)	
Motion and Reason	<input type="checkbox"/>	Negative is related and persuasive. (Needs >1/3 votes to pass.)		

Persuasive	(check one)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Negative is related and not persuasive. (Needs ≥2/3 votes to pass.)			
			Reason	Not related to the balloted change. Lack of safety checklist was not significant to the change being made.		
	Motion by/ 2nd by	Sean Larsen (LAM Research)/Mark Fessler (ASM)				
	Discussion	Negative can be made due to a procedural issue. Regs 15.1.2 requires a safety check list accompanying the Letter Ballot. Although no technical content is added, the original safety checklist should be added in the ballot. [Mashiro Supika] We are wasting too much time discussing for title correction as the line item permitted in the Appendix 4 of Procedure Manual [Chris Evanston]				
Result of Vote (check one)	6 Y-3 N; Motion passed					
	<input type="checkbox"/>	[Negative is related and persuasive.] > 1/3	Is a technical change recommended? (check one)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y GO TO "Address by Technical Change Option" subsection	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	[Negative is related and not persuasive.] < 2/3		<input type="checkbox"/>	N GO TO "Final" subsection → (E)	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2/3 ≤ [Negative is related and not persuasive.] < 90%	GO TO "Final" subsection → (C)			
	<input type="checkbox"/>	90% ≤ [Negative is related and not persuasive.]	GO TO "Not Significant Finding Option" subsection			
Final	(check if applicable)	<input type="checkbox"/>	(A)	Withdrawn (counted under h in disposition)		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	(B)	Not related (counted under i in disposition)		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	(C)	Related and not persuasive (significant)		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	(D)	Not significant (counted under j in disposition)		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	(E)	Related and persuasive and not addressed by technical change	DOCUMENT FAILS	
		<input type="checkbox"/>	(F)	Addressed by technical change (counted under k disposition)		
	(check if applicable)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment generated. See Section V-(ii) Comment # X.			

Disposition of Voting Interest Reject 1

1	Original number (#) of Negatives	(g)	
#	Number of Negatives withdrawn	(h)	
#	Number of Negatives found not related	(i)	
#	Number of Negatives found not significant	(j)	
	Number of Negatives addressed by technical change (Negative becomes not significant)	(k)	
Final	<input type="checkbox"/>	$g - (h + i + j + k) = 0$	Reject is Not Valid and is not included in the denominator of § VI. Approval Conditions Check
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	$g - (h + i + j + k) > 0$	Reject is included in the denominator of § VI. Approval Conditions Check
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Reject without a Negative	Not Valid

Note: If all of the Negatives included with a Reject Vote are withdrawn, determined to be not related, or determined to be not significant, the Reject Vote is not valid. (Regulations ¶ 9.4.3.3)

Note: A Negative addressed by a technical change is automatically considered to be not significant. (Regulations ¶ 9.6.4.4.2)

IV. Other Technical Issues

None

V. Comments

V- (i) Voters' Comments

None

V-(ii) Comments Created by Handling Negative

None

VI. Editorial Changes Other than Those Voted on in § V

Original section/paragraph number and at least one full sentence are required in "FROM" and "TO" fields.
None

VII. Approval Conditions Check

VII. - (i). Approval Rate

APPROVAL CONDITION 1: All Negatives have been discussed and were withdrawn, found not related, found not persuasive, or addressed by a technical change. (Regulations ¶ 9.7.1.2)

APPROVAL CONDITION 2: At least 90% of the sum of valid Voting Interest Accept and Voting Interest Reject Votes must be Accept. (Regulations ¶ 9.7.1.3)

Note: If both approval conditions are not satisfied, the Document fails.

		Accepts		(Accepts + Valid Rejects)					
Approval Rate	=	40	/	41	=	97.6%		≥90%	

VII. – (ii) Approval Level (check one)

Note: See Regulations § 9.7.2 for further information.

Globally Approved (No Ratification Ballot needed):

Line Item 1 meets the Letter Ballot approval conditions for the global technical committee.

Need a Ratification Ballot:

Line Item 1 meets the Letter Ballot approval conditions for the TC Chapter and a Ratification Ballot will be issued to validate technical changes.

Checks for Entire Document Including All Approved Line Items

VIII. Safety Check

Note: This Safety check applies to the entire Standard or Safety Guideline including all the approved Line Items. See § 15 of the Regulations for further information.

Motion		This is not a Safety Document , when all safety-related information is removed, the Document is still technically sound and complete. (<i>Regulations</i> ¶ 8.7.1)
	x	This is a Safety Document , when all safety-related information is removed, the Document is not technically sound and complete. (<i>Regulations</i> ¶ 8.7.2)
		Safety Checklist (<i>Regulations</i> ¶ 15.3) is complete and has been included with the Document throughout the balloting process. (<i>Regulations</i> ¶ 15.1.2)
Motion by/2nd by		Eric Sklar (Safety Guru)/Sean Larsen (LAM Research)
Discussion		<p>Safety Checklist was not included in the ballot. Procedure Manual Appendix 4 allows a title correction for S14, but it does not elaborate details on safety checklist for nonconforming title correction ballot.</p> <p>Move to find that this document: This is a safety document: when all safety-related information is removed, the document is not technically sound and complete. And the safety checklist did not accompany the document.</p> <p>By/2nd: Eric Sklar (Safety Guru)/Lauren Crane (Tokyo Electron) Disc: xxx Vote: 8-0. Motion passed</p>
Vote		10 Y-0 N; Motion passed

IX. Intellectual Property (IP) Check

Note: This IP check applies to the entire Standard or Safety Guideline including all the approved Line Items. See § 16 of the Regulations for further information.

x	The TC Chapter meeting chair asked those participating, if they were aware of any potentially material patented technology or copyrighted items* in the Standard or Guideline. (<i>Regulations</i> ¶ 8.8.1)	
Motion	x	No potentially material patented technology or reproduction of copyrighted items is known. GO TO SECTION X.
		Potentially material patented technology or reproduction of copyrighted items is known, but a Letter of Assurance (LOA) or copyright release letter for such items has been obtained or presented to the TC Chapter. GO TO SECTION X.
		Potentially material patented technology or reproduction of copyrighted items is known and use of such materials is technically justified by the TC Chapter, but an LOA or copyright release letter for some of the item(s) has NOT been obtained or presented to the TC Chapter.
		Ask ISC for special permission to publish.
	Quit activity.	
	Wait for LOA for patented technology or release of copyrighted items.	

	Motion by/2nd by	Name (Company)/Name (Company)	
	Discussion	XXXX	
	Vote	XX Y-XX N	
	Final Action	<input type="checkbox"/>	Motion passed
<input type="checkbox"/>		Motion failed	

* Note: Such potentially material patented technology or copyrighted items might have become known since the Standard or Safety Guideline was last reviewed, or might become relevant due to this Letter Ballot.

X. Action for This Document

Motion applicable items)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Line item(s) [1] passed TC Chapter review as balloted and will be forwarded to the ISC A&R SC for procedural review.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Line item(s) [x] passed TC Chapter review with editorial changes and will be forwarded to the ISC A&R SC for procedural review.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Line item(s) [x] passed TC Chapter review with technical changes and with editorial changes and will be forwarded to the ISC A&R SC for procedural review. A Ratification Ballot will be issued to verify the technical changes.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Line item(s) [X], [X] and [X] failed TC Chapter review and will be returned to the TF for rework.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Line item(s) [X], [X] and [X] failed TC Chapter review and work will be discontinued.
Motion by/ 2nd by	Mark Fessler (ASM)/Ron Macklin (Bureau Veritas NA)	
Discussion	<p>This process of approving deletion of “s” from a safety guideline is time consuming and no value added, and this problem should be addressed, so this problem does not happen again.</p> <p>Move to find: This particular case of approving deletion of “s” from the title of a safety guideline is time consuming and no value added, and this problem should be addressed, so this problem does not happen again</p> <p>By/2nd: Chris Evanston (Salus Engineering)/Mark Fessler (ASM) Vote: 8-0. Motion passed.</p>	
Vote	6 Y-1 N	
Final Action	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Motion passed
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Motion failed

Standards staff to record the result of the A&R procedural review here:

A&R	<input type="checkbox"/>	Line item(s) [X], [X] and [X] are Approved for publication
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Line item(s) [X], [X] and [X] are Approved pending acceptance of the Ratification Ballot
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Line item(s) [X], [X] and [X] are Not approved
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Reason: