Procedural Review Voting Sheet

2014 Cycle 3

REGION: North America

COMMITTEE: Information & Control

EVENT: SEMICON West 2014

DATE OF MEETING: July 9, 2014

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

COMMITTEE CO-CHAIRS: Brian Rubow/Cimetrix, Lance Rist/RistTex, Jack Ghiselli/Ghiselli Consulting

SEMI STAFF: Paul Trio

A&R Voter: Name/Company

Date: 201X/MM/DD

I. Document Number & Title

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Document 5507A** | **Line Item Revisions to SEMI E132-0310E2, Specification for Equipment Client Authentication and Authorization** |

II-1 Line item 1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Line Item 1** | **E132 Session Termination Errors** |

1. Tally (Staff to fill in)

**Voting Tally: As-cast tally after the close of the 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)



|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **A&R** |  | **Not approved** |
| **Reason:** |

2. Rejects

There were no reject votes received for ballot 5507A, line item 1.

3. Comments

Comment 1

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Comment** | **Referenced Section** | **\*TF/Committee to fill in if necessary** |
| **From** | **Eberhard Teichmann (PEER Group)** |
| **Comment** | The line item is a good Idea, but the definition in the table ‘Session State Transitions’, last column:A communication error means that the “client does not respond after the configured number of pings” as defined in 13.3.2.7 “SESSION MONITOR (MONITORING Sub-State)”. is a bit too narrow.I think, it would be better to include:‘Clients responding with HTTP error codes (e.g. 401, 404, 500) to NewData or Ping requests&quot;Further could be debatable:Must an invalid request from the client constitute a communication error?From my point of view it can already be handled on a message level. |
| **Discussion** | Voter input will be added to the DDA Task Force’s Issues List and will be addressed in a future ballot. |
| **Action proposed** | x | **The committee agreed to do one of the following actions.**  |
| \***No motion is required in this step.** |
|  | x | No further action was taken by the committee. |
|  | Refer to the task force for more consideration.  |
|  | New Business |
|  | Other |
| **Editorial Change** |  |
|  |  | **Case 1: No vote in this section :** |
| **To be included and voted on in 4. Summary of Editorial Changes.** |
|  | **Case 2: Voted in this section :**  |
| **Original section number and at least one full sentence are required in “FROM” and “TO” fields.** |
|  | **1** | **FROM: Section xxx** |
| **To: Section xxx** |
| **Justification (If necessary)** |
|  | **2** | **FROM: Section xxx** |
| **To: Section xxx** |
| **Justification (If necessary)** |
| **Motion by/2nd** | Name (Company)/Name (Company) |
| **Vote** | XX-XX Motion passed (or failed) |
| **A&R** |  | **Not approved** |
| **Reason:** |

Comment 2

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Comment** | **Referenced Section** | **\*TF/Committee to fill in if necessary** |
| **From** | **Christian Hoffmann (PEER Group)** |
| **Comment** | ‘Clients to respond with HTTP error codes (e.g. 401, 404, 500) to NewData or Ping requests’ |
| **Discussion** | Voter input will be added to the DDA Task Force’s Issues List and will be addressed in a future ballot. The voter was present at the time of the TF’s discussion and was acceptable of the action. |
| **Action proposed** | x | **The committee agreed to do one of the following actions.**  |
| \***No motion is required in this step.** |
|  | x | No further action was taken by the committee. |
|  | Refer to the task force for more consideration.  |
|  | New Business |
|  | Other |
| **Editorial Change** |  |
|  |  | **Case 1: No vote in this section :** |
| **To be included and voted on in 4. Summary of Editorial Changes.** |
|  | **Case 2: Voted in this section :**  |
| **Original section number and at least one full sentence are required in “FROM” and “TO” fields.** |
|  | **1** | **FROM: Section xxx** |
| **To: Section xxx** |
| **Justification (If necessary)** |
|  | **2** | **FROM: Section xxx** |
| **To: Section xxx** |
| **Justification (If necessary)** |
| **Motion by/2nd** | Name (Company)/Name (Company) |
| **Vote** | XX-XX Motion passed (or failed) |
| **A&R** |  | **Not approved** |
| **Reason:** |

4. Summary of Editorial Changes

There were no editorial changes for ballot 5507A, line item 1.

5. Approval Conditions Check

**APPROVAL CONDITION 1:** All negatives have been discussed and were withdrawn, found not related, or not persuasive. (Regulations ¶ 9.6.2)

**APPROVAL CONDITION 2:** At least 90% of the sum of the valid accept and reject votes must be accept. (Regulations ¶ 9.6.3)

Note: if both approval conditions are not satisfied, the balloted item fails.

III. Safety Check

This section applies to the entire document.

See Section 14 of the Regulations for further information

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Motion:** | **x** | This is not a Safety Document: when all safety-related information is removed, the document is still technically sound and complete. |
|  | This is a Safety Document: when all safety-related information is removed, the document is not technically sound and complete. |
|  |   | Safety Checklist is complete and has been included with the document throughout the balloting process. (Regulations ¶14.3)  |
| **Motion by/ 2nd by** | Jack Ghiselli (Ghiselli Consulting) / Jan Rothe (GLOBALFOUNDRIES) |
| **Discussion** | None |
| **Vote** | 18-0 Motion passed |
| **A&R** |  | **Not approved** |
| **Reason:** |

IV. Intellectual Property Check

**Note: This ballot may be all or part of a Standard or Safety Guideline. This IP check applies to the entire Standard or Safety Guideline. See § 15 of the Regulations for further information**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| x | The meeting chair asked those present in person or by electronic link, if they were aware of any potentially material patented technology or copyrighted items\* in the Standard or Guideline. |
|  | x | No potentially material patented technology or copyrighted items are known | **GO TO SECTION V** |
|  | Potentially material patented technology or copyrighted items are known but a Letter of Assurance (LOA) or copyright release for such material has been obtained or presented to the committee. | **GO TO SECTION V** |
|  | Potentially material patented technology or copyrighted items are known but an LOA or copyright release for some of the material(s) has NOT been obtained or presented to the committee |
| **MOTION** |  | 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-XX |
| **Final Action** |  | Motion Passed |
|  | Motion Failed |
| **A&R** |  | **Not approved** |
| **Reason:** |

\* 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 ballot.

V. Action for this document

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Motion** **(Check all applicable items)** | **x** | Line item(s) [1] passed committee review as balloted and will be forwarded to the A&R for procedural review. |
|  | Line item(s) [X], [X] and [X] passed committee review with editorial changes and will be forwarded to the A&R for procedural review. |
|  | Line item(s) [X], [X] and [X] failed committee review and will be returned to the task force for rework. |
|  | Line item(s) [X], [X] and [X] failed committee review and work will be discontinued. |
| **Motion by/ 2nd by** | Gino Crispieri (consultant) / Jan Rothe (GLOBALFOUNDRIES) |
| **Discussion** | None |
| **Vote** | 16-0  |
| **Final Action** | x | Motion passed |
|  | Motion failed  |
| **A&R** |  | **Approved** |
|  | **Not approved** |
| **Reason:** |