Responses and Review Form for SEMI Draft Document #5969
Line Item Revisions to SEMI S2-0715, Environmental, Health, and Safety Guideline for Semiconductor Manufacturing Equipment (Re: Fire Protection)
Overall Summary

Line Item	Negatives	Comments
1 – Addition of criteria to determine which method of assessing fire risk is to be used.	Lam: Brian Claes: 3 Salus: Chris Evanston: 3 Screen: Ryosuke Imamiya: 2 Applied Materials: Ed Karl: 2	TI: Paul Schwab: 2
2 – Restructuring of portions of Section 14	Screen: Ryosuke Imamiya: 2	None

Line Item 1 – Addition of criteria to determine which method of assessing fire risk is to be used.

Tallies at Close of Voting

Voting Return Data		Acceptance Rate Data	
Voting Interest Returns	55	*Voting Interest Accept Votes (VIAccept)*	36
Total Voting Interests	87	*Interest Reject Votes (IReject)*	4
Voting Interest Return %	63.22%	*Approval % [VIAccept / (VIAccept + IReject)]*	90.00%
Other Returns (Intercommittee, etc.)	15	*# of Interest Rejects that Need to be not found Valid for Final Approval % >= 90%*	0
Total Votes	92		
Total Votes with Comments	1		
Total Reject Votes	4		

Rejects/Negatives

Summary: 10 Total Items Submitted

Company: Submitter	*ID*	*Negs*	*Disp*	*Company: Submitter*	*ID*	*Negs*	*Disp*
Lam: Brian Claes	Lam	3		SCREEN: Ryosuke Imamiya	SCREEN	2	
Salus: Chris Evanston	Salus	3		Applied Materials: Ed Karl	AMAT	2	

Details:

NOTICE: SEMI Staff must receive copies of ALL withdrawals of negative votes.

Table 0 Merged Negatives

W = Withdrawn, NR = Not Related, NP = Not Persuasive, RP = Related and Persuasive, NS = Not Significant, S = Significant

#	Ref.	Negative including Justification	TF Finding and Reason
Salus 1	14.2.3 Flowchart Figure 1	*"Does the equipment have outside the primary power enclosure(s), high-voltage (>1000dc or 600Vac) or high-power (5>5kW) electrical components?"* This should be eliminated as a criteria that triggers a Full S14. Reason (T): This concern will be much more thoroughly be covered under the electrical section that it will be under an S14 because it is an electrical issue. Using it to trigger a full S14 is not value added for the industry.	Select 1) __Not related __Not persuasive (assumes related) __Related & persuasive Reason: Sklar, 22mar16: One of the goals in creating S14 was to provide a means of identifying and considering fire and smoke concerns with equipment that met the relevant general industry standards but not necessarily the needs of the semiconductor industry. In particular, what is acceptable behavior in general industry might include emission of a large enough particle load to the cleanroom to be unacceptable. Also, there are concerns about electrical equipment being a source of ignition of non-electrical components. TF, 05apr16: Keep second diamond: 6 Remove second diamond: 5
Lam 1 (BC)	LI 1, Part A 14.2.3	NEGATIVE The second decision block ("Does the equipment have….") specifies "YES"/"NO" criteria not directly or proportionately related to likelihood of fire risk warranting an S14 assessment. For instance, electrostatic chucks often operate at greater than 1000 vdc but present negligible risk because of extremely low available fault current. Additionally, there are examples of high-power commodities (e.g., RF generators for plasma processing) that exceed 5 KW that are assessed for fire and energy risks under applicable standards and usually ATL certified. Suggestion / Justification Change to wording to limit the application of this decision block to primary power circuits for the voltage threshold and add an "AND" (not an "OR") that affected components are "not certified by an ATL or not used in accordance with the manufacturer's specifications"	Select 1) __Not related __Not persuasive (assumes related) __Related & persuasive Reason: Sklar, 22mar16: See Salus 1. It's not clear whether the suggestion is to use the voltage criterion or the power criterion. Adding the proposed "and not certified by and ATL or not used in accordance with the manufacturer's specifications" would be superfluous. Anything meeting either of those criteria would, as a function of the fourth diamond, lead to the use of S14. TF, 05apr16:

W = Withdrawn, NR = Not Related, NP = Not Persuasive, RP = Related and Persuasive, NS = Not Significant, S = Significant

#	Ref.	Negative including Justification	TF Finding and Reason
SCREEN 1	14.2.3 flowchart, second branch	What is a risk difference of outside power enclosures from the inside power enclosures. The fire risk level seems same. I recommend deleting "outside the primary power enclosures".	Select 1) __Not related __Not persuasive (assumes related) __Related & persuasive Reason: Sklar, 22mar16: Primary power enclosures were excluded to avoid causing all SME to be subject to S14 assessment and because power enclosures, in most cases, include only electrical equipment. TF, 05apr16:
Salus 2	14.2.3 Flowchart Figure 1	*"Are any of the electrical components/parts/assemblies that operate from or conduct hazardous voltage or hazardous power, not certified by an ATL or not used in accordance with the manufacturer's specifications"* This should be eliminated as a criteria that triggers a Full S14. Reason (T) This concern will be much more thoroughly be covered under the electrical section that it will be under an S14 because it is an electrical issue. Using it to trigger a full S14 is not value added for the industry.	Select 1) __Not related __Not persuasive (assumes related) __Related & persuasive Reason: Sklar, 22mar16: See Salus 1. TF, 05apr16:
Lam 2 (BC)	LI 1, Part A 14.2.3	NEGATIVE The hazardous voltage criteria is essentially unrelated to fire risk. The more useful criteria is related to available energy under fault conditions. The hazardous power criteria (240 VA) is an inappropriately low threshold regardless of the ATL/use qualifiers. The 240 VA threshold has been used for decades to demarcate the upper end where no energy risk (e.g., fire) is presumed. There is an extremely large additional headroom above this threshold before a condition justifying an S14 assessment is present. This headroom can vary significantly from one physical application to another and an assessment of fire risk should be left up to the expert assessor. Suggestion / Justification Delete the 4th decision block entirely. I question whether alternative language defining appropriate quantitative technical criteria is both available and agreeable. Alternatively, the Task Force can assemble incident histories that allow study of the relationship between available electrical energy and equipment fires where an S14 assessment would have been essential because other existing methods, standards and certifications, when implemented in equipment design and manufacturing, are not adequate.	Select 1) __Not related __Not persuasive (assumes related) __Related & persuasive Reason: Sklar, 22mar16: As the submitter points out, 240 VA has been used as level below some fire risks are considered not to exist. The TF felt that makes it appropriate to use as a screening tool to determine how fire risk should be assessed. It's not obvious how the submitter foresees how the document could implement "fire risk should be left up to the expert assessor" without directing thorough assessment. TF, 05apr16:

W = Withdrawn, NR = Not Related, NP = Not Persuasive, RP = Related and Persuasive, NS = Not Significant, S = Significant

#	Ref.	Negative including Justification	TF Finding and Reason
AMAT-2	Line Item 1, Part A Figure 1	Negative The last diamond in the flowchart states if the question to, "Are any of the electrical components/parts/assemblies that operate from or conduct hazardous voltage or hazardous power, not certified by an ATL or not used in accordance with the manufacturer's specifications?" is "Yes", then "SEMI S14 should be used to evaluate the equipment. Provide the SEMI S14 report with, or as part of, the S2 report (Also, see 14.3.1.1.)" Rationale: In a state-of-the-art, complex piece of customized semiconductor manufacturing equipment, it is not always feasible (nor practical) to use 100% ATL certified components/parts/assemblies. The fact that an electrical component/part/assembly with hazardous voltage or hazardous power is not ATL certified, should not be the sole criteria for having the entire semiconductor equipment be evaluated to SEMI S14. Proposed Solution: Proposal 1: Revise the question to "Are any of the electrical components/parts/assemblies that operate from or conduct hazardous voltage or hazardous power, not compliant with an applicable national or international product safety standard or not used in accordance with the manufacturer's specifications?" Proposal 2: Separate the question of "ATL certification" and allow for the third party to evaluate the non-ATL certified components/parts/assemblies against the appropriate national or international product safety standard." Proposal 3: Instead of requiring the entire semiconductor manufacturing equipment to undergo SEMI S14 because a single component/part/assembly is not ATL certified, revise the flow chart such that a "Yes" response is routed to a different oral box stating, "The portion of the equipment where the non-ATL certified components/parts/assemblies are enclosed should be evaluated to SEMI S14."	Select 1) __Not related __Not persuasive (assumes related) __Related & persuasive Reason: Sklar, 22mar16: It is not clear that the proposed language would assign the decision of whether the item in question complies with a relevant standard to a quasi-independent party, rather than an equipment supplier. S2 does not require that evaluations be done by quasi-independent parties. Proposal 3 assumes that a component can affect fire risk in only its location. I don't accept that assumption. TF, 05apr16:
Salus 3	14.2.3 Flowchart Figure 1	There is no criteria in this flowchart that triggers a full S14 because the equipment is largely made out of flammable material Reason (T) Equipment that is not made of largely metal or 4910 plastic should be subject to a full S14. Suggest adding a criteria "Is equipment made of greater than 5% of material that neither metal nor 4910 plastic? If yes trigger full S14 - if no S14 need not be used.	Select 1) __Not related __Not persuasive (assumes related) __Related & persuasive Reason: Sklar, 22mar16: In developing this ballot, the TF discussed whether combustible materials of construction, alone, merited the use of S14. The TF decided that, without a credible ignition source, they do not. (S14 explicitly excludes fires resulting from external sources of ignition.) TF, 05apr16:

W = Withdrawn, NR = Not Related, NP = Not Persuasive, RP = Related and Persuasive, NS = Not Significant, S = Significant

#	Ref.	Negative including Justification	TF Finding and Reason
Lam 3 (BC)	LI 1, Part A 14.3.1.2	NEGATIVE The second bullet ("the decision path…") seems contradictory to the initial qualifying sentence in the clause. This clause deals with requirements applicable if one declines to conduct an S14 assessment yet the second bullet has language that speaks to the flowchart leading to use ofS14 ("the decision path through the flowchart that lead to using SEMI S14, and…." Suggestion / Justification Revise the test to read: "the decision path through the flowchart that leads to waiving use of SEMI S14" (or something to that effect)	Select 1) __Not related __Not persuasive (assumes related) __Related & persuasive Reason: Sklar, 22mar16: Submitter is correct. Consider this to be a ballot preparation error, as the header of the bullet list precludes there being a path that led to the use of S14. The key question is: May we treat this as a ballot preparation error and fix it editorially or must we fail the Line Item, fix this, and reballot? TF, 05apr16: Motion (Holbrook, Larsen) RP because there is a logical fault in the ballot as distributed for consideration. Y: 11 N: 0\ Fix & reballot
AMAT-1	Line Item 1, Part B 14.3.1.2, 2nd bullet	Negative The second bullet states, "the decision path through the flowchart that lead to using SEMI S14, and". But this is under Section 14.3.1.2 which is applicable "If SEMI S14 was not used to assess the equipment...". If the second bullet shows the decision path leading to using SEMI S14, why would this be sufficient justification for not using SEMI S14? Proposed Solution: Revise 2nd bullet to, "the decision path through the flowchart that lead to not using SEMI S14, and"	Select 1) __Not related __Not persuasive (assumes related) __Related & persuasive Reason: See Lam 3
SCREEN 2	Line Item 1, Part B 14.3.1.2 3	If SEMI S14 is not used, I think there would be no summary report. I recommend not use "summary report".	Select 1) __Not related __Not persuasive (assumes related) __Related & persuasive Reason: Sklar, 22mar16: Reason for having the described report for cases in which S14 is not used is that, without such a report, there would be no record of the basis for not using S14. That would preclude review of such a decision. Recommend finding this NP. TF, 05apr16:

Table 1 Negatives from < Lam: Brian Claes >

W = Withdrawn, NR = Not Related, NP = Not Persuasive, RP = Related and Persuasive, NS = Not Significant, S = Significant						
#	*Ref.*	*Negative including Justification*	*TF Finding and Reason*	*Motion and Reason in Committee:*	*Final*	
Lam 1 (BC)	LI 1, Part A 14.2.3	NEGATIVE The second decision block ("Does the equipment have….") specifies "YES"/"NO" criteria not directly or proportionately related to likelihood of fire risk warranting an S14 assessment. For instance, electrostatic chucks often operate at greater than 1000 vdc but present negligible risk because of extremely low available fault current. Additionally, there are examples of high-power commodities (e.g., RF generators for plasma processing) that exceed 5 KW that are assessed for fire and energy risks under applicable standards and usually ATL certified. Suggestion / Justification Change to wording to limit the application of this decision block to primary power circuits for the voltage threshold and add an "AND" (not an "OR") that affected components are "not certified by an ATL or not used in accordance with the manufacturer's specifications"				
Lam 2 (BC)	LI 1, Part A 14.2.3	NEGATIVE The hazardous voltage criteria is essentially unrelated to fire risk. The more useful criteria is related to available energy under fault conditions. The hazardous power criteria (240 VA) is an inappropriately low threshold regardless of the ATL/use qualifiers. The 240 VA threshold has been used for decades to demarcate the upper end where no energy risk (e.g., fire) is presumed. There is an extremely large additional headroom above this threshold before a condition justifying an S14 assessment is present. This headroom can vary significantly from one physical application to another and an assessment of fire risk should be left up to the expert assessor. Suggestion / Justification Delete the 4th decision block entirely. I question whether alternative language defining appropriate quantitative technical criteria is both available and agreeable. Alternatively, the Task Force can assemble incident histories that allow study of the relationship between available electrical energy and equipment fires where an S14 assessment would have been essential because other existing methods, standards and certifications, when implemented in equipment design and manufacturing, are not adequate.				

W = Withdrawn, NR = Not Related, NP = Not Persuasive, RP = Related and Persuasive, NS = Not Significant, S = Significant

#	Ref.	Negative including Justification	TF Finding and Reason	Motion and Reason in Committee:	Final
Lam 3 (BC)	LI 1, Part A 14.3.1.2	NEGATIVE The second bullet ("the decision path…") seems contradictory to the initial qualifying sentence in the clause. This clause deals with requirements applicable if one declines to conduct an S14 assessment yet the second bullet has language that speaks to the flowchart leading to use ofS14 ("the decision path through the flowchart that lead to using SEMI S14, and…." Suggestion / Justification Revise the test to read: "the decision path through the flowchart that leads to waiving use of SEMI S14" (or something to that effect)	(Select 1) __Not related __Not persuasive (assumes related) _X_ Related & persuasive Reason: Sklar, 22mar16: Submitter is correct. Consider this to be a ballot preparation error, as the header of the bullet list precludes there being a path that led to the use of S14 TF, 05apr16: Motion (Holbrook, Larsen) RP because there is a logical fault in the ballot as distributed for consideration. Y: 11 N: 0\ Fix & reballot	__Withdrawn by Subm. (Date: __) Move to find this negative: (select 1) __Not related (requires reason, follow) __Committee new business __Assigned to: _____ __Not persuasive (requires reason) __x Related & persuasive (ballot fails) Reason: *By/2nd*: Sklar/PLanting *Disc*: *Vote*: #-#-#. 10-0 Motion passed failed Significance finding/method: (select 1) __Not significant by agreement __Not significant by motion __Significant by % of NP vote (>10%) __Significant by agreement __Significant by motion *By/2nd*: *Disc*: *Vote*: #-#-#. Motion passed failed	

Final disposition of this reject:
__Valid (includes at least one significant negative)
__Not Valid (all negatives withdrawn, found not related, or found not significant)

Table 2 Negatives from < Salus: Chris Evanston >

W = Withdrawn, NR = Not Related, NP = Not Persuasive, RP = Related and Persuasive, NS = Not Significant, S = Significant					
#	*Ref.*	*Negative including Justification*			
Salus 1	14.2.3 Flowchart Figure 1	*"Does the equipment have outside the primary power enclosure(s), high-voltage (>1000dc or 600Vac) or high-power (5>5kW) electrical components?"* This should be eliminated as a criteria that triggers a Full S14. Reason (T): This concern will be much more thoroughly be covered under the electrical section that it will be under an S14 because it is an electrical issue. Using it to trigger a full S14 is not value added for the industry.			
SCREEN 1	Line Item 1, Part A 14.2.3 The flowchart in Figure 1, second branch	What is a risk difference of outside power enclosures from the inside power enclosures. The fire risk level seems same. I recommend deleting "outside the primary power enclosures".			
Salus 2	14.2.3 Flowchart Figure 1	*"Are any of the electrical components/parts/assemblies that operate from or conduct hazardous voltage or hazardous power, not certified by an ATL or not used in accordance with the manufacturer's specifications"* This should be eliminated as a criteria that triggers a Full S14. Reason (T) This concern will be much more thoroughly be covered under the electrical section that it will be under an S14 because it is an electrical issue. Using it to trigger a full S14 is not value added for the industry.			
Salus 3	14.2.3 Flowchart Figure 1	There is no criteria in this flowchart that triggers a full S14 because the equipment is largely made out of flammable material Reason (T) Equipment that is not made of largely metal or 4910 plastic should be subject to a full S14. Suggest adding a criteria "Is equipment made of greater than 5% of material that neither metal nor 4910 plastic? If yes trigger full S14 - if no S14 need not be used.			
Final disposition of this reject: __Valid (includes at least one significant negative) __Not Valid (all negatives withdrawn, found not related, or found not significant)					

Table 3 Negatives from < SCREEN: Ryosuke Imamiya>

W = Withdrawn, NR = Not Related, NP = Not Persuasive, RP = Related and Persuasive, NS = Not Significant, S = Significant

#	Ref.	Negative including Justification	TF Finding and Reason	Motion and Reason in Committee:	Final		
SCREEN 1	Line Item 1, Part A 14.2.3 The flowchart in Figure 1, second branch	What is a risk difference of outside power enclosures from the inside power enclosures. The fire risk level seems same. I recommend deleting “outside the primary power enclosures”.					
SCREEN 1	Line Item 1, Part B 14.3.1.2 3	If SEMI S14 is not used, I think there would be no summary report. I recommend not use “summary report”.					

Final disposition of this reject:
__Valid (includes at least one significant negative)
__Not Valid (all negatives withdrawn, found not related, or found not significant)

Table 4 Negatives from < AMAT: Ed Karl >

W = Withdrawn, NR = Not Related, NP = Not Persuasive, RP = Related and Persuasive, NS = Not Significant, S = Significant

#	Ref.	Negative including Justification	TF Finding and Reason	Motion and Reason in Committee:	Final		
AMAT-1	Line Item 1, Part B 14.3.1.2, 2nd bullet	Negative The second bullet states, “the decision path through the flowchart that lead to using SEMI S14, and”. But this is under Section 14.3.1.2 which is applicable “If SEMI S14 was not used to assess the equipment...”. If the second bullet shows the decision path leading to using SEMI S14, why would this be sufficient justification for not using SEMI S14? Proposed Solution: Revise 2nd bullet to, “the decision path through the flowchart that lead to not using SEMI S14, and”					

W = Withdrawn, NR = Not Related, NP = Not Persuasive, RP = Related and Persuasive, NS = Not Significant, S = Significant

#	Ref.	Negative including Justification	TF Finding and Reason	Motion and Reason in Committee:	Final		
AMAT-2	Line Item 1, Part A Figure 1	Negative The last diamond in the flowchart states if the question to, "Are any of the electrical components/parts/assemblies that operate from or conduct hazardous voltage or hazardous power, not certified by an ATL or not used in accordance with the manufacturer's specifications?" is "Yes", then "SEMI S14 should be used to evaluate the equipment. Provide the SEMI S14 report with, or as part of, the S2 report (Also, see 14.3.1.1.)" Rationale: In a state-of-the-art, complex piece of customized semiconductor manufacturing equipment, it is not always feasible (nor practical) to use 100% ATL certified components/parts/assemblies. The fact that an electrical component/part/assembly with hazardous voltage or hazardous power is not ATL certified, should not be the sole criteria for having the entire semiconductor equipment be evaluated to SEMI S14. Proposed Solution: Proposal 1: Revise the question to "Are any of the electrical components/parts/assemblies that operate from or conduct hazardous voltage or hazardous power, not compliant with an applicable national or international product safety standard or not used in accordance with the manufacturer's specifications?" Proposal 2: Separate the question of "ATL certification" and allow for the third party to evaluate the non-ATL certified components/parts/assemblies against the appropriate national or international product safety standard." Proposal 3: Instead of requiring the entire semiconductor manufacturing equipment to undergo SEMI S14 because a single component/part/assembly is not ATL certified, revise the flow chart such that a "Yes" response is routed to a different oral box stating, "The portion of the equipment where the non-ATL certified components/parts/assemblies are enclosed should be evaluated to SEMI S14."					

Final disposition of this reject:

__Valid (includes at least one significant negative)

__Not Valid (all negatives withdrawn, found not related, or found not significant)

Comments

Summary: 2 Total Items Submitted

Company: Submitter	*ID*	*#*	*Company: Submitter*	*ID*	*#*
TI: Paul Schwab	TI	2			

Details:

NOTICE: Items from "Reject" votes that are clearly marked by the voter as comments can be reviewed here.

#	*Ref.*	*Comment*		*TF Response*	*Committee Action:*
TI-1		Consider adding on board heating elements or tool construction to this this flow chart. I saw the tool construction appendix and didn't know if that was part of the decision making process on determining if S14 is necessary or not..	Sklar, 22mar16: On-board heating elements are captured by the third diamond. I don't know to what "tool construction" pertains. TF, 05apr16:	(Select one) __No further action _X_Refer to TF for further review __New Business __Editorial Change: #__in ECs below __Other: (Select one) __Committee agrees (no motion nec.) __Motion to act as indicated above: *By/2nd*: *Disc*: *Vote*: #-#-#. Motion passed failed	

#	Ref.	Comment	TF Response	Committee Action:
TI-2		Chart contains terminology of 100°C which is 212°F and then states flammable or combustible material. Why would it be a concern for flammable when IFC/OSHA classify flammables in the following manner: Flammable liquid: any liquid having a flash point below 100ºF (37.8ºC), except any mixture having components with flashpoints of 100ºF (37.8ºC) or higher, the total of which make up 99 percent or more of the total volume of the mixture. Flammable liquids shall be known as Class I liquids. Class I liquids are divided into three classes as follows: 1. Class IA shall include liquids having flash points below 73ºF (22.8ºC) and having a boiling point below 100ºF (37.8ºC). 2. Class IB shall include liquids having flash points below 73ºF (22.8ºC) and having a boiling point at or above 100ºF (37.8ºC). 3. Class IC shall include liquids having flash points at or above 73ºF (22.8ºC) and below 100ºF (37.8ºC). Flammable gas: Any material which is a gas at 20 °C (68 °F) or less and 101.3 kPa (14.7 psia) of pressure (a material which has a boiling point of 20 °C (68 °F) or less at 101.3 kPa (14.7 psia)) (5969_Texas_Inst_comments.docx)  5969_Texas_Inst_comments.docx	Sklar, 22mar16: Flammable and combustible fluids that are consumable are addressed in the first diamond. The third diamond addresses any such fluids that are not consumable. Furthermore, it addresses combustible solids, which are not addressed in the preceding diamonds. TF, 05apr16:	(Select one) ___No further action _X_Refer to TF for further review ___New Business ___Editorial Change: #___in ECs below ___Other: (Select one) ___Committee agrees (no motion nec.) ___Motion to act as indicated above: *By/2nd*: *Disc*: *Vote*: #-#-#. Motion passed failed

Line Item 1 – Summary of Editorial Changes

NOTICE: TF leaders have the option of addressing editorial changes prior to addressing negatives, if they believe that their editorial changes will render some or all of the submitted negatives non-persuasive.

NOTICE: It is only necessary to approve each editorial change separately if someone objects to one or more of the suggested changes.

#	*Ref.*	*Before*	*After*	*Object? (Y/N)*	*Motion to Approve: (if necessary)*
					By/2nd: *Disc*: *Vote*: #-#-#. **Motion passed failed**
					By/2nd: *Disc*: *Vote*: #-#-#. **Motion passed failed**

Move to approve **all** editorial changes as shown above:

By/2nd:

Disc:

Vote: #-#-#. **Motion passed failed**

Line Item 1 – Forwarding Motions

Documents Passing Review	*Documents Failing Review*
Safety Check Move to find that this document: ___Is NOT a safety document: when all safety-related information is removed, the document is still technically sound and complete. ___IS a safety document: when all safety-related information is removed, the document is not technically sound and complete. ___The Safety Checklist (Regulations 13.3) for this document is complete and has accompanied the document through the balloting process. *By*/*2nd*: *Disc*: *Vote*: #-#-#. **Motion passed failed** **Intellectual Property Check** The meeting chair asked those present in person or by electronic link, if they were aware of any patented or copyrighted material in the Standard or Guideline. (Note: Such material might have become known since the Standard or Safety Guideline was last reviewed, or might become relevant due to this ballot.) ___No patented or copyrighted material is known to exist in the Standard or Guideline. (no motion needed) ___Patented or copyrighted material is known to exist in the Standard or Guideline but release for such material has been obtained or presented to the committee. (no motion needed) ___Patented or copyrighted material is known to exist in the Standard or Guideline but release for some of the material(s) has NOT been obtained or presented to the committee. The committee moves to: ___Ask the ISC for special permission to publish the standard without release ___Quit the activity ___Wait for the release of the patented or copyrighted material. *By*/*2nd*: *Disc*: *Vote*: #-#-#. **Motion passed failed** **Final Action** Move to: ___Pass this document as balloted and forward to the A&R for procedural review. ___Pass this document with editorial changes and forward to the A&R for procedural review. *By*/*2nd*: *Disc*: *Vote*: #-#-#. **Motion passed failed**	**Followup Activity Authorization** Move to: _X_Return ballot to the originating task force for rework __X_and authorize a follow-up ballot ___Transfer ballot to the (name) task force for rework ___and authorize a follow-up ballot ___Discontinue work on ballot. *By*/*2nd*: Sklar/PLanting *Disc*: *Vote*: #-#-#. 10-0 Motion passed failed

Line Item 2 – Restructuring of portions of Section 14.

Tallies at Close of Voting

Voting Return Data		Acceptance Rate Data	
Voting Interest Returns	55	*Voting Interest Accept Votes (VIAccept)*	38
Total Voting Interests	87	*Interest Reject Votes (IReject)*	1
Voting Interest Return %	63.22%	*Approval % [VIAccept / (VIAccept + IReject)]*	97.44%
Other Returns (Intercommittee, etc.)		*# of Interest Rejects that Need to be not found Valid for*	
	15	*Final Approval % >= 90%*	0
Total Votes	92		
Total Votes with Comments	0		
Total Reject Votes	1		

Rejects/Negatives

Summary: 2 Total Items Submitted

Company: Submitter	*ID*	*Negs*	*Disp*	*Company: Submitter*	*ID*	*Negs*	*Disp*
SCREEN: Ryosuke Imamiya	SCREEN	2					

Details:

NOTICE: SEMI Staff must receive copies of ALL withdrawals of negative votes.

Table 5 Negatives from < SCREEN: Ryosuke Imamiya>

W = Withdrawn, NR = Not Related, NP = Not Persuasive, RP = Related and Persuasive, NS = Not Significant, S = Significant					
#	*Ref.*	*Negative including Justification*	*TF Finding and Reason*	*Motion and Reason in Committee:*	*Final*

W = Withdrawn, NR = Not Related, NP = Not Persuasive, RP = Related and Persuasive, NS = Not Significant, S = Significant

#	Ref.	Negative including Justification	TF Finding and Reason	Motion and Reason in Committee:	Final
SCREEN 1	Line Item 2, Part A	Please explain what is licensed. Add examples of the licenses.	(Select 1) __Not related _X_Not persuasive (assumes related) __Related & persuasive Reason: Sklar, 22mar16: This does not appear to be an objection to the restructuring. Recommend finding this NP. I suggest considering adding a NOTE to provide the requested information. TF, 05apr16: RNP: (Karl, Planting) Not an objection to the restructuring, so the use of "licensed" is not being changed. Y: 12 N: 0 Recommend editorial change.	__**Withdrawn by Subm. (Date: _____)** **Move to find this negative: (select 1)** ___Not related (**requires reason, follow**) ____Committee new business ____Assigned to: _____ ___x Not persuasive (**requires reason**) ___Related & persuasive (**ballot fails**) **Reason:** Not an objection to the restructuring, so the use of "licensed" is not being changed. *By/2nd*: Sklar/Planting *Disc*: *Vote*: #-#-#. 9-0 **Motion passed** **Significance finding/method: (select 1)** ___Not significant by agreement ___Not significant by motion ___Significant by % of NP vote (>10%) ___Significant by agreement ___Significant by motion *By/2nd*: *Disc*:	

W = Withdrawn, NR = Not Related, NP = Not Persuasive, RP = Related and Persuasive, NS = Not Significant, S = Significant

#	Ref.	*Negative including Justification*	*TF Finding and Reason*	*Motion and Reason in Committee:*	*Final*
SCREEN 2	Line Item 2, Part B 14.5.1.12	The requirements should be in the front of the sentence, exemptions should not in the front. I recommend starting from the requirements. Shutdown or failure of a fire detection or suppression system should prevent additional processing …….	(Select 1) __Not related __Not persuasive (assumes related) __Related & persuasive Reason: Sklar, 22mar16: This appears to be an editorial suggestion on how the first sentence should be structured, rather than an objection to moving this paragraph. (There is no change proposed to the sentence structure.) I recommend finding this NP. TF, 05apr16: RNP (Karl, Holbrook): Paragraph is proposed to be moved, not changed. Negative is request for an editorial change. Y: 9 N: 0	__**Withdrawn by Subm. (Date: ___)** **Move to find this negative: (select 1)** __Not related (**requires reason, follow**) ___Committee new business ___Assigned to: _____ __x Not persuasive (**requires reason**) __Related & persuasive (**ballot fails**) **Reason:** Paragraph is proposed to be moved, not changed. Negative is request for an editorial change. *By/2nd*: Sklar/Karl *Disc*: *Vote*: #-#-#. 8-0 **Motion passed** **Significance finding/method: (select 1)** ___Not significant by agreement ___Not significant by motion ___Significant by % of NP vote (>10%) ___Significant by agreement ___Significant by motion *By/2nd*: *Disc*: *Vote*: #-#-#. **Motion passed failed**	

Final disposition of this reject:
__Valid (includes at least one significant negative)
__Not Valid (all negatives withdrawn, found not related, or found not significant)

Line Item 2 – Summary of Editorial Changes

NOTICE: TF leaders have the option of addressing editorial changes prior to addressing negatives, if they believe that their editorial changes will render some or all of the submitted negatives non-persuasive.

NOTICE: It is only necessary to approve each editorial change separately if someone objects to one or more of the suggested changes.

#	*Ref.*	*Before*	*After*	*Object? (Y/N)*	*Motion to Approve: (if necessary)*
					By/2nd: *Disc*: *Vote*: #-#-#. **Motion passed failed**
					By/2nd: *Disc*: *Vote*: #-#-#. **Motion passed failed**

Move to approve **all** editorial changes as shown above:

By/2nd:

Disc:

Vote: #-#-#. **Motion passed failed**

Line Item 2 – Forwarding Motions

Documents Passing Review	*Documents Failing Review*
Safety Check Move to find that this document: ___Is NOT a safety document: when all safety-related information is removed, the document is still technically sound and complete. __x_ IS a safety document: when all safety-related information is removed, the document is not technically sound and complete. __x__The Safety Checklist (Regulations 13.3) for this document is complete and has accompanied the document through the balloting process. *By/2nd*: Sklar/PLanting *Disc*: *Vote*: #-#-#. 8-0 Motion passed failed Intellectual Property Check The meeting chair asked those present in person or by electronic link, if they were aware of any patented or copyrighted material in the Standard or Guideline. (Note: Such material might have become known since the Standard or Safety Guideline was last reviewed, or might become relevant due to this ballot.) __x_ No patented or copyrighted material is known to exist in the Standard or Guideline. (no motion needed) ___Patented or copyrighted material is known to exist in the Standard or Guideline but release for such material has been obtained or presented to the committee. (no motion needed) ___Patented or copyrighted material is known to exist in the Standard or Guideline but release for some of the material(s) has NOT been obtained or presented to the committee. The committee moves to: ___Ask the ISC for special permission to publish the standard without release ___Quit the activity ___Wait for the release of the patented or copyrighted material. *By/2nd*: *Disc*: *Vote*: #-#-#. Motion passed failed	Followup Activity Authorization Move to: ___Return ballot to the originating task force for rework ___and authorize a follow-up ballot ___Transfer ballot to the (name) task force for rework ___and authorize a follow-up ballot ___Discontinue work on ballot. *By/2nd*: *Disc*: *Vote*: #-#-#. Motion passed failed

Final Action Move to: __x__ Pass this document as balloted and forward to the A&R for procedural review. ___ Pass this document with editorial changes and forward to the A&R for procedural review. *By/2nd*: Sklar/PLanting *Disc*: *Vote*: #-#-#. 8-0 Motion passed	