

Procedural Review Voting Sheet 2014 Cycle 4

REGION: **North America**
 COMMITTEE: **Silicon Wafer**
 EVENT: **SEMICON West 2014**
 DATE OF MEETING: **July 8, 2014**
 PLACE OF MEETING: **San Francisco Marriott Marquis, San Francisco, CA**
 COMMITTEE CO-CHAIRS: **Noel Poduje (SMS), Dinesh Gupta (STA)**
 SEMI STAFF: **Kevin Nguyen**

A&R Voter: **Name/Company**
 Date: **200X/MM/DD**

I. Document Number & Title

Document 5604	Line Item Revision to SEMI M1-0414, Specification for Polished Single Crystal Silicon Wafer and SEMI M20-0110, Practice for Establishing a Wafer Coordinate System
----------------------	---

II-1 Line item 1

Line Item 1	Revise both SEMI M1 and SEMI M20 to add a notchless category of 450 mm diameter wafers
--------------------	---

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)

	Return		Distribution		Return Rate	
Yellow	53	÷	86	=	61.6%	>=60%
Lilac & Others	27					
Total Vote	80					
Reject	0					
Accept	39					

A&R		Not approved
	Reason:	

2. Rejects

There was no reject submitted for ballot 5604 of line item 1.

3. Comments

Comment 1

Comment	Referenced Section	<p>Abstain with comments</p> <p>I think this is just editorial, probably generated by Word at some point: Starting on page 6, there is a renumbering of Footnotes for Table 2, e.g., #6 > #5 #7 > #6</p> <p>This renumbering suggests that a prior #5 was deleted, which I don't believe was the case (however, if this was the case, then this comment would be other than editorial)</p>
	From	Richard Allen (NIST)
	Comment	
	Discussion	The last published version, the footnote subscripts need to be corrected. As listed above, #6 should be #5, and #7 should be #6. No committee action is needed. SEMI Publication will correct it.
Action proposed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The committee agreed to do one of the following actions.
		*No motion is required in this step.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No further action was taken by the committee.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Refer to the task force for more consideration.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	New Business
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other
	Editorial Change	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Case 1: No vote in this section :
		To be included and voted on in <u>4. Summary of Editorial Changes</u>.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	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	Accept with comments ID marking specification for 450mm only requires T7, and does not say anything about an option for a human readable ID mark (SEMI M12 OCR). This is an oversight that should be corrected in a subsequent revision.
	From	Robb Robles (Cognex)
	Comment	
	Discussion	The task force recommends the committee that this change is not appropriate.
Action proposed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The committee agreed to do one of the following actions. *No motion is required in this step.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	No further action was taken by the committee.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Refer to the task force for more consideration.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	New Business
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other
	Editorial Change	
		Case 1: No vote in this section : To be included and voted on in <u>4. Summary of Editorial Changes.</u>
	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 3

Comment	Referenced Section	Accept with comments The notchless wafer surely has many technical merits such as a damage free around notch and an increase of FQA, etc. In the economic views, I still think that the notchless wafer standard is premature. I go for support for the notchless wafer standard in the technical views such as manufacturing process and measuring technique, etc.
	From	Eun Suck Choi (LG Siltron)
	Comment	
	Discussion	The TF recommends to the committee that no action is necessary
Action passed	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 <u>4. Summary of Editorial Changes</u> .
		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 3

Comment	Referenced Section	Accept with comments As foreseen the 3 fiducials are at uneven angles, but only of 1° difference. A bigger angle difference between each of the fiducial could in some cases add a way to quickly determine the current position while aligning wafers (measuring the angle btw 2 fiducials)
	From	Thomas Brillouet (RECIF Technologies)
	Comment	

	Discussion	The TF recommends to the committee that no change is necessary.
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 <u>4. Summary of Editorial Changes</u>.
		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

Note: 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	To approve the above editorial changes	
Motion by / 2nd by	Name (Company) / Name (Company)	
Discussion	XXXX	
Vote	XX-XX Motion passed (or failed)	
A&R	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not approved
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Reason:

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.

		Accepts		(Accepts + Valid Rejects)			
Approval Rate	=	<input type="text" value="39"/>	/	<input type="text" value="39"/>	=	<input type="text" value="100.0%"/>	≥90%

6. Preliminary action for this line item

Motion	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	This line item passed committee review as balloted.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	This line item passed committee review with editorial changes
	<input type="checkbox"/>	This line item failed committee review and will be returned to the task force for rework.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	This line item failed committee review and work will be discontinued.
Motion by/ 2nd by	Noel Poduje (SMS)/Pinyen Lin (G450C)	
Discussion	None	

Vote	15-0	
Final Action	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Motion passed
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Motion failed
A&R	<input type="checkbox"/>	Approved
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not approved
	Reason:	

III. Safety Check

This section applies to the entire document.
See Section 14 of the Regulations for further information

Motion:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	This is not a Safety Document: when all safety-related information is removed, the document is still technically sound and complete.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	This is a Safety Document: when all safety-related information is removed, the document is not technically sound and complete.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety Checklist is complete and has been included with the document throughout the balloting process. (Regulations ¶ 14.3)
Motion by/ 2nd by		Noel Poduje (SMS)/Pinyen Lin (G450C)
Discussion		None
Vote		11-0 Motion passed
A&R	<input type="checkbox"/>	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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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.	
	No potentially material patented technology or copyrighted items are known	GO TO SECTION IX
	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 IX
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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	<input type="checkbox"/>	Ask ISC for special permission to publish
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Quit activity
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Wait for LOA for patented technology or release of copyrighted items.
Motion by/2nd by		Noel Poduje (SMS)/ Mike Goldstein (Intel)
Discussion		Pinyen Lin: There is a published patent application TSMC_US2013258339A1

	Vote	7-1	
	Final Action	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Motion Passed
		<input type="checkbox"/>	Motion Failed
A&R	<input type="checkbox"/>	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)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Line item(s) [1] passed committee review as balloted and will be forwarded to the A&R for procedural review.	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Line item(s) [X], [X] and [X] passed committee review with editorial changes and will be forwarded to the A&R for procedural review.	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Line item(s) [X], [X] and [X] failed committee review and will be returned to the task force for rework.	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Line item(s) [X], [X] and [X] failed committee review and work will be discontinued.	
Motion by/ 2nd by	Noel Poduje (SMS)/Pinyen Lin (G450C)		
Discussion	Pinyen: He believes that TSMC will offer an LOA with free and open license.		
Vote	3-6		
Final Action	<input type="checkbox"/>	Motion passed	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Motion failed	
A&R	<input type="checkbox"/>	Approved	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not approved	
		Reason:	

Motion: Noel Poduje (SMS) moved to that the NA TC Chapter Silicon Wafer Technical Committee request GCS to allow the final portion of adjudication of this document to be moved to the first international meeting after receipt and acceptance of the LOA by SEMI

Seconded: Pinyen Lin (G450C)

Vote: 15-0 in favor.

Motion passed.