Ballot Review Summary

2014 Cycle 4

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

I. Document Number & Title

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Document 5620** | **Line Item Revision to Add XML SECS-II Message Notation and a Complementary File to SEMI E5-0813, SEMI Equipment Communications Standard 2 Message Content (SECS-II)** |

II-1 Line item 1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Line Item 1** | **SECS-II Message Notation** |

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)



2. Rejects

Reject 1 (Thomas Hoogenboom – ASML)

Negative 2 of Reject 1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Negative** | **Referenced Section** | **\*TF/Committee to fill in if necessary** | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | |
| **Reason** | **\*Original negative comment and as well as justification should be included.** | | | | | | | | | |
| Reject 2  The XML schema represents all data as ‘string’.  This leaves the conversion of the SECS data value into  the ‘string’ type implementation dependent.  For the boolean types the obvious choices would be 0/1,  but others could choose T/F, Y/N, True/False etc.  For the binary type there are many string reprentations in use.  I claim that the standard is not technically complete until there is  an unambiguous method described to convert the SECS-II message bytes  into the XML string representation. | | | | | | | | | |
| **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] <90% | | | | **GO TO “Final”** 🡪 **(B)** | | | |
|  | | 90% =< [Negative is not related] | | | | **GO TO** “**Not Significant Finding Option”** | | | |
| **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** | Brian Rubow (Cimetrix) / Jan Rothe (GLOBALFOUNDRIES) | | | | | | | | | |
| **Discussion** | None | | | | | | | | | |
| **Result of Vote (check ONE)** | 16-0 | | | | | | | | | |
| 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 in either case of “if the committee finds a negative not related by a vote equal to or greater than 90% of the persons voting on the action” or “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 ¶ 9.5.3.1.4, 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 🡪 (B) OR (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 🡪 (B) OR (C)** | | |
| **Final** | | Negative is: | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | **(A)** | withdrawn (counted under **h** in disposition) | | | | | | |
|  | | **(B)** | not related (significant) (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 | | | | | | | |

Reject votes were also received from the following voters:

* Mitch Sakamoto (Tokyo Electron)
* Franz Putz (znt Zentren fuer Neue Technologien GmbH)
* Mitsuhiro Matsuda (Hitachi Kokusai)
* Jan Rothe (GLOBALFOUNDRIES)

3. Comments

Comments were received from the following voters:

* Thomas Hoogenboom (ASML)
* Tadashi Mochizuki (Tokyo Electron)
* Mitsuhiro Matsuda (Hitachi Kokusai)
* Jan Rothe (GLOBALFOUNDRIES)

III. Action for this document

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Motion**  **(Check all applicable items)** |  | Line item(s) [X], [X] and [X] 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. | | |
| **x** | Line item(s) [1] 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** | | | Brian Rubow (Cimetrix) / Jan Rothe (GLOBALFOUNDRIES) | |
| **Discussion** | | | None | |
| **Vote** | | | 16-0 | |
| **Final Action** | | | x | Motion passed |
|  | Motion failed |