Responses and Review Form for SEMI Draft Document #4683I Line Item Revision to SEMI S2-0715, Environmental, Health, and Safety Guideline for Semiconductor Manufacturing Equipment. Delayed Revisions Related to Chemical Exposure

# Line Item 1 – Delayed Revisions Related to Chemical Exposure Criteria

## **Tallies at Close of Voting**

Voting Return Data		Acceptance Rate Data	
Voting Interest Returns	54	Voting Interest Accept Votes (VIAccept)	34
Total Voting Interests	89	Interest Reject Votes (IReject)	2
Voting Interest Return %	60.67%	Approval % [VIAccept / (VIAccept + IReject)]	94.44%
Other Returns (Intercommittee, etc.)		# of Interest Rejects that Need to be not found Valid for	
	19	Final Approval % >= 90%	0
Total Votes	104		
Total Votes with Comments	2		
Total Reject Votes	2		

### Rejects/Negatives

Summary: 4 Total Items Submitted

Company: Submitter	ID	Negs	Disp	Company: Submitter	ID	Negs	Disp
Applied Materials: Ed Karl	AMAT	3		ASML: Bert Planting	ASML	1	

Details:

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

	W =	Withdrawn, NR = Not Related, NP = Not Persuasive, R	$P = \frac{Related}{Related}$ and $\frac{Related}{Related}$ and $\frac{Related}{Related}$	= Not Significant, S = Significant
#	Ref.	Negative including Justification	TF Finding <u>and Reason</u>	Motion and Reason in Committee: Final
AMA T-1	23.5.2	Section 23.5.2 attempts to define (or explain) "Laboratories" as an "accredited industrial hygiene laboratory"; however, the only use of the word of the word "laboratories" in SEMI S2 pertains to Accredited Testing Laboratories. In fact, neither the Chemical Section (Section 23) nor the ballot uses the word "Laboratories" (plural). Lastly, although the term used in 23.5.2 is "Laboratories" (plural), the	Not relatedNot persuasive (assumes related) _XX _Related & persuasive Reason: R&P For 8 Opposed 0	Withdrawn by Subm. (Date:)  Move to find this negative: (select 1)Not related (requires reason, follow)Committee new businessAssigned to:Not persuasive (requires reason) x_Related & persuasive (ballot fails) Reason:  By/2nd: John Visty/Ed Karl Disc: Vote: 10-0. Motion passed  Significance finding/method: (select 1)Not significant by agreementNot significant by motionSignificant by % of NP vote (>10%)Significant by agreementSignificant by motion  By/2nd: Disc: Vote: #-#-#. Motion passed failed

	W = W	Withdrawn, $NR = Not Related$ , $NP = Not Persuasive$ , $R$	P = Related and Persuasive, $NS =$	= Not Significant, S = Significant
#	Ref.	Negative <u>including Justification</u>	TF Finding <u>and Reason</u>	Motion and Reason in Committee: Fin
	23.5.1.1 third bullet	Negative S2 Chemical Task Force introduced the term "accredited laboratory"; however, "accredited laboratory" is not used nor defined in SEMI S2. Using "accredited laboratory" could easily be confused with "accredited testing laboratory" (which the S2 Chemical Task Force tries so hard to differentiate in Section 23.5.2.  Proposed Solution: Replace "accredited laboratory" with "accredited industrial hygiene laboratory" as the term "accredited industrial hygiene laboratory" is being used over and over again in Section 23.	Not related Not persuasive (assumes related) Related & persuasive Reason:	Withdrawn by Subm. (Date:)  Move to find this negative: (select 1)Not related (requires reason, follow)Committee new businessAssigned to:Not persuasive (requires reason)Related & persuasive (ballot fails) Reason:  By/2nd: Disc: Vote: #-#-#. Motion passed failed  Significance finding/method: (select 1)Not significant by agreementNot significant by motionSignificant by % of NP vote (>10%)Significant by agreementSignificant by motion  By/2nd: Disc: Vote: #-#-#. Motion passed failed

# Ref.	Negative including Justification	TF Finding and Reason	Motion and Reason in Committee:
# Rej. 23.5.1.1, third "Note xxx"  MA 3	Negative S2 Chemical Task Force introduced the term "accredited laboratory"; however, "accredited laboratory" is not used nor defined in SEMI S2. Using "accredited laboratory" could easily be confused with "accredited testing laboratory" (which the S2 Chemical Task Force tries so hard to differentiate in Section 23.5.2.  Proposed Solution: Replace "accredited laboratory" with "accredited industrial hygiene laboratory" as the term "accredited industrial hygiene laboratory" is being used over and over again in Section 23.	(Select 1) Not relatedNot persuasive (assumes related)Related & persuasive Reason:	Withdrawn by Subm. (Date:)  Move to find this negative: (select 1)Not related (requires reason, follow)Committee new businessAssigned to:Not persuasive (requires reason)Related & persuasive (ballot fails) Reason:  By/2nd: Disc: Vote: #-#-#. Motion passed failed  Significance finding/method: (select 1)Not significant by agreementNot significant by motionSignificant by % of NP vote (>10%)Significant by agreementSignificant by motion  By/2nd: Disc: Vote: #-#-#. Motion passed failed

Table 2 Negatives from < ASML: Bert Planting>

<i>W</i> =	Withdrawn, $NR = Not Related$ , $NP = Not Related$	ot Persuasive, RP = <mark>Related and Persuasive</mark>	e, NS = Not Significant, S = Significant
# Ref.	Negative including Justification	TF Finding <u>and Reason</u>	Motion <u>and Reason</u> in Committee: Fi
23.5.2 .SM -1	Why an accredited laboratory. SEMI is not requiring this for electrical conformance etc. I think use of an approved method is sufficient		

### **Comments**

Summary: 2 Total Items Submitted

Company: Submitter	ID	#	Company: Submitter	ID	#
SCREEN Semiconductor Solutions:	SCREEN	2	Lam Research: Sean Larsen	LMRC	1
Ryosuke Imamiya					

#### 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:
SCR EEN- 1		Exposure. At IHTESH2016 KOBE, there was a session of the Safety & Health (nanomaterials). TSIA presented "Nanoparticle Assessment in the Workplaces of Semiconductor Factory" at the session. They have measured obvious nanoparticle emission during a periodic maintenance of a PH3 Implanter  They referred the NIOSH's limits in the OSHA Fact Sheet.  https://www.osha.gov/Publications/OSHA_FS-3634.pdf	Hazards from nanomaterials should be incorporated into section 23. The TF should discuss and determine the best strategy to proceed.	(Select one)No further actionXXRefer to TF for further reviewNew BusinessEditorial Change: #in ECs belowOther: (Select one)Committee agrees (no motion nec.)Motion to act as indicated above:  By/2nd: Disc: Vote: #-#-#. Motion passed failed
LMR C1	1.1 3 <sup>rd</sup> note	Accept with COMMENT Suggest adding a reference to the Laboratories paragraph in the note as the accredited laboratory hasn't been discussed yet.  Suggestion / Justification Insert "(see ¶ 23.5.2)" between " Contact the accredited laboratory" and "to determine". Likely also insert "industrial hygiene" between "accredited" and "laboratory".		(Select one) No further action 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

### **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

# **Forwarding Motions**

Documents Passing Review	Documents Failing Review
Safety Check	Followup Activity Authorization
Move to find that this document:	Move to:
Is NOT a safety document: when all safety-related information is removed, the document is still technically sound and complete.	Return ballot to the originating task force for rework
IS a safety document: when all safety-related information is removed, the document is not technically sound and completeThe Safety Checklist (Regulations 13.3) for this document is complete and has accompanied the document through the balloting process.	and authorize a follow-up ballotTransfer ballot to the (name) task force for reworkand authorize a follow-up ballot
	Discontinue work on ballot.
By/2nd:	
Disc:	By/2nd:
Vote: #-#-#. Motion passed failed	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	