

Record of Letter Ballot Review by TC Chapter for Procedural Review

Region/Locale: [Japan](#)

Global Technical Committee: [Information & Control](#)

TC Chapter Cochairs: [Takayuki Nishimura/ SCREEN Semiconductor Solutions, Mitsuhiro Matsuda/ Hitachi Kokusai Electric](#)

Standards staff: [Chie Yanagisawa](#)

	Scheduled in Background Statement	Actual
Date	12/18/2015	12/18/2015
Location	Tokyo Big Sight Conference Tower, Tokyo	Tokyo Big Sight Conference Tower, Tokyo

I. Document Number and Title

Document Number	Document Title
5888	Revision to: SEMI E170-0815: SPECIFICATION FOR PRODUCTION RECIPE CACHE (PRC) with title change to SPECIFICATION FOR SECURED FOUNDATION OF RECIPE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (SFORMS) SEMI E170.1-0815: SPECIFICATION FOR SECS-II PROTOCOL FOR PRODUCTION RECIPE CACHE with title change to SPECIFICATION FOR SECS-II PROTOCOL FOR SECURED FOUNDATION OF RECIPE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (SFORMS)

II. Tally (Standards staff to fill in)

Voting Tally: As-cast tally after close of voting period

A minimum of 60% of the Voting Interests that have TC Members within the global technical committee that issued the Letter Ballot must return Votes. (*Regulations ¶ 9.7.1.1*)

Voting Tally (with example values):

Voting Interest:	Returned Votes		Distribution	=	Return Rate	
Letter Ballot	57	÷	95	=	60.0%	>=60%
Intercommittee Ballot	17					
Voting Interest Reject(s)	0		Total Voter with Rejects		0	
Voting Interest Accept(s)	22					

III. Rejects

There was no reject vote received for Ballot 5888.

IV. Other Technical Issues

There was no Other Technical Issue for Ballot 5888.

V. Comments

V- (i) Voters' Comments

Commenter 1 (Christian Hoffmann / PEER Group GmbH) - Comment 1

Comment	*TF/TC Chapter to fill in, if necessary.	
	Page 4: As section 1.3 has been struck out, the current sections 1.4 and 1.5 need to be renumbered to 1.3 and 1.4 respectively.	
	Page 5: As section 2.5 has been struck out, the current sections 2.6 and 2.7 need to be renumbered to 2.5 and 2.6 respectively.	
	<p><TF Response> TF also found same issue on the deletion of 10.2.2. Adjust all section numbers (including the Table 46 Compliance Statement) related to those deletions as editorial changes by SEMI because section number adjustments of affected portions are logically required and cause no technical changes/misalignments.</p> <p>Normally, ballots which uses strike-through for deletion have a note which means 'Numbering of sections will be adjusted by SEMI prior to publication' but, this ballot missed to put the note.</p>	
Action	The TC Chapter agreed to do one of the following actions.	
	*No motion is required in this step.	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Already addressed by Commenter #, Comment #
	<input type="checkbox"/>	No further action was taken by the TC Chapter.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Refer to the TF for more consideration.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	New Business
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Editorial Change	
Options for Editorial Change (check one)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Case 1: No vote in this section : To be included and voted on in <u>§ VI. Summary of Editorial Changes.</u>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Case 2: Voted in this section : Original section number and at least one full sentence are required in "FROM" and "TO" fields.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Editorial Change	1	<p>FROM: Section/Paragraph xxx Renumber all section numbers affected by deletion of sections appropriately.</p> <p>TO: Section/Paragraph xxx</p>

		Justification (If necessary)
	2	FROM: Section/Paragraph xxx
		TO: Section/Paragraph xxx
		Justification (If necessary)
Motion	To approve above editorial change(s)	
Motion by/2nd by	Yuko Toyoshima (Hitachi High-Technologies) / Tadashi Mochizuki (Tokyo Electron)	
Discussion	None	
Vote	10-0; Motion passed.	

Commenter 1 (Christian Hoffmann / PEER Group GmbH) - Comment 2

Comment	*TF/TC Chapter to fill in, if necessary.	
	page 20 section 8. seems to be a partial repetition of section 7.5, which is used to introduce RecipeXID details already with similar text.	
	<TF Response> They are intentionally written in those separate sections. 7.5 is in "Conceptual Description" section and not a requirement, 8. is the requirement section	
Action	The TC Chapter agreed to do one of the following actions.	
	*No motion is required in this step.	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Already addressed by Commenter #, Comment #
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No further action was taken by the TC Chapter.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Refer to the TF for more consideration.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	New Business
<input type="checkbox"/>	Editorial Change	
Options for Editorial Change (check one)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Case 1: No vote in this section : To be included and voted on in § VI. Summary of Editorial Changes.
	<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.
Editorial Change	1	FROM: Section/Paragraph xxx
		TO: Section/Paragraph xxx

	Justification (If necessary)
2	FROM: Section/Paragraph xxx
	TO: Section/Paragraph xxx
	Justification (If necessary)
Motion	To approve above editorial change(s)
Motion by/2nd by	Name (Company)/Name (Company)
Discussion	XXXX
Vote	XX-XX; Motion passed/failed.

Commenter 1 (Christian Hoffmann / PEER Group GmbH) - Comment 3

Comment	*TF/TC Chapter to fill in, if necessary.
	page 31 section 10.2.4. 'Recipe Consistency Management by the Host'. Please clarify this section's first sentence. Please include a motivation (such as a use case) why the host would attempt deleting a PEM recipe.
	<TF Response> They are shown in 10.2.4.1 and 10.2.4.2.
	<Quotation from #5829A> 10.2.4 Recipe Consistency Management by the Host — In the following cases the host (Recipe Server) shall delete a PEM Recipe potentially exists in PRC by using Delete Operation in order to maintain consistency between the PEM Recipes in Recipe Server and the PEM Recipes in PRC. The host shall not execute Delete Operation on the PEM recipe which is being used for PJ creation (the PJ creation demand from the host is not responded with completion by the equipment) by the equipment. Equipment ignores the Delete Operation from the host in case the specified recipe is not in PRC. In case MaxNumber=0 (Full Download Mode or Full Query Mode), the deletion may not be required.
	10.2.4.1 Recipe Modification under the Same Recipe ID on Recipe Server — In case PEM Recipe modification under the same Recipe ID without the use of Version ID occurred on Recipe Server, the host (Recipe Server) shall delete a PEM Recipe, which has the same Recipe ID, potentially exists in PRC.
10.2.4.2 Recipe Deletion on Recipe Server — In case PEM Recipe deletion occurred on Recipe Server, the host (Recipe Server) shall delete the PEM Recipe, which has the same Recipe ID (and Version ID if in use), potentially exists in PRC.	
Action	The TC Chapter agreed to do one of the following actions.
	*No motion is required in this step.

		Already addressed by Commenter #, Comment #
	X	No further action was taken by the TC Chapter.
		Refer to the TF for more consideration.
		New Business
		Editorial Change
	Options for Editorial Change (check one)	Case 1: No vote in this section : To be included and voted on in § VI. 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.
Editorial Change	1	FROM: Section/Paragraph xxx
		TO: Section/Paragraph xxx
		Justification (If necessary)
	2	FROM: Section/Paragraph xxx
		TO: Section/Paragraph xxx
		Justification (If necessary)
Motion	To approve above editorial change(s)	
Motion by/2nd by	Name (Company)/Name (Company)	
Discussion	XXXX	
Vote	XX-XX; Motion passed/failed.	

Commenter 1 (Christian Hoffmann / PEER Group GmbH) - Comment 4

Comment	*TF/TC Chapter to fill in, if necessary.
	page 31 section 10.2.4.2 'Recipe Deletion on Recipe Server'. One sentence states 'In case PEM Recipe deletion occurred on Recipe Server, the host (Recipe Server) shall delete the PEM Recipe, which has the same Recipe ID (and version ID if in use), potentially exists in PRC.' The lead-in to the statement is that a PEM recipe has been deleted from the recipe server (host). The sub-subsequent request is that the host is to delete the PEM Recipe. Please clarify which recipe is to be deleted (by the host), as this seems to be a circular reference.

		<p><TF Response> 10.2.4.2 is an explanation of one case the host needs to delete PEM Recipe in PRC described in 10.2.4. The 2nd sentence says that the host need to delete a PEM Recipe potentially exists in PRC, not in the host system.</p> <p><Quotation from #5829A> 10.2.4.2 Recipe Deletion on Recipe Server — In case PEM Recipe deletion occurred on Recipe Server, the host (Recipe Server) shall delete the PEM Recipe, which has the same Recipe ID (and Version ID if in use), potentially exists in PRC.</p>	
Action	The TC Chapter agreed to do one of the following actions.		
	*No motion is required in this step.		
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Already addressed by Commenter #, Comment #	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No further action was taken by the TC Chapter.	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Refer to the TF for more consideration.	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	New Business	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Editorial Change		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	Options for Editorial Change (check one)
			Case 1: No vote in this section : To be included and voted on in § VI. Summary of Editorial Changes.
		<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.
Editorial Change	1	FROM: Section/Paragraph xxx	
		TO: Section/Paragraph xxx	
		Justification (If necessary)	
	2	FROM: Section/Paragraph xxx	
		TO: Section/Paragraph xxx	
		Justification (If necessary)	
Motion		To approve above editorial change(s)	
Motion by/2nd by		Name (Company)/Name (Company)	
Discussion		XXXX	
Vote		XX-XX; Motion passed/failed.	

Commenter 1 (Christian Hoffmann / PEER Group GmbH) - Comment 5

Comment	*TF/TC Chapter to fill in, if necessary.		
	page 43, table 40 defines the RACOBJ attribute 'AutoClose'and refers to the Maximum Time. However, MaxTime has been specified as PRCOBJ attribute (as well as as a service parameter). Please clarify whether the RACOBJ shares this attribute with the PRCOBJ attribute.		
	<TF Response> Maximum time and MaxTime are different. There is no relationship.		
Action	The TC Chapter agreed to do one of the following actions.		
	*No motion is required in this step.		
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Already addressed by Commenter #, Comment #	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No further action was taken by the TC Chapter.	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Refer to the TF for more consideration.	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	New Business	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Editorial Change		
	Options for Editorial Change (check one)	Case 1: No vote in this section : To be included and voted on in § VI. 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.	
	Editorial Change	1	FROM: Section/Paragraph xxx TO: Section/Paragraph xxx Justification (If necessary)
		2	FROM: Section/Paragraph xxx TO: Section/Paragraph xxx Justification (If necessary)
Motion		To approve above editorial change(s)	
Motion by/2nd by		Name (Company)/Name (Company)	
Discussion		XXXX	
Vote		XX-XX; Motion passed/failed.	

Commenter 1 (Christian Hoffmann / PEER Group GmbH) - Comment 6

Comment	*TF/TC Chapter to fill in, if necessary.	
	page 81: variable SecurityID: the second list element is not shown (except for its format). Please add 'SecurityID 0-16 characters'	
	<TF Response> The text recommend to add by the voter is a comment for the definition. Without the text the definition is technically correct, however, for readability, it is better to add the comment as suggested by the voter. SecurityID format is clearly specified in "RecipeList" variable as 0-16 characters.	
Action	The TC Chapter agreed to do one of the following actions.	
	*No motion is required in this step.	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Already addressed by Commenter #, Comment #
	<input type="checkbox"/>	No further action was taken by the TC Chapter.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Refer to the TF for more consideration.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Editorial Change
Editorial Change	Options for Editorial Change (check one)	<input type="checkbox"/> Case 1: No vote in this section : To be included and voted on in § VI. Summary of Editorial Changes .
		<input checked="" 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/Paragraph Table 7 last row L,2 1.[20]='SecurityID' 2.[20]
		TO: Section/Paragraph Table 7 last row L,2 1.[20]='SecurityID' 2.[20]SecurityID_0-16 characters
Justification (If necessary)		
2	FROM: Section/Paragraph xxx	
	TO: Section/Paragraph xxx	
	Justification (If necessary)	
Motion	To approve above editorial change(s)	
Motion by/2nd by	Yuko Toyoshima (Hitachi High-Technologies) / Tadashi Mochizuki (Tokyo Electron)	

Discussion	None
Vote	12-0; Motion passed.

V-(ii) Comments Created by handling Negative

There was no Comments Created by handling Negative for Ballot 5888.

VI. Editorial Changes other than those dealt with in Section V.

There was no Editorial Changes other than those dealt with in Section V for Ballot 5888.

VII. Approval Conditions Check

VII - (i). Approval Rate

APPROVAL CONDITION 1: All Negatives have been discussed and were withdrawn, found not related, found not persuasive, or addressed by a Technical Change. (Regulations ¶ 9.7.1.2)

APPROVAL CONDITION 2: At least 90% of the sum of valid Voting Interest Accept and Voting Interest Reject Votes must be Accept. (Regulations ¶ 9.7.1.3)

Note: If both approval conditions are not satisfied, the Document fails.

			Accepts		(Accepts + Valid Rejects)			
Approval Rate	=	22	/	22	=	100.0%		

VII – (ii) Approval Level (check one)

See § 9.7.2 of the *Regulations* for further information

- The Letter Ballot meets the Letter Ballot Approval Conditions for the global technical committee
- The Letter Ballot the Letter Ballot Approval Conditions for the TC Chapter and a Ratification Ballot will be issued to verify Technical Changes

VIII. Safety Check

See § 15 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. (<i>Regulations</i> ¶ 8.7.1)
		This is a Safety Document , when all safety-related information is removed, the Document is not technically sound and complete. (<i>Regulations</i> ¶ 8.7.2)
		Safety Checklist (<i>Regulations</i> ¶ 15.3) is complete and has been included with the Document throughout the balloting process. (<i>Regulations</i> ¶¶ 15.1.2)
Motion by/2nd by		Yuko Toyoshima (Hitachi High-Technologies) / Tadashi Mochizuki (Tokyo Electron)
Discussion		None
Vote		12-0; Motion passed

IX. Intellectual Property (IP) Check

Note: This Letter Ballot may cover all or part of a Standard or Safety Guideline. This IP check applies to the entire Standard or Safety Guideline. See § 16 of the *Regulations* for further information.

X	The TC Chapter meeting chair asked those participating, if they were aware of any potentially material patented technology or copyrighted items* in the Standard or Guideline. (<i>Regulations</i> ¶ 8.8.1)	
	X	No potentially material patented technology or reproduction of copyrighted items are known. GO TO SECTION IX
		Potentially material patented technology or reproduction of copyrighted items are known, but a Letter of Assurance (LOA) or copyright release letter for such items has been obtained or presented to the TC Chapter. GO TO SECTION IX
		Potentially material patented technology or reproduction of copyrighted items are known and use of such materials is technically justified by the TC Chapter, but an LOA or copyright release letter for some of the item(s) has NOT been obtained or presented to the TC Chapter.
MOTION		Ask ISC for special permission to publish.
		Quit activity.
		Wait for LOA for patented technology or release of copyrighted items.
Motion by/2 nd by		Name (Company)/Name (Company)
Discussion		XXXX
Vote		XX-XX
Final Action		Motion Passed
		Motion Failed

* 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 Letter Ballot.

X. Action for This Document

Motion	<input type="checkbox"/>	This Document passed TC Chapter review as balloted and will be forwarded to the A&R SC for procedural review.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	This Document passed TC Chapter review with editorial changes and will be forwarded to the A&R SC for procedural review.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	This Document passed TC Chapter review with Technical Changes and with or without editorial changes and will be forwarded to the A&R SC for procedural review. A Ratification Ballot will be issued to verify the Technical Changes.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	This Document failed TC Chapter review and will be returned to the TF for rework.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	This Document failed TC Chapter review and work will be discontinued.
Motion by/2nd by	Yuko Toyoshima (Hitachi High-Technologies) / Tadashi Mochizuki (Tokyo Electron)	
Discussion	None	
Vote	12-0	
Final Action	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Motion passed
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Motion failed

Standards staff to record the result of the A&R procedural review here:

A&R	<input type="checkbox"/>	Approved for publication
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Approved pending for acceptance of the Ratification Ballot
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not approved
	Reason:	