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 2The XML schema represents all data as ‘string’.This leaves the conversion of the SECS data value intothe ‘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 isan unambiguous method described to convert the SECS-II message bytesinto 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  |