

Record of Line-item Letter Ballot Review by TC Chapter for Procedural Review

Region/Locale: **Japan**
 Global Technical Committee: **EHS**
 TC Chapter Cochairs: **Hidetoshi Sakura/advisor, Supika Mashiro/Tokyo Electron, Moray Crawford/Hatsuta Seisakusho**
 Standards Staff: **Junko Collins**

	Scheduled in Background Statement	Actual
Date	06/28/2016	06/28/2016
Location	Meeting Room, SEMI Japan Office, Tokyo, Japan	Meeting Room, SEMI Japan Office, Tokyo, Japan
Reason for Change of Date and/or Location (if changed)		

Note: See *Regulations* ¶ 9.5 Exception for allowable reason to change.

Document Information

I. Document Number, Title, Lists of Line Items

Document Number 5556B	Document Title Line Item Revision to SEMI S2-0715, Environmental, Health, and Safety Guideline for Semiconductor Manufacturing Equipment Revision to §19 “Seismic Protection” (In Delayed Effective Date Format)
List of Line Items Line Item 1	Line Item Title Revision to §19 “Seismic Protection” (Effective July 2018)

Line Item 1 Adjudication

II. Tally

Standards staff to fill in.

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

Note: 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	56	÷	92	=	60.9%	≥60%
Intercommittee Ballot	29					
Voting Interest Reject(s)	4		Total Voters with Rejects			4
Voting Interest Accept(s)	45					

Note: See Regulations § 3.2.1 for definition of Voting Interest.

III. Rejects

Voting Interest Reject 1 (Voting Interest Name: Intel Corporation)

Voter Reject 1 (Voter: Swanson Scott / Intel Corporation)

Negative 1

Negative	Referenced Section/ Paragraph	*TF/TC Chapter to fill in, including text in the ballot if necessary.		
		(19)		
	Negative Text	The current design forces are based on the 1997 Uniform Building Code and this has not changed with this proposal. This is unacceptable – our industry should not be designing components using a 20-year old standard when there have been at least four editions of more modern standards written since then.		
TF input (optional)				
Withdrawal (check one)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Negative withdrawal made by Voter.	GO TO “Related” subsection	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Withdrawal document received by Standards staff on MM/DD/YYYY.	GO TO “Final” subsection → (A)	
Related	Motion and Reason (check one)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	‘Related’ is mutually agreed upon. (Needs no motion.)	GO TO “Persuasive” subsection
		<input type="checkbox"/>	Negative is not related. (Needs ≥2/3 votes to pass.)	
			Reason	XXXX
	Motion by/ 2nd by	Name (Company)/Name (Company)		
	Discussion			
	Result of Vote (check one)	<input type="checkbox"/>	XX Y-XX N; Motion passed/failed.	
<input type="checkbox"/>		[Negative is not related.] < 2/3	GO TO “Persuasive” subsection	
<input type="checkbox"/>		2/3 ≤ [Negative is not related.]	GO TO “Final” subsection → (B)	
Persuasive	Motion and Reason (check one)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Negative is related and persuasive. (Needs >1/3 votes to pass.)	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Negative is related and not persuasive. (Needs ≥2/3 votes to pass.)		

		Reason	<p>TF was thought originally that seismic force values should be updated to the most stringent set of seismic force calculation criteria among applicable local requirements (e.g., regulations, Standards) for regions in which known semiconductor manufacturing sites are located so that updated criteria would be conservative enough to cover any of such sites. (“one design rule fits all” idea)</p> <p>TF found, however, that any single requirement of any region, (e.g., IBC or ASCE < US>, TBC< Taiwan>, Seismic Design and Construction Guideline for Building Equipment < Japan>) couldn’t satisfy above condition as each requirement is based on different assumptions and equations.</p> <p>While current S2 criteria don’t give highest value for horizontal or vertical force, it is consistently high enough for both directions. TF was convinced that the current design forces should be regarded as a field proven criteria in recent three major earthquakes experienced in Japan (i.e., Great Hanshin-Awaji Earthquake, Niigata Chuetsu Earthquake and Great East Japan Earthquake). Therefore TF used the current design forces based on the 1997 Uniform Building Code.</p>			
Motion by/ 2 nd by	Naokatsu Nishiguchi (SCREEN) /Hidetoshi Sakura (Advisor)					
Discussion						
Result of Vote (check one)	7 Y-0 N; Motion passed					
		[Negative is related and persuasive.] > 1/3	Is a technical change recommended? (check one)	Y	GO TO “Address by Technical Change Option” subsection	
		[Negative is related and not persuasive.] < 2/3		N	GO TO “Final” subsection → (E)	
		2/3 ≤ [Negative is related and not persuasive.] < 90%	GO TO “Final” subsection → (C)			
	x	90% ≤ [Negative is related and not persuasive.]	GO TO “Not Significant Finding Option” subsection			
Address by Technical Change Option	Technical Change Recommendations					
	Original section/paragraph number and at least one full sentence are required in “FROM” and “TO” fields.					
	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	Negative is addressed by the technical change(s).				
	Motion by/2 nd by	Name (Company)/Name (Company)				
Discussion						

Result of Vote (check one)		XX Y-XX N; Motion passed/failed.	
		<input type="checkbox"/>	2/3 ≤ [Negative is addressed by the technical change(s).] GO TO "Incorporation of the Technical Change" subsection
		<input type="checkbox"/>	[Negative is not addressed by the technical change(s).] < 2/3 GO TO "Final" subsection → (E)
Incorporation of the Technical Change	Motion	To incorporate the technical change(s).	
	Motion by/2 nd by	Name (Company)/Name (Company)	
	Discussion		
	Result of Vote (check one)	XX Y-XX N; Motion passed/failed.	
Result of Vote (check one)		<input type="checkbox"/>	90% ≤ [Agree to incorporate.] GO TO "Final" subsection → (F)
		<input type="checkbox"/>	[Disagree to incorporate.] > 10% GO TO "Final" subsection → (E)
Not Significant Finding Option	This option can be used only "if the TC Chapter finds a Negative not persuasive by a vote equal to or greater than 90% of the persons voting on the action". (Regulations ¶ 9.6.4.4.2)		
	Use of "Not significant finding option" (check one)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	It is mutually agreed upon to term the Negative "not significant". GO TO "Final" subsection → (D)
		<input type="checkbox"/>	It is mutually agreed upon to term the Negative "significant". GO TO "Final" subsection → (C)
		<input type="checkbox"/>	Whether or not the Negative is "not significant" is decided by a vote.
	Motion	The Negative is "not significant".	
	Motion by/ 2 nd by	Name (Company)/Name (Company)	
	Vote	<input type="checkbox"/>	XX Y-XX N; Motion passed with simple majority GO TO "Final" subsection → (D)
<input type="checkbox"/>		XX Y-XX N; Motion failed with simple majority GO TO "Final" subsection → (C)	
Final	(check if applicable)	<input type="checkbox"/>	(A) Withdrawn (counted under h in disposition)
		<input type="checkbox"/>	(B) Not related (counted under i in disposition)
		<input type="checkbox"/>	(C) Related and not persuasive (significant)
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	(D) Not significant (counted under j in disposition)
		<input type="checkbox"/>	(E) Related and persuasive and not addressed by technical change DOCUMENT FAILS
		<input type="checkbox"/>	(F) Addressed by technical change (counted under k disposition)
	(check if applicable)	Comment generated. See Section V-(ii) Comment # X.	

Negative 2

Negative	Referenced Section/ Paragraph	*TF/TC Chapter to fill in, including text in the ballot if necessary. (19.2)
	Negative Text	The current design forces are 0.94W and 0.63W and this has not changed with this proposal. This is unacceptable - these are too conservative when compared with current industry practice. These values are based on an older version of the 1997 UBC that was amended a few years later and on requirements for concrete anchors that are no longer applicable.

TF input (optional)									
Withdrawal (check one)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Negative withdrawal made by Voter.					GO TO "Related" subsection		
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Withdrawal document received by Standards staff on MM/DD/YYYY.					GO TO "Final" subsection → (A)		
Related	Motion and Reason (check one)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	'Related' is mutually agreed upon. (Needs no motion.)					GO TO "Persuasive" subsection	
		<input type="checkbox"/>	Negative is not related. (Needs ≥2/3 votes to pass.)						
		Reason	XXXX						
	Motion by/ 2nd by	Name (Company)/Name (Company)							
	Discussion								
	Result of Vote (check one)	XX Y-XX N; Motion passed/failed.							
		<input type="checkbox"/>	[Negative is not related.] < 2/3					GO TO "Persuasive" subsection	
<input type="checkbox"/>		2/3 ≤ [Negative is not related.]					GO TO "Final" subsection → (B)		
Persuasive	<input type="checkbox"/>	Negative is related and persuasive. (Needs >1/3 votes to pass.)							
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Negative is related and not persuasive. (Needs ≥2/3 votes to pass.)							
		Reason	<p>The agreed objectives of revision if the Seismic Protection Section is to define seismic force values that can be justified to be applied to design of semiconductor manufacturing equipment regardless of location of use. If newer US standard (i.e. ASCE7-10) is used to calculate seismic forces in relatively seismically active US location such as Santa Clara / CA, horizontal and vertical seismic force values are 0.38W and 0.16W respectively. Certainly, proposed seismic forces in this Ballot are much conservative than them.</p> <p>Considering industry's desire to seek a design rule applicable to other global locations such as Taiwan, however, seismic force values calculated for typical Taiwanese semiconductor production location based on ASCE7-10 are much higher and closer to the values proposed in the Ballot. (e.g., horizontal and vertical seismic force values based on ASCE 7-10 for Hsin-chu are 0.90W and 0.37W respectively.)</p>						
	Motion by/ 2nd by	Naokatsu Nishiguchi (SCREEN) / Hidetoshi Sakura (Advisor)							
	Discussion								
	Result of Vote (check one)	7 Y-0 N; Motion passed							
		<input type="checkbox"/>	[Negative is related and persuasive.] > 1/3		Is a technical change recommended? (check one)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y	GO TO "Address by Technical Change Option" subsection	
<input type="checkbox"/>		[Negative is related and not persuasive.] < 2/3		(check one)	<input type="checkbox"/>	N	GO TO "Final" subsection → (E)		
<input type="checkbox"/>		2/3 ≤ [Negative is related and not persuasive.] < 90%		GO TO "Final" subsection → (C)					

		x	90% ≤ [Negative is related and not persuasive.]	GO TO “Not Significant Finding Option” subsection	
Address by Technical Change Option	Technical Change Recommendations				
	Original section/paragraph number and at least one full sentence are required in “FROM” and “TO” fields.				
	Technical Changes	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		Negative is addressed by the technical change(s).		
	Motion by/2 nd by		Name (Company)/Name (Company)		
	Discussion				
	Result of Vote (check one)		XX Y-XX N; Motion passed/failed.		
			2/3 ≤ [Negative is addressed by the technical change(s).]	GO TO “Incorporation of the Technical Change” subsection	
			[Negative is not addressed by the technical change(s).] < 2/3	GO TO “Final” subsection → (E)	
Incorporation of the Technical Change	Motion		To incorporate the technical change(s).		
	Motion by/2 nd by		Name (Company)/Name (Company)		
	Discussion				
	Result of Vote (check one)		XX Y-XX N; Motion passed/failed.		
		90% ≤ [Agree to incorporate.]	GO TO “Final” subsection → (F)		
		[Disagree to incorporate.] > 10%	GO TO “Final” subsection → (E)		
Not Significant Finding Option	This option can be used only “if the TC Chapter finds a Negative not persuasive by a vote equal to or greater than 90% of the persons voting on the action”. (Regulations ¶ 9.6.4.4.2)				
	Use of “Not significant finding option” (check one)	x	It is mutually agreed upon to term the Negative “not significant”.	GO TO “Final” subsection → (D)	
			It is mutually agreed upon to term the Negative “significant”.	GO TO “Final” subsection → (C)	
			Whether or not the Negative is “not significant” is decided by a vote.		
	Motion		The Negative is “not significant”.		
Motion by/2 nd by		Name (Company)/Name (Company)			

	Vote	<input type="checkbox"/>	XX Y-XX N; Motion passed with simple majority	GO TO "Final" subsection → (D)	
		<input type="checkbox"/>	XX Y-XX N; Motion failed with simple majority	GO TO "Final" subsection → (C)	
Final	(check if applicable)	<input type="checkbox"/>	(A)	Withdrawn (counted under h in disposition)	
		<input type="checkbox"/>	(B)	Not related (counted under i in disposition)	
		<input type="checkbox"/>	(C)	Related and not persuasive (significant)	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	(D)	Not significant (counted under j in disposition)	
		<input type="checkbox"/>	(E)	Related and persuasive and not addressed by technical change	DOCUMENT FAILS
		<input type="checkbox"/>	(F)	Addressed by technical change (counted under k disposition)	
	(check if applicable)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment generated. See Section V-(ii) Comment # X.		

Negative 3

Negative	Referenced Section/ Paragraph	*TF/TC Chapter to fill in, including text in the ballot if necessary. (19.2)			
	Negative Text	The proposal changes the title of Section 19.2 from "Design Loads" to "Anticipated Seismic Forces." This is unacceptable – the correct industry term is "design seismic forces" or "design loads" and the language should not be changed when it is more confusing.			
TF input (optional)					
Withdrawal (check one)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Negative withdrawal made by Voter.		GO TO "Related" subsection	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Withdrawal document received by Standards staff on MM/DD/YYYY.		GO TO "Final" subsection → (A)	
Related	Motion and Reason (check one)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	'Related' is mutually agreed upon. (Needs no motion.)		GO TO "Persuasive" subsection
		<input type="checkbox"/>	Negative is not related. (Needs ≥2/3 votes to pass.)		
		Reason	XXXX		
	Motion by/ 2 nd by	Name (Company)/Name (Company)			
	Discussion				
Result of Vote (check one)	<input type="checkbox"/>	[Negative is not related.] < 2/3		GO TO "Persuasive" subsection	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	2/3 ≤ [Negative is not related.]		GO TO "Final" subsection → (B)	
Persuasive	Motion and Reason (check one)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Negative is related and persuasive. (Needs >1/3 votes to pass.)		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Negative is related and not persuasive. (Needs ≥2/3 votes to pass.)		

	Reason	This terminology was specifically selected to promote precise consideration of forces that may be acting on the equipment from seismic events. While ‘loading’ might be common terminology for structure/building design, ‘seismic forces’ is nonetheless a correct concept. ‘Anticipated’ is an important qualifier in the context of S2 in order to link with section 19.1 which sets performance criteria with regard to anticipated seismic forces. It is not clear to which industry the submitter is referring, but ‘anticipated’ is used many times in SEMI S-series Documents and it is not uncommon in general discussions of seismic engineering.			
Motion by/ 2 nd by	Naokatsu Nishiguchi (SCREEN) / Hidetoshi Sakura (Advisor)				
Discussion					
Result of Vote (check one)	7 Y-0 N; Motion passed				
		[Negative is related and persuasive.] > 1/3	Is a technical change recommended? (check one)		Y GO TO “Address by Technical Change Option” subsection
		[Negative is related and not persuasive.] < 2/3			N GO TO “Final” subsection → (E)
		2/3 ≤ [Negative is related and not persuasive.] < 90%	GO TO “Final” subsection → (C)		
	x	90% ≤ [Negative is related and not persuasive.]	GO TO “Not Significant Finding Option” subsection		

Technical Change Recommendations

Original section/paragraph number and at least one full sentence are required in “FROM” and “TO” fields.

Address by Technical Change Option	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	Negative is addressed by the technical change(s).	
Motion by/2 nd by	Name (Company)/Name (Company)	
Discussion		
Result of Vote (check one)	XX Y-XX N; Motion passed/failed.	
		2/3 ≤ [Negative is addressed by the technical change(s).] GO TO “Incorporation of the Technical Change” subsection
	[Negative is not addressed by the technical change(s).] < 2/3 GO TO “Final” subsection → (E)	

	Incorporation of the Technical Change	Motion	To incorporate the technical change(s).		
		Motion by/2 nd by	Name (Company)/Name (Company)		
		Discussion			
		Result of Vote (check one)	XX Y-XX N; Motion passed/failed.		
	90% ≤ [Agree to incorporate.]		GO TO “Final” subsection → (F)		
	[Disagree to incorporate.]>10%		GO TO “Final” subsection → (E)		
Not Significant Finding Option	This option can be used only “if the TC Chapter finds a Negative not persuasive by a vote equal to or greater than 90% of the persons voting on the action”. (Regulations ¶ 9.6.4.4.2)				
	Use of “Not significant finding option” (check one)	x	It is mutually agreed upon to term the Negative “not significant”.	GO TO “Final” subsection → (D)	
			It is mutually agreed upon to term the Negative “significant”.	GO TO “Final” subsection → (C)	
			Whether or not the Negative is “not significant” is decided by a vote.		
	Motion	The Negative is “not significant”.			
	Motion by/ 2 nd by	Name (Company)/Name (Company)			
Vote		XX Y-XX N; Motion passed with simple majority	GO TO “Final” subsection → (D)		
		XX Y-XX N; Motion failed with simple majority	GO TO “Final” subsection → (C)		
Final	(check if applicable)		(A)	Withdrawn (counted under h in disposition)	
			(B)	Not related (counted under i in disposition)	
			(C)	Related and not persuasive (significant)	
		x	(D)	Not significant (counted under j in disposition)	
			(E)	Related and persuasive and not addressed by technical change	DOCUMENT FAILS
			(F)	Addressed by technical change (counted under k disposition)	
(check if applicable)		Comment generated. See Section V-(ii) Comment # X.			

Negative 4

Negative	Referenced Section/ Paragraph	*TF/TC Chapter to fill in, including text in the ballot if necessary. (19.2.4)		
	Negative Text	The proposal, Section 19.2.4 continues to use a maximum weight value for computing overturning forces. This is unacceptable – the standard should properly use a vertical seismic force like all the modern seismic codes on which this standard is based.		
TF input (optional)				
Withdrawal (check one)	x	No Negative withdrawal made by Voter.		GO TO “Related” subsection
		Withdrawal document received by Standards staff on MM/DD/YYYY.		GO TO “Final” subsection → (A)

Related	Motion and Reason (check one)	X	‘Related’ is mutually agreed upon. (Needs no motion.)		GO TO “Persuasive” subsection	
			Negative is not related. (Needs ≥2/3 votes to pass.)			
			Reason			
	Motion by/ 2nd by					
	Discussion					
Persuasive	Motion and Reason (check one)		XX Y-XX N; Motion passed/failed.			
			[Negative is not related.] < 2/3	GO TO “Persuasive” subsection		
			2/3 ≤ [Negative is not related.]	GO TO “Final” subsection → (B)		
		X	Negative is related and not persuasive. (Needs ≥2/3 votes to pass.)			
	Reason	<p>This section does not direct address the overturning force, but rather sets the maximum percent of equipment weight that may be considered as resisting the overturning moment. The overturning moment in turn is determined from the horizontal seismic force acting on equipment center of gravity along with other factors (e.g., equipment dimensions). The vertical seismic force participates in this analysis to the extent that it effectively makes the weight of the equipment greater or lesser. This concept and the way it has been expressed in this section has been used successfully in SEMI S2 for many years, and in and of itself is not incorrect.</p> <p>Further, many seismic analysis guidance documents (through text or force diagrams) show the equipment weight opposing the vertical force acting at the center of gravity of the equipment when discussing overturning moments of non-structural equipment (e.g. http://www.mason-industries.com/masonind/_doc/pdf/ch49.pdf page 2&3, and http://extras.springer.com/2003/978-0-7923-7301-4/SDH2/Chapter%2013-Design%20of%20Nonstructural%20Systems%20and%20Components.pdf page 699])</p>				
Motion by/ 2nd by	Naokatsu Nishiguchi (SCREEN) / Hidetoshi Sakura (Advisor)					
Discussion						
Result of Vote (check one)	7 Y-0 N; Motion passed					
		[Negative is related and persuasive.] > 1/3	Is a technical change recommended? (check one)		Y GO TO “Address by Technical Change Option” subsection	
		[Negative is related and not persuasive.] < 2/3			N GO TO “Final” subsection → (E)	
		2/3 ≤ [Negative is related and not persuasive.] < 90%	GO TO “Final” subsection → (C)			
	X	90% ≤ [Negative is related and not persuasive.]	GO TO “Not Significant Finding Option” subsection			

Address by Technical Change Option		Technical Change Recommendations			
		Original section/paragraph number and at least one full sentence are required in "FROM" and "TO" fields.			
		Technical Changes	1	FROM: Section/Paragraph XXX	
				TO: Section/Paragraph xxx	
				Justification (if necessary)	
		2	2	FROM: Section/Paragraph XXX	
				TO: Section/Paragraph xxx	
				Justification (if necessary)	
		Motion		Negative is addressed by the technical change(s).	
		Motion by/2nd by		Name (Company)/Name (Company)	
Discussion					
Result of Vote (check one)		XX Y-XX N; Motion passed/failed.			
		2/3 ≤ [Negative is addressed by the technical change(s).]	GO TO "Incorporation of the Technical Change" subsection		
		[Negative is not addressed by the technical change(s).] < 2/3	GO TO "Final" subsection → (E)		
Incorporation of the Technical Change		Motion			
		To incorporate the technical change(s).			
		Motion by/2nd by			
		Name (Company)/Name (Company)			
Discussion					
Result of Vote (check one)		XX Y-XX N; Motion passed/failed.			
		90% ≤ [Agree to incorporate.]	GO TO "Final" subsection → (F)		
		[Disagree to incorporate.] > 10%	GO TO "Final" subsection → (E)		
Not Significant Finding Option		This option can be used only "if the TC Chapter finds a Negative not persuasive by a vote equal to or greater than 90% of the persons voting on the action". (Regulations ¶ 9.6.4.4.2)			
		Use of "Not significant finding option" (check one)	x	It is mutually agreed upon to term the Negative "not significant".	GO TO "Final" subsection → (D)
				It is mutually agreed upon to term the Negative "significant".	GO TO "Final" subsection → (C)
			Whether or not the Negative is "not significant" is decided by a vote.		
		Motion		The Negative is "not significant".	
		Motion by/ 2nd by		Name (Company)/Name (Company)	
Vote		XX Y-XX N; Motion passed with simple majority	GO TO "Final" subsection → (D)		

			XX Y-XX N; Motion failed with simple majority	GO TO "Final" subsection → (C)	
Final	(check if applicable)		(A)	Withdrawn (counted under h in disposition)	
			(B)	Not related (counted under i in disposition)	
			(C)	Related and not persuasive (significant)	
		x	(D)	Not significant (counted under j in disposition)	
			(E)	Related and persuasive and not addressed by technical change	DOCUMENT FAILS
			(F)	Addressed by technical change (counted under k disposition)	
	(check if applicable)		Comment generated. See Section V-(ii) Comment # X.		

Disposition of Voting Interest Reject 1

Check only when the Document has not been failed.

4	Original number (#) of Negatives	(g)	
0	Number of Negatives withdrawn	(h)	
0	Number of Negatives found not related	(i)	
4	Number of Negatives found not significant	(j)	
0	Number of Negatives addressed by technical change (Negative becomes not significant)	(k)	
Final	x	$g - (h + i + j + k) = 0$	Reject is Not Valid and is not included in the denominator of § VI. Approval Conditions Check
		$g - (h + i + j + k) > 0$	Reject is included in the denominator of § VI. Approval Conditions Check
		Reject without a Negative	Not Valid

Note: If all of the Negatives included with a Reject Vote are withdrawn, determined to be not related, or determined to be not significant, the Reject Vote is not valid. (Regulations ¶ 9.4.3.3)

Note: A Negative addressed by a technical change is automatically considered to be not significant. (Regulations ¶ 9.6.4.4.2)

Voting Interest Reject 2 (Voting Interest Name: NikonP)

Voter Reject 1 (Voter: Mccafferty William/ NikonP)

Negative 1

Negative	Referenced Section/ Paragraph	*TF/TC Chapter to fill in, including text in the ballot if necessary.		
		19.1		
	Negative Text	By the statement in this paragraph relating to a risk level of medium or higher we are accepting that during a seismic event we are accepting that it is ok to injure people. One person's definition will differ from another. I suggest that the measure is changed to... and no parts will fail or yield such that there would be a risk of causing injury to personnel or environmental impact.		
TF input (optional)				
Withdrawal (check one)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Negative withdrawal made by Voter.	GO TO "Related" subsection	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Withdrawal document received by Standards staff on MM/DD/YYYY.	GO TO "Final" subsection → (A)	
Related	Motion and Reason (check one)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	'Related' is mutually agreed upon. (Needs no motion.)	GO TO "Persuasive" subsection
		<input type="checkbox"/>	Negative is not related. (Needs ≥2/3 votes to pass.)	
		Reason	XXXX	
	Motion by/ 2 nd by	Name (Company)/Name (Company)		
	Discussion			
	Result of Vote (check one)	XX Y-XX N; Motion passed/failed.		
<input type="checkbox"/>		[Negative is not related.] < 2/3	GO TO "Persuasive" subsection	
<input type="checkbox"/>		2/3 ≤ [Negative is not related.]	GO TO "Final" subsection → (B)	
Persuasive	Motion and Reason (check one)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Negative is related and persuasive. (Needs >1/3 votes to pass.)	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Negative is related and not persuasive. (Needs ≥2/3 votes to pass.)	
		Reason	Negative comment here appears to claim that no risk of causing injury is acceptable, which is different from SEMI S2 concept. It is described below so this negative is not persuasive. 6.5 No reasonably foreseeable single-point failure condition or operational error should allow exposure of personnel, facilities, or the community to hazards that could result in death, significant injury, or significant equipment damage. NOTE 9: The intent is to control single fault conditions that result in significant risks (i.e., Very High, High, or Medium risks based on the example risk assessment matrix in SEMI S10).	
Motion by/ 2 nd by	Naokatsu Nishiguchi (SCREEN) / Hidetoshi Sakura (Advisor)			

Discussion							
Result of Vote (check one)		7 Y-0 N; Motion passed					
		<input type="checkbox"/>	[Negative is related and persuasive.] > 1/3	Is a technical change recommended? (check one)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y	GO TO "Address by Technical Change Option" subsection
		<input type="checkbox"/>	[Negative is related and not persuasive.] < 2/3		<input type="checkbox"/>	N	GO TO "Final" subsection → (E)
		<input type="checkbox"/>	2/3 ≤ [Negative is related and not persuasive.] < 90%	GO TO "Final" subsection → (C)			
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	90% ≤ [Negative is related and not persuasive.]	GO TO "Not Significant Finding Option" subsection			
Technical Change Recommendations							
Original section/paragraph number and at least one full sentence are required in "FROM" and "TO" fields.							
Address by Technical Change Option	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		Negative is addressed by the technical change(s).					
Motion by/2nd by		Name (Company)/Name (Company)					
Discussion							
Result of Vote (check one)		XX Y-XX N; Motion passed/failed.					
		<input type="checkbox"/>	2/3 ≤ [Negative is addressed by the technical change(s).]				GO TO "Incorporation of the Technical Change" subsection
		<input type="checkbox"/>	[Negative is not addressed by the technical change(s).] < 2/3				GO TO "Final" subsection → (E)
Incorporation of the Technical Change	Motion		To incorporate the technical change(s).				
	Motion by/2nd by		Name (Company)/Name (Company)				
	Discussion						
	Result of Vote (check one)		XX Y-XX N; Motion passed/failed.				
			<input type="checkbox"/>	90% ≤ [Agree to incorporate.]			
	<input type="checkbox"/>	[Disagree to incorporate.] > 10%				GO TO "Final" subsection → (E)	

Not Significant Finding Option	This option can be used only “if the TC Chapter finds a Negative not persuasive by a vote equal to or greater than 90% of the persons voting on the action”. (Regulations ¶ 9.6.4.4.2)				
	Use of “Not significant finding option” (check one)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	It is mutually agreed upon to term the Negative “not significant”.	GO TO “Final” subsection → (D)	
		<input type="checkbox"/>	It is mutually agreed upon to term the Negative “significant”.	GO TO “Final” subsection → (C)	
		<input type="checkbox"/>	Whether or not the Negative is “not significant” is decided by a vote.		
	Motion	The Negative is “not significant”.			
	Motion by/ 2nd by	Name (Company)/Name (Company)			
	Vote	<input type="checkbox"/>	XX Y-XX N; Motion passed with simple majority	GO TO “Final” subsection → (D)	
<input type="checkbox"/>		XX Y-XX N; Motion failed with simple majority	GO TO “Final” subsection → (C)		
Final	(check if applicable)	<input type="checkbox"/>	(A)	Withdrawn (counted under h in disposition)	
		<input type="checkbox"/>	(B)	Not related (counted under i in disposition)	
		<input type="checkbox"/>	(C)	Related and not persuasive (significant)	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	(D)	Not significant (counted under j in disposition)	
		<input type="checkbox"/>	(E)	Related and persuasive and not addressed by technical change	DOCUMENT FAILS
		<input type="checkbox"/>	(F)	Addressed by technical change (counted under k disposition)	
(check if applicable)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment generated. See Section V-(ii) Comment # X.			

Disposition of Voting Interest Reject 2

Check only when the Document has not been failed.

1	Original number (#) of Negatives	(g)	
0	Number of Negatives withdrawn	(h)	
0	Number of Negatives found not related	(i)	
1	Number of Negatives found not significant	(j)	
0	Number of Negatives addressed by technical change (Negative becomes not significant)	(k)	
Final	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	$g - (h + i + j + k) = 0$	Reject is Not Valid and is not included in the denominator of § VI. Approval Conditions Check
	<input type="checkbox"/>	$g - (h + i + j + k) > 0$	Reject is included in the denominator of § VI. Approval Conditions Check
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Reject without a Negative	Not Valid

Note: If all of the Negatives included with a Reject Vote are withdrawn, determined to be not related, or determined to be not significant, the Reject Vote is not valid. (Regulations ¶ 9.4.3.3)

Note: A Negative addressed by a technical change is automatically considered to be not significant. (Regulations ¶ 9.6.4.4.2)

**Voting Interest Reject 3 (Voting Interest Name: Applied Materials)
Voter Reject 1 (Voter: Edward Karl / Applied Materials)**

Negative 1

Negative	Referenced Section/ Paragraph	*TF/TC Chapter to fill in, including text in the ballot if necessary.	
		19.1.3	
	Negative Text	<p>“Structurally dependent modules are modules which transfer the forces to each other. They should be assessed together.”</p> <p>With AMAT’s highly configurable cluster tools, this methodology would make the # of chamber combinations requiring analysis impractical.</p> <p>Proposed Solution: Replace entire sentence with either, “Modules having their own seismic tie-downs are separately analyzed.” or “Structurally dependent modules are modules which transfer the forces to each other. It is recommended that they be assessed together where practical.”</p>	
	TF input (optional)		
	Withdrawal (check one)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Negative withdrawal made by Voter.	GO TO “Related” subsection
		<input type="checkbox"/> Withdrawal document received by Standards staff on MM/DD/YYYY.	GO TO “Final” subsection → (A)
Related	Motion and Reason (check one)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ‘Related’ is mutually agreed upon. (Needs no motion.)	GO TO “Persuasive” subsection
		<input type="checkbox"/> Negative is not related. (Needs ≥2/3 votes to pass.)	
		Reason	XXXX
	Motion by/ 2 nd by	Name (Company)/Name (Company)	
	Discussion		
	Result of Vote (check one)	XX Y-XX N; Motion passed/failed.	
<input type="checkbox"/> [Negative is not related.] < 2/3			GO TO “Persuasive” subsection
<input type="checkbox"/> 2/3 ≤ [Negative is not related.]			GO TO “Final” subsection → (B)
Persuasive	Motion and Reason (check one)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Negative is related and persuasive. (Needs >1/3 votes to pass.)	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Negative is related and not persuasive. (Needs ≥2/3 votes to pass.)	
		Reason	It is disproportionately big burden without merit if such modules have their own seismic tie-downs.
	Motion by/ 2 nd by	Naokatsu Nishiguchi (SCREEN) / Hidetoshi Sakura (Advisor)	
	Discussion		
Result of Vote	7 Y-0 N; Motion passed		

(check one)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	[Negative is related and persuasive.] > 1/3	Is a technical change recommended? (check one)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	GO TO “Address by Technical Change Option” subsection
	<input type="checkbox"/>	[Negative is related and not persuasive.] < 2/3		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	GO TO “Final” subsection → (E)
	<input type="checkbox"/>	2/3 ≤ [Negative is related and not persuasive.] < 90%	GO TO “Final” subsection → (C)			
	<input type="checkbox"/>	90% ≤ [Negative is related and not persuasive.]	GO TO “Not Significant Finding Option” subsection			
Technical Change Recommendations						
Original section/paragraph number and at least one full sentence are required in “FROM” and “TO” fields.						
Address by Technical Change Option	Technical Changes	1	FROM: Section/Paragraph 19.1.3 19.1.3 Structurally dependent modules are modules which transfer the forces to each other. They should be assessed together.			
		TO: Section/Paragraph 19.1.3 and Exception (Add Exception just after 19.1.3) 19.1.3 Structurally dependent modules are modules which transfer the forces to each other. They should be assessed together. Exception : Modules that can transfer the forces to each other may be separately analyzed, if each of them has its own seismic tie-downs.				
		Justification (if necessary)				
	2	FROM: Section/Paragraph XXX				
	TO: Section/Paragraph xxx					
	Justification (if necessary)					
Motion		Negative is addressed by the technical change(s).				
Motion by/2nd by		Naokatsu Nishiguchi (SCREEN) / Hidetoshi Sakura (Advisor)				
Discussion						
Result of Vote (check one)		7 Y-0 N; Motion passed				
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2/3 ≤ [Negative is addressed by the technical change(s).]			GO TO “Incorporation of the Technical Change” subsection
		<input type="checkbox"/>	[Negative is not addressed by the technical change(s).] < 2/3			GO TO “Final” subsection → (E)
Incorporation of the Technical Change	Motion		To incorporate the technical change(s).			
	Motion by/2nd by		Nishigushi (Company)/ Hidetoshi Sakura (Advisor)			
	Discussion					
	Result of Vote (check one)		7 Y-0 N; Motion passed			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			90% ≤ [Agree to incorporate.]			GO TO “Final” subsection → (F)
<input type="checkbox"/>			[Disagree to incorporate.] > 10%			GO TO “Final” subsection → (E)

Not Significant Finding Option	This option can be used only “if the TC Chapter finds a Negative not persuasive by a vote equal to or greater than 90% of the persons voting on the action”. (Regulations ¶ 9.6.4.4.2)			
	Use of “Not significant finding option” (check one)	<input type="checkbox"/>	It is mutually agreed upon to term the Negative “not significant”.	GO TO “Final” subsection → (D)
		<input type="checkbox"/>	It is mutually agreed upon to term the Negative “significant”.	GO TO “Final” subsection → (C)
		<input type="checkbox"/>	Whether or not the Negative is “not significant” is decided by a vote.	
	Motion	The Negative is “not significant”.		
	Motion by/ 2 nd by	Name (Company)/Name (Company)		
	Vote	<input type="checkbox"/>	XX Y-XX N; Motion passed with simple majority	GO TO “Final” subsection → (D)
<input type="checkbox"/>		XX Y-XX N; Motion failed with simple majority	GO TO “Final” subsection → (C)	
Final	(check if applicable)	<input type="checkbox"/>	(A)	Withdrawn (counted under h in disposition)
		<input type="checkbox"/>	(B)	Not related (counted under i in disposition)
		<input type="checkbox"/>	(C)	Related and not persuasive (significant)
		<input type="checkbox"/>	(D)	Not significant (counted under j in disposition)
		<input type="checkbox"/>	(E)	Related and persuasive and not addressed by technical change
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	(F)	Addressed by technical change (counted under k disposition)	
(check if applicable)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment generated. See Section V-(ii) Comment # X.		

Negative 2

Negative	Referenced Section/ Paragraph	*TF/TC Chapter to fill in, including text in the ballot if necessary.		
		19.4		
	Negative Text	<p>“The locations of the tie-ins, attachments, or seismic anchorage points intended by the supplier to limit equipment motion during a seismic event should be clearly identified by direct labelling on the equipment.”</p> <p>Applied Materials believes that identification of anchorage points in installation documentation should also be acceptable.</p> <p>Proposed Solution: “The locations of the tie-ins, attachments, or seismic anchorage points intended by the supplier to limit equipment motion during a seismic event should be clearly identified by either direct labelling on the equipment or through documentation.”</p>		
TF input (optional)				
Withdrawal (check one)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Negative withdrawal made by Voter.		GO TO “Related” subsection
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Withdrawal document received by Standards staff on MM/DD/YYYY.		GO TO “Final” subsection → (A)
Related	Motion and Reason (check one)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	‘Related’ is mutually agreed upon. (Needs no motion.)	GO TO “Persuasive” subsection
		<input type="checkbox"/>	Negative is not related. (Needs ≥2/3 votes to pass.)	

		Reason	XXXX			
	Motion by/ 2 nd by	Name (Company)/Name (Company)				
	Discussion					
	Result of Vote (check one)	XX Y-XX N; Motion passed/failed.				
		[Negative is not related.] < 2/3	GO TO “Persuasive” subsection			
		2/3 ≤ [Negative is not related.]	GO TO “Final” subsection → (B)			
Persuasive	Motion and Reason (check one)	X	Negative is related and persuasive. (Needs >1/3 votes to pass.)			
			Negative is related and not persuasive. (Needs ≥2/3 votes to pass.)			
		Reason	Not allowing supplier-intended anchorage points to be identified by installation documentation is too limiting.			
	Motion by/ 2 nd by	Naokatsu Nishiguchi (SCREEN) / Hidetoshi Sakura (Advisor)				
	Discussion					
		Result of Vote (check one)	7 Y-0 N; Motion passed			
	x		[Negative is related and persuasive.] > 1/3	Is a technical change recommended? (check one)	X Y N	GO TO “Address by Technical Change Option” subsection
			[Negative is related and not persuasive.] < 2/3		N	GO TO “Final” subsection → (E)
			2/3 ≤ [Negative is related and not persuasive.] < 90%	GO TO “Final” subsection → (C)		
		90% ≤ [Negative is related and not persuasive.]	GO TO “Not Significant Finding Option” subsection			
Address by Technical Change Option	Technical Change Recommendations					
	Original section/paragraph number and at least one full sentence are required in “FROM” and “TO” fields.					
	Technical Changes	1	FROM: Section/Paragraph 19.4 19.4 The locations of the tie-ins, attachments, or anchorage points intended by the supplier to limit equipment motion during a seismic event should be clearly identified by direct labelling on the equipment.			
TO: Section/Paragraph 19.4 19.4 The locations of the tie-ins, attachments, or anchorage points intended by the supplier to limit equipment motion during a seismic event should be clearly identified by either direct labelling on the equipment or through documentation.						
		Justification (if necessary)				
	2	FROM: Section/Paragraph XXX				
		TO: Section/Paragraph xxx				

		Justification (if necessary)	
	Motion	Negative is addressed by the technical change(s).	
	Motion by/2nd by	Naokatsu Nishiguchi (SCREEN) / Hidetoshi Sakura (Advisor)	
	Discussion		
	Result of Vote (check one)	7 Y-0 N; Motion passed	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2/3 ≤ [Negative is addressed by the technical change(s).] GO TO “Incorporation of the Technical Change” subsection
		<input type="checkbox"/>	[Negative is not addressed by the technical change(s).] < 2/3 GO TO “Final” subsection → (E)
Incorporation of the Technical Change	Motion	To incorporate the technical change(s).	
	Motion by/2nd by	Nishiguchi (Company)/ Hidetoshi Sakura (Advisor)	
	Discussion		
	Result of Vote (check one)	7 Y-0 N; Motion passed	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		90% ≤ [Agree to incorporate.] GO TO “Final” subsection → (F)	
<input type="checkbox"/>		[Disagree to incorporate.] > 10% GO TO “Final” subsection → (E)	
Not Significant Finding Option	This option can be used only “if the TC Chapter finds a Negative not persuasive by a vote equal to or greater than 90% of the persons voting on the action”. (Regulations ¶ 9.6.4.4.2)		
	Use of “Not significant finding option” (check one)	<input type="checkbox"/>	It is mutually agreed upon to term the Negative “not significant”. GO TO “Final” subsection → (D)
		<input type="checkbox"/>	It is mutually agreed upon to term the Negative “significant”. GO TO “Final” subsection → (C)
		<input type="checkbox"/>	Whether or not the Negative is “not significant” is decided by a vote.
	Motion	The Negative is “not significant”.	
	Motion by/ 2nd by	Name (Company)/Name (Company)	
Vote	<input type="checkbox"/>	XX Y-XX N; Motion passed with simple majority GO TO “Final” subsection → (D)	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	XX Y-XX N; Motion failed with simple majority GO TO “Final” subsection → (C)	
Final	(check if applicable)	<input type="checkbox"/>	(A) Withdrawn (counted under h in disposition)
		<input type="checkbox"/>	(B) Not related (counted under i in disposition)
		<input type="checkbox"/>	(C) Related and not persuasive (significant)
		<input type="checkbox"/>	(D) Not significant (counted under j in disposition)
		<input type="checkbox"/>	(E) Related and persuasive and not addressed by technical change DOCUMENT FAILS
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	(F) Addressed by technical change (counted under k disposition)	
(check if applicable)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment generated. See Section V-(ii) Comment # X.	

Disposition of Voting Interest Reject 3

Check only when the Document has not been failed.

2	Original number (#) of Negatives		(g)
0	Number of Negatives withdrawn		(h)
0	Number of Negatives found not related		(i)
0	Number of Negatives found not significant		(j)
2	Number of Negatives addressed by technical change (Negative becomes not significant)		(k)
Final	x	$g - (h + i + j + k) = 0$	Reject is Not Valid and is not included in the denominator of § VI. <i>Approval Conditions Check</i>
		$g - (h + i + j + k) > 0$	Reject is included in the denominator of § VI. <i>Approval Conditions Check</i>
		Reject without a Negative	Not Valid

Note: If all of the Negatives included with a Reject Vote are withdrawn, determined to be not related, or determined to be not significant, the Reject Vote is not valid. (*Regulations ¶ 9.4.3.3*)

Note: A Negative addressed by a technical change is automatically considered to be not significant. (*Regulations ¶ 9.6.4.4.2*)

**Voting Interest Reject 4 (Voting Interest Name: Lam Research)
Voter Reject 1 (Voter: Sean Larsen / Lam Research)**

Negative 1

Negative	Referenced Section/ Paragraph	*TF/TC Chapter to fill in, including text in the ballot if necessary.	
		19.1 & 19.1.1	
	Negative Text	<p>There is evaluation criteria that “no parts will fail or yield such that there would be a risk of injury to personnel or adverse environmental impact of Medium or higher per SEMI S10. However, there is no compliance criteria for how to evaluate the stresses applied to a part within the system other than the subjective “it looks strong enough to me.” Per 19.1.6, the indicated forces should be considered acting on the equipment’s center of gravity, which could be an empty space in the middle of the equipment.</p> <p>Suggestion / Justification Clarify what is the intended compliance criteria beyond accessible for visual evaluation of damage.</p>	
TF input (optional)			
Withdrawal (check one)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Negative withdrawal made by Voter.	GO TO “Related” subsection
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Withdrawal document received by Standards staff on MM/DD/YYYY.	GO TO “Final” subsection → (A)
Related	Motion and Reason (check one)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	‘Related’ is mutually agreed upon. (Needs no motion.) GO TO “Persuasive” subsection
		<input type="checkbox"/>	Negative is not related. (Needs ≥2/3 votes to pass.)
		Reason	XXXX
	Motion by/ 2nd by	Name (Company)/Name (Company)	
	Discussion		
	Result of Vote (check one)	XX Y-XX N; Motion passed/failed.	
<input type="checkbox"/>		[Negative is not related.] < 2/3	GO TO “Persuasive” subsection
<input type="checkbox"/>		2/3 ≤ [Negative is not related.]	GO TO “Final” subsection → (B)
Persuasive	Motion and Reason (check one)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Negative is related and persuasive. (Needs >1/3 votes to pass.)
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Negative is related and not persuasive. (Needs ≥2/3 votes to pass.)

		Reason	<p>TF does not agree with the submitters assertion that the statement of considering the forces to be acting on the COG (a physical point that might not coincide with any physical aspect of the equipment) means components of the equipment would not be impacted by the seismic event. The statement about the COG is a common way of express how to consider forces acting on a complex assembly. Of course the assembly will be accelerated and that acceleration could damage parts. There is no credible argument to be made that if there is no component exactly at the COG then there will be no movement of the equipment.</p> <p>TF also disagree with the submitter’s assertion that there is no compliance criteria. The text directs at consideration of whether certain types of parts might fail. During S2 assessment, demonstrating one has done this consideration will drive the level of action the TF thought was appropriate.</p>			
Motion by/ 2 nd by	Naokatsu Nishiguchi (SCREEN) / Hidetoshi Sakura (Advisor)					
Discussion						
Result of Vote (check one)	7 Y-0 N; Motion passed					
	<input type="checkbox"/>	[Negative is related and persuasive.] > 1/3	Is a technical change recommended? (check one)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y GO TO “Address by Technical Change Option” subsection	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	[Negative is related and not persuasive.] < 2/3		<input type="checkbox"/>	N GO TO “Final” subsection → (E)	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	2/3 ≤ [Negative is related and not persuasive.] < 90%	GO TO “Final” subsection → (C)			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	90% ≤ [Negative is related and not persuasive.]	GO TO “Not Significant Finding Option” subsection				
Address by Technical Change Option	Technical Change Recommendations					
	Original section/paragraph number and at least one full sentence are required in “FROM” and “TO” fields.					
	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	Negative is addressed by the technical change(s).				
	Motion by/2 nd by	Name (Company)/Name (Company)				
Discussion						
Result of Vote (check one)	XX Y-XX N; Motion passed/failed.					
	<input type="checkbox"/>	2/3 ≤ [Negative is addressed by the technical change(s).]	GO TO “Incorporation of the Technical Change” subsection			

		[Negative is not addressed by the technical change(s).] < 2/3	GO TO “Final” subsection → (E)	
Incorporation of the Technical Change	Motion	To incorporate the technical change(s).		
	Motion by/2 nd by	Name (Company)/Name (Company)		
	Discussion			
	Result of Vote (check one)	XX Y-XX N; Motion passed/failed.		
		90% ≤ [Agree to incorporate.]	GO TO “Final” subsection → (F)	
		[Disagree to incorporate.]>10%	GO TO “Final” subsection → (E)	
Not Significant Finding Option	This option can be used only “if the TC Chapter finds a Negative not persuasive by a vote equal to or greater than 90% of the persons voting on the action”. (Regulations ¶ 9.6.4.4.2)			
	Use of “Not significant finding option” (check one)	x	It is mutually agreed upon to term the Negative “not significant”.	GO TO “Final” subsection → (D)
			It is mutually agreed upon to term the Negative “significant”.	GO TO “Final” subsection → (C)
			Whether or not the Negative is “not significant” is decided by a vote.	
	Motion	The Negative is “not significant”.		
	Motion by/ 2 nd by	Name (Company)/Name (Company)		
	Vote		XX Y-XX N; Motion passed with simple majority	GO TO “Final” subsection → (D)
		XX Y-XX N; Motion failed with simple majority	GO TO “Final” subsection → (C)	
Final	(check if applicable)		(A)	Withdrawn (counted under h in disposition)
			(B)	Not related (counted under i in disposition)
			(C)	Related and not persuasive (significant)
		x	(D)	Not significant (counted under j in disposition)
			(E)	Related and persuasive and not addressed by technical change
		(F)	Addressed by technical change (counted under k disposition)	
(check if applicable)		Comment generated. See Section V-(ii) Comment # X.		

Negative 2

Negative	Referenced Section/ Paragraph	*TF/TC Chapter to fill in, including text in the ballot if necessary.
		19.1
	Negative Text	Provide guidance on how risk assessment should be done for seismic events, particularly for the frequency aspect. Across the industry, it could reasonably be argued the frequency is a D or E, which would equate to a low risk for most concerns. In Japan lately, the frequency could be considered higher. Suggestion / Justification If consistent assessment is desired, then provide some guidance.
TF input (optional)		

Withdrawal (check one)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Negative withdrawal made by Voter.		GO TO “Related” subsection		
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Withdrawal document received by Standards staff on MM/DD/YYYY.		GO TO “Final” subsection → (A)		
Related	Motion and Reason (check one)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	‘Related’ is mutually agreed upon. (Needs no motion.)		GO TO “Persuasive” subsection	
		<input type="checkbox"/>	Negative is not related. (Needs ≥2/3 votes to pass.)			
		Reason	XXXX			
	Motion by/ 2nd by	Name (Company)/Name (Company)				
	Discussion					
	Result of Vote (check one)	XX Y-XX N; Motion passed/failed.				
<input type="checkbox"/>		[Negative is not related.] < 2/3			GO TO “Persuasive” subsection	
<input type="checkbox"/>		2/3 ≤ [Negative is not related.]			GO TO “Final” subsection → (B)	
Persuasive	Motion and Reason (check one)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Negative is related and persuasive. (Needs >1/3 votes to pass.)			
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Negative is related and not persuasive. (Needs ≥2/3 votes to pass.)			
		Reason	Estimation of “frequency” is not within the scope of SEMI S2.			
	Motion by/ 2nd by	Naokatsu Nishiguchi (SCREEN) / Hidetoshi Sakura (Advisor)				
	Discussion					
	Result of Vote (check one)	7 Y-0 N; Motion passed				
<input type="checkbox"/>		[Negative is related and persuasive.] > 1/3	Is a technical change recommended? (check one)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y	GO TO “Address by Technical Change Option” subsection
<input type="checkbox"/>		[Negative is related and not persuasive.] < 2/3		<input type="checkbox"/>	N	GO TO “Final” subsection → (E)
<input type="checkbox"/>		2/3 ≤ [Negative is related and not persuasive.] < 90%	GO TO “Final” subsection → (C)			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		90% ≤ [Negative is related and not persuasive.]	GO TO “Not Significant Finding Option” subsection			
Address by Technical Change Option	Technical Change Recommendations					
	Original section/paragraph number and at least one full sentence are required in “FROM” and “TO” fields.					
	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		Negative is addressed by the technical change(s).		
Motion by/2nd by		Name (Company)/Name (Company)		
Discussion				
Result of Vote (check one)		XX Y-XX N; Motion passed/failed.		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	2/3 ≤ [Negative is addressed by the technical change(s).] GO TO “Incorporation of the Technical Change” subsection	
		<input type="checkbox"/>	[Negative is not addressed by the technical change(s).] < 2/3 GO TO “Final” subsection → (E)	
Incorporation of the Technical Change	Motion		To incorporate the technical change(s).	
	Motion by/2nd by		Name (Company)/Name (Company)	
	Discussion			
	Result of Vote (check one)		XX Y-XX N; Motion passed/failed.	
<input type="checkbox"/>			90% ≤ [Agree to incorporate.] GO TO “Final” subsection → (F)	
<input type="checkbox"/>			[Disagree to incorporate.] > 10% GO TO “Final” subsection → (E)	
Not Significant Finding Option	This option can be used only “if the TC Chapter finds a Negative not persuasive by a vote equal to or greater than 90% of the persons voting on the action”. (Regulations ¶ 9.6.4.4.2)			
	Use of “Not significant finding option” (check one)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	It is mutually agreed upon to term the Negative “not significant”. GO TO “Final” subsection → (D)	
		<input type="checkbox"/>	It is mutually agreed upon to term the Negative “significant”. GO TO “Final” subsection → (C)	
		<input type="checkbox"/>	Whether or not the Negative is “not significant” is decided by a vote.	
	Motion		The Negative is “not significant”.	
	Motion by/ 2nd by		Name (Company)/Name (Company)	
	Vote		<input type="checkbox"/>	XX Y-XX N; Motion passed with simple majority GO TO “Final” subsection → (D)
<input type="checkbox"/>			XX Y-XX N; Motion failed with simple majority GO TO “Final” subsection → (C)	
Final	(check if applicable)	<input type="checkbox"/>	(A)	Withdrawn (counted under h in disposition)
		<input type="checkbox"/>	(B)	Not related (counted under i in disposition)
		<input type="checkbox"/>	(C)	Related and not persuasive (significant)
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	(D)	Not significant (counted under j in disposition)
		<input type="checkbox"/>	(E)	Related and persuasive and not addressed by technical change DOCUMENT FAILS
		<input type="checkbox"/>	(F)	Addressed by technical change (counted under k disposition)

	(check if applicable)		Comment generated. See Section V-(ii) Comment # X.
--	-----------------------	--	--

Negative 3

Negative	Referenced Section/ Paragraph	*TF/TC Chapter to fill in, including text in the ballot if necessary.				
		19.1.2 & 19.1.3				
	Negative Text	What about modules that are largely structurally independent and may even have a gasket between them to isolate any vibrations, but have alignment pins to assist with proper alignment for wafer hand-off? These would provide a means for forces to be transferred in at least one direction. Suggestion / Justification Clarify intent for how this design concept should be evaluated.				
TF input (optional)						
Withdrawal (check one)	x	No Negative withdrawal made by Voter.		GO TO "Related" subsection		
		Withdrawal document received by Standards staff on MM/DD/YYYY.		GO TO "Final" subsection → (A)		
Related	Motion and Reason (check one)	X	'Related' is mutually agreed upon. (Needs no motion.)		GO TO "Persuasive" subsection	
			Negative is not related. (Needs ≥2/3 votes to pass.)			
		Reason	XXXX			
	Motion by/ 2 nd by	Name (Company)/Name (Company)				
	Discussion					
	Result of Vote (check one)	XX Y-XX N; Motion passed/failed.				
		[Negative is not related.] < 2/3			GO TO "Persuasive" subsection	
		2/3 ≤ [Negative is not related.]			GO TO "Final" subsection → (B)	
Persuasive	Motion and Reason (check one)	X	Negative is related and persuasive. (Needs >1/3 votes to pass.)			
			Negative is related and not persuasive. (Needs ≥2/3 votes to pass.)			
		Reason	XXXX			
	Motion by/ 2 nd by	Naokatsu Nishiguchi (SCREEN) / Hidetoshi Sakura (Advisor)				
	Discussion					
	Result of Vote (check one)	7 Y-0 N; Motion passed				
x		[Negative is related and persuasive.] > 1/3	Is a technical change recommended? (check one)	X	Y	GO TO "Address by Technical Change Option" subsection
		[Negative is related and not persuasive.] < 2/3			N	GO TO "Final" subsection → (E)

		2/3 ≤ [Negative is related and not persuasive.] < 90%	GO TO “Final” subsection → (C)	
		90% ≤ [Negative is related and not persuasive.]	GO TO “Not Significant Finding Option” subsection	
Address by Technical Change Option	Technical Change Recommendations			
	Original section/paragraph number and at least one full sentence are required in “FROM” and “TO” fields.			
	Technical Changes	1	FROM: Section/Paragraph 19.1.2 19.1.2 Structurally independent modules are modules which react to seismic forces independently and do not transfer the forces to adjacent modules. They should be assessed independently.	
			TO: Section/Paragraph 19.1.2 and Exception (Add Exception just after 19.1.2) 19.1.2 Structurally independent modules are modules which react to seismic forces independently and do not transfer the forces to adjacent modules. They should be assessed independently. Exception: When any force that can be transferred to adjacent modules is negligible level in comparison to the anticipated seismic force those adjacent modules may be considered structurally independent.	
		Justification (if necessary)		
		2	FROM: Section/Paragraph XXX	
	TO: Section/Paragraph xxx			
	Justification (if necessary)			
	Motion		Negative is addressed by the technical change(s).	
	Motion by/2 nd by		Naokatsu Nishiguchi (SCREEN) / Hidetoshi Sakura (Advisor)	
	Discussion			
	Result of Vote (check one)		7 Y-0 N; Motion passed	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2/3 ≤ [Negative is addressed by the technical change(s).]	GO TO “Incorporation of the Technical Change” subsection
		<input type="checkbox"/>	[Negative is not addressed by the technical change(s).] < 2/3	GO TO “Final” subsection → (E)
	Incorporation of the Technical Change	Motion		To incorporate the technical change(s).
Motion by/2 nd by		Nishiguchi (Company)/ Hidetoshi Sakura (Advisor)		
Discussion				
Result of Vote (check one)		7 Y-0 N; Motion passed		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	90% ≤ [Agree to incorporate.]	GO TO “Final” subsection → (F)	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	[Disagree to incorporate.] > 10%	GO TO “Final” subsection → (E)	
Significant Finding	This option can be used only “if the TC Chapter finds a Negative not persuasive by a vote equal to or greater than 90% of the persons voting on the action”. (Regulations ¶ 9.6.4.4.2)			
	Use of “Not significant”	<input type="checkbox"/>	It is mutually agreed upon to term the Negative “not significant”. GO TO “Final” subsection → (D)	

	finding option” (check one)	<input type="checkbox"/>	It is mutually agreed upon to term the Negative “significant”.	GO TO “Final” subsection → (C)	
		<input type="checkbox"/>	Whether or not the Negative is “not significant” is decided by a vote.		
	Motion	The Negative is “not significant”.			
	Motion by/ 2nd by	Name (Company)/Name (Company)			
	Vote	<input type="checkbox"/>	XX Y-XX N; Motion passed with simple majority	GO TO “Final” subsection → (D)	
<input type="checkbox"/>		XX Y-XX N; Motion failed with simple majority	GO TO “Final” subsection → (C)		
Final	(check if applicable)	<input type="checkbox"/>	(A)	Withdrawn (counted under h in disposition)	
		<input type="checkbox"/>	(B)	Not related (counted under i in disposition)	
		<input type="checkbox"/>	(C)	Related and not persuasive (significant)	
		<input type="checkbox"/>	(D)	Not significant (counted under j in disposition)	
		<input type="checkbox"/>	(E)	Related and persuasive and not addressed by technical change	DOCUMENT FAILS
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	(F)	Addressed by technical change (counted under k disposition)	
	(check if applicable)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment generated. See Section V-(ii) Comment # X.		

Negative 4

Negative	Referenced Section/ Paragraph	*TF/TC Chapter to fill in, including text in the ballot if necessary.			
		Whole ballot			
	Negative Text	While the titles indicate that the intention is a delayed revision and an e-mail was sent out indicating the intent was delayed revision and this was a ballot preparation error, the rest of the ballot if formatted as an immediate effectivity ballot. With no effectivity date given in what we are reviewing there appears to be significant grounds for voter confusion and it is not clear if the ballot should be allowed to proceed to A&R. Suggestion / Justification Fail the ballot and reballot with a properly formatted document.			
TF input (optional)					
Withdrawal (check one)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Negative withdrawal made by Voter.		GO TO “Related” subsection	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Withdrawal document received by Standards staff on MM/DD/YYYY.		GO TO “Final” subsection → (A)	
Related	Motion and Reason (check one)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	‘Related’ is mutually agreed upon. (Needs no motion.)		GO TO “Persuasive” subsection
		<input type="checkbox"/>	Negative is not related. (Needs ≥2/3 votes to pass.)		
		Reason	XXXX		
	Motion by/ 2nd by	Name (Company)/Name (Company)			
	Discussion				
Result of Vote	XX Y-XX N; Motion passed/failed.				

	(check one)	<input type="checkbox"/>	[Negative is not related.] < 2/3	GO TO "Persuasive" subsection			
		<input type="checkbox"/>	2/3 ≤ [Negative is not related.]	GO TO "Final" subsection → (B)			
Persuasive	Motion and Reason (check one)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Negative is related and persuasive. (Needs >1/3 votes to pass.)				
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Negative is related and not persuasive. (Needs ≥2/3 votes to pass.)				
			Reason	<p>Not only title but also the second NOTICE following the title clearly indicates material that has been not immediate effective. Also the term "Delayed Revision Sections" is missing in the material shown as Line Item effective date are shown in the title of Line Item. Both combined, it is reasonable to assume intention of balloting this document as Delayed Revision can be correctly understood by voters. This was formatting error by responsible SEMI staff. It is not reasonable to punish task force for a shortcoming of staff.</p>			
	Motion by/ 2 nd by	Naokatsu Nishiguchi (SCREEN) / Hidetoshi Sakura (Advisor)					
	Discussion						
	Result of Vote (check one)	7 Y-0 N; Motion passed					
		<input type="checkbox"/>	[Negative is related and persuasive.] > 1/3	Is a technical change recommended? (check one)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y	GO TO "Address by Technical Change Option" subsection
<input type="checkbox"/>		[Negative is related and not persuasive.] < 2/3		<input type="checkbox"/>	N	GO TO "Final" subsection → (E)	
<input type="checkbox"/>		2/3 ≤ [Negative is related and not persuasive.] < 90%	GO TO "Final" subsection → (C)				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		90% ≤ [Negative is related and not persuasive.]	GO TO "Not Significant Finding Option" subsection				
Address by Technical Change Option	Technical Change Recommendations						
	Original section/paragraph number and at least one full sentence are required in "FROM" and "TO" fields.						
	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	Negative is addressed by the technical change(s).						
Motion by/2 nd by	Name (Company)/Name (Company)						

Discussion				
Result of Vote (check one)		<input type="checkbox"/> 2/3 ≤ [Negative is addressed by the technical change(s).]	GO TO “Incorporation of the Technical Change” subsection	
		<input type="checkbox"/> [Negative is not addressed by the technical change(s).] < 2/3	GO TO “Final” subsection → (E)	
Incorporation of the Technical Change	Motion	To incorporate the technical change(s).		
	Motion by/2 nd by	Name (Company)/Name (Company)		
	Discussion			
	Result of Vote (check one)	<input type="checkbox"/> 90% ≤ [Agree to incorporate.]	GO TO “Final” subsection → (F)	
<input type="checkbox"/> [Disagree to incorporate.] > 10%		GO TO “Final” subsection → (E)		
Not Significant Finding Option	This option can be used only “if the TC Chapter finds a Negative not persuasive by a vote equal to or greater than 90% of the persons voting on the action”. (Regulations ¶ 9.6.4.4.2)			
	Use of “Not significant finding option” (check one)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> It is mutually agreed upon to term the Negative “not significant”.	GO TO “Final” subsection → (D)	
		<input type="checkbox"/> It is mutually agreed upon to term the Negative “significant”.	GO TO “Final” subsection → (C)	
		Whether or not the Negative is “not significant” is decided by a vote.		
	Motion	The Negative is “not significant”.		
	Motion by/ 2 nd by	Name (Company)/Name (Company)		
Vote	<input type="checkbox"/> XX Y-XX N; Motion passed with simple majority	GO TO “Final” subsection → (D)		
	<input type="checkbox"/> XX Y-XX N; Motion failed with simple majority	GO TO “Final” subsection → (C)		
Final	(check if applicable)	<input type="checkbox"/> (A)	Withdrawn (counted under h in disposition)	
		<input type="checkbox"/> (B)	Not related (counted under i in disposition)	
		<input type="checkbox"/> (C)	Related and not persuasive (significant)	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (D)	Not significant (counted under j in disposition)	
		<input type="checkbox"/> (E)	Related and persuasive and not addressed by technical change	DOCUMENT FAILS
	<input type="checkbox"/> (F)	Addressed by technical change (counted under k disposition)		
(check if applicable)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment generated. See Section V-(ii) Comment # X.		

Disposition of Voting Interest Reject 4

Check only when the Document has not been failed.

4	Original number (#) of Negatives	(g)
0	Number of Negatives withdrawn	(h)

0	Number of Negatives found not related		(i)
3	Number of Negatives found not significant		(j)
1	Number of Negatives addressed by technical change (Negative becomes not significant)		(k)
Final	x	$g - (h + i + j + k) = 0$	Reject is Not Valid and is not included in the denominator of § VI. <i>Approval Conditions Check</i>
		$g - (h + i + j + k) > 0$	Reject is included in the denominator of § VI. <i>Approval Conditions Check</i>
		Reject without a Negative	Not Valid

Note: If all of the Negatives included with a Reject Vote are withdrawn, determined to be not related, or determined to be not significant, the Reject Vote is not valid. (*Regulations ¶ 9.4.3.3*)

Note: A Negative addressed by a technical change is automatically considered to be not significant. (*Regulations ¶ 9.6.4.4.2*)

IV. Other Technical Issues

Note: TC Chapter may choose to address a technical issue that is not part of a Negative received on a Letter Ballot (i.e., a Comment or a reason not addressed by a Vote response) by handling it as a Negative and finding it related and technically persuasive. The TC Chapter may then fail the Document or address such technical issue by using the procedure defined in *Regulations* § 9.6.4.3 to make a technical change to the Document. (*Regulations* ¶ 9.6.2.4.5)

Technical Issue	Origin	*TF/TC Chapter to choose Commenter 3 (Hicks, Julie/ Edwards) - Comment 1		
	Referenced Section/ Paragraph	*TF/TC Chapter to fill in including text in the ballot as appropriate. 19.1.2, 19.1.3		
	Reason	*Original Comment text, if applicable, and problem statement, including justification and suggestion, should be copied. 19.1.2 Structurally independent modules are modules which react to seismic forces independently and do not transfer the forces to adjacent modules. They should be assessed independently. 19.1.3 Structurally dependent modules are modules which transfer the forces to each other. They should be assessed together. I think 19.1.2 relates to pumps – but 19.1.3 could be interpreted as relating to semi systems – so we need some clarification on what “assessed together” means.		
Handle technical issue identified above as a Negative.				
Related	Motion and Reason (check one)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	'Related' is mutually agreed upon. (Needs no motion.)	GO TO “Persuasive” subsection
		<input type="checkbox"/>	Negative is not related and assigned to TF. (Needs ≥2/3 votes to pass.)	
		<input type="checkbox"/>	Negative is not related and placed on agenda of current TC Chapter meeting as new business. (Needs ≥2/3 votes to pass.)	
			Reason	XXXX
	Motion by/ 2nd by	Name (Company)/Name (Company)		
	Discussion			
Result of Vote (check one)	XX Y-XX N; Motion passed/failed.			
	<input type="checkbox"/>	[Negative is not related.] <2/3	GO TO “Persuasive” subsection	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	2/3 ≤ [Negative is not related] and assigned to TF. 2/3 ≤ [Negative is not related] and placed on agenda of current TC Chapter meeting as new business.	GO TO “Final” subsection → (B)	
Persuasive	Motion and Reason (check one)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Negative is related and persuasive. (Needs >1/3 votes to pass.)	
		<input type="checkbox"/>	Negative is related and not persuasive. (Needs ≥2/3 votes to pass.)	
			Reason	Without clarification, a pump would always be required to be accessed with main part of semiconductor manufacturing equipment to which the pump connect.
	Motion by/ 2 nd by	Naokatsu Nishiguchi (SCREEN) / Hidetoshi Sakura (Advisor)		
Discussion				

Result of Vote (check one)	7 Y-0 N; Motion passed					
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	[Negative is related and persuasive.] > 1/3	Is a technical change recommended? (check one)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	GO TO “Address by Technical Change Option” subsection
	<input type="checkbox"/>	[Negative is related and not persuasive.] < 2/3		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	GO TO “Final” subsection → (E)
	<input type="checkbox"/>	2/3 ≤ [Negative is related and not persuasive.] < 90%	GO TO “Final” subsection → (C)			

Technical Change Recommendations			
Original section/paragraph number and at least one full sentence are required in “FROM” and “TO” fields.			
Address by Technical Change Option	Technical Changes	1	<p>FROM: Section/Paragraph 19.1.3 19.1.3 Structurally dependent modules are modules which transfer the forces to each other. They should be assessed together.</p> <p>TO: Section/Paragraph 19.1.3 and Exception (Add Exception just after 19.1.3) 19.1.3 Structurally dependent modules are modules which transfer the forces to each other. They should be assessed together. Exception : Modules that can transfer the forces to each other may be separately analyzed, if each of them has its own seismic tie-downs</p> <p>Justification (if necessary)</p>
		2	<p>FROM: Section/Paragraph 19.1.2 19.1.2 Structurally independent modules are modules which react to seismic forces independently and do not transfer the forces to adjacent modules. They should be assessed independently.</p> <p>TO: Section/Paragraph 19.1.2 and Exception (Add Exception just after 19.1.2) 19.1.2 Structurally independent modules are modules which react to seismic forces independently and do not transfer the forces to adjacent modules. They should be assessed independently. Exception: When any force that can be transferred to adjacent modules is negligible level in comparison to the anticipated seismic force those adjacent modules may be considered structurally independent.</p> <p>Justification (if necessary)</p>
		<p>Motion Negative is addressed by the technical change(s).</p> <p>Motion by/2nd by Naokatsu Nishiguchi (SCREEN) / Hidetoshi Sakura (Advisor)</p> <p>Discussion</p>	
	Result of Vote (check one)	7 Y-0 N; Motion passed	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2/3 ≤ [Negative is addressed by the technical change(s).]
	<input type="checkbox"/>	[Negative is not addressed by the technical change(s).] < 2/3	GO TO “Final” subsection → (E)
Incorporation of the Technical	Motion To incorporate the technical change(s).		
	Motion by/2nd by No further motion is required for incorporation.		
	Discussion Identical motion was approved for the technical change in response to Voting Interest Reject 3, negative 1and Voting Interest Reject 4, negative 3.		
	XX Y-XX N; Motion passed/failed.		

		Result of Vote (check one)	90% ≤ [Agree to incorporate.]	GO TO “Final” subsection → (F)
			[Disagree to incorporate.] >10%	GO TO “Final” subsection → (E)
Final	(check one)		(B) Not related	
			(C) Related and not persuasive	
			(E) Related and persuasive and not addressed by technical change	DOCUMENT FAILS
	x	(F) Addressed by technical change		
	(check if applicable)		Comment generated. See Section V-(ii) Comment # X.	

Technical Issue	Origin	*TF/TC Chapter to choose Commenter 3 (Hicks, Julie/ Edwards) - Comment 3		
	Referenced Section/ Paragraph	*TF/TC Chapter to fill in including text in the ballot as appropriate. 19.4		
	Reason	<p>*Original Comment text, if applicable, and problem statement, including justification and suggestion, should be copied.</p> <p>The locations of the tie-ins, attachments, or seismic anchorage points intended by the supplier to limit equipment motion during a seismic event should be clearly identified by direct labelling on the equipment.</p> <p>we currently do not do this – we put guidance in our manual. And because we provide options for front, side or rear seismic bolting on our pumps we would have to add 8 labels – is this really necessary to do ?</p>		

Handle technical issue identified above as a Negative.

Related	Motion and Reason (check one)	X	'Related' is mutually agreed upon. (Needs no motion.)	GO TO “Persuasive” subsection
			Negative is not related and assigned to TF. (Needs ≥2/3 votes to pass.)	
			Negative is not related and placed on agenda of current TC Chapter meeting as new business. (Needs ≥2/3 votes to pass.)	
			Reason	XXXX
	Motion by/ 2nd by	Name (Company)/Name (Company)		
	Discussion			
Result of Vote (check one)		XX Y-XX N; Motion passed/failed.		
		[Negative is not related.] <2/3		GO TO “Persuasive” subsection
		2/3 ≤ [Negative is not related] and assigned to TF.		GO TO “Final” subsection → (B)
	2/3 ≤ [Negative is not related] and placed on agenda of current TC Chapter meeting as new business.			
Persuasive	Motion and Reason (check one)	X	Negative is related and persuasive. (Needs >1/3 votes to pass.)	
			Negative is related and not persuasive. (Needs ≥2/3 votes to pass.)	

		Reason	Not allowing supplier-intended anchorage points to be identified by installation documentation is too limiting.			
Motion by/ 2nd by	Naokatsu Nishiguchi (SCREEN) / Hidetoshi Sakura (Advisor)					
Discussion						
Result of Vote (check one)	7 Y-0 N; Motion passed					
	x	[Negative is related and persuasive.] > 1/3	Is a technical change recommended? (check one)	x	Y	GO TO “Address by Technical Change Option” subsection
		[Negative is related and not persuasive.] < 2/3			N	GO TO “Final” subsection → (E)
	2/3 ≤ [Negative is related and not persuasive.] < 90%		GO TO “Final” subsection → (C)			
Technical Change Recommendations						
Original section/paragraph number and at least one full sentence are required in “FROM” and “TO” fields.						
Address by Technical Change Option	Technical Changes	1	FROM: Section/Paragraph 19.4 19.4 The locations of the tie-ins, attachments, or anchorage points intended by the supplier to limit equipment motion during a seismic event should be clearly identified by direct labelling on the equipment.			
			TO: Section/Paragraph 19.4 19.4 The locations of the tie-ins, attachments, or anchorage points intended by the supplier to limit equipment motion during a seismic event should be clearly identified by either direct labelling on the equipment or through documentation.			
			Justification (if necessary)			
	2	FROM: Section/Paragraph XXX				
		TO: Section/Paragraph xxx				
		Justification (if necessary)				
Motion	Negative is addressed by the technical change(s).					
Motion by/2nd by	Naokatsu Nishiguchi (SCREEN) / Hidetoshi Sakura (Advisor)					
Discussion						
Result of Vote (check one)	7 Y-0 N; Motion passed					
	x	2/3 ≤ [Negative is addressed by the technical change(s).]		GO TO “Incorporation of the Technical Change” subsection		
		[Negative is not addressed by the technical change(s).] < 2/3		GO TO “Final” subsection → (E)		
Incorporation	Motion	To incorporate the technical change(s).				
	Motion by/2nd by	No further motion is required for incorporation.				

	Discussion	Identical motion was approved for the technical change in response to Voting Interest Reject 3, negative 2.		
	Result of Vote (check one)	XX Y-XX N; Motion passed/failed.		
		90% ≤ [Agree to incorporate.]	GO TO “Final” subsection → (F)	
		[Disagree to incorporate.] >10%	GO TO “Final” subsection → (E)	
Final	(check one)	(B)	Not related	
		(C)	Related and not persuasive	
		(E)	Related and persuasive and not addressed by technical change	DOCUMENT FAILS
		x (F)	Addressed by technical change	
(check if applicable)		Comment generated. See Section V-(ii) Comment # X.		

Technical Issue	Origin	*TF/TC Chapter to choose A reason not addressed by a Vote response	
	Referenced Section/ Paragraph	*TF/TC Chapter to fill in including text in the ballot as appropriate. 19.2.3	
	Reason	*Original Comment text, if applicable, and problem statement, including justification and suggestion, should be copied. In this revision, the term “horizontal force(s)” is used throughout the text being revised. The term “horizontal load”, however, was kept unchanged where text was not revised. It might cause confusions for the user of the Safety Guideline. To be consistent all the instances of “horizontal load” should be replaced with “horizontal force(s)”.	

Handle technical issue identified above as a Negative.

Related	Motion and Reason (check one)	X	‘Related’ is mutually agreed upon. (Needs no motion.)	GO TO “Persuasive” subsection
			Negative is not related and assigned to TF. (Needs ≥2/3 votes to pass.)	
			Negative is not related and placed on agenda of current TC Chapter meeting as new business. (Needs ≥2/3 votes to pass.)	
			Reason	XXXX
	Motion by/ 2nd by	Name (Company)/Name (Company)		
	Discussion			
	Result of Vote (check one)		XX Y-XX N; Motion passed/failed.	
		[Negative is not related.] <2/3	GO TO “Persuasive” subsection	
		2/3 ≤ [Negative is not related] and assigned to TF. 2/3 ≤ [Negative is not related] and placed on agenda of current TC Chapter meeting as new business.	GO TO “Final” subsection → (B)	
Motion and Reason	X	Negative is related and persuasive. (Needs >1/3 votes to pass.)		

	(check one)		Negative is related and not persuasive. (Needs $\geq 2/3$ votes to pass.)			
		Reason	Consistent use of a significant term is important.			
Motion by/ 2 nd by		Naokatsu Nishiguchi (SCREEN) / Hidetoshi Sakura (Advisor)				
Discussion						
Result of Vote (check one)	7 Y-0 N; Motion passed					
	x	[Negative is related and persuasive.] > 1/3	Is a technical change recommended? (check one)	X	Y	GO TO "Address by Technical Change Option" subsection
		[Negative is related and not persuasive.] < 2/3			N	GO TO "Final" subsection → (E)
		2/3 ≤ [Negative is related and not persuasive.] < 90%	GO TO "Final" subsection → (C)			
Technical Change Recommendations						
Original section/paragraph number and at least one full sentence are required in "FROM" and "TO" fields.						
Address by Technical Change Option	Technical Changes	1	FROM: Section/Paragraph 19.2.3 19.2.3 Horizontal loads should be calculated independently on each of the X and Y axes, or on the axis that produces the largest loads on the anchorage points.			
			TO: Section/Paragraph 19.2.3 19.2.3 Horizontal forces should be calculated independently on each of the X and Y axes, or on the axis that produces the largest forces on the anchorage points.			
			Justification (if necessary)			
	2	FROM: Section/Paragraph XXX				
		TO: Section/Paragraph xxx				
		Justification (if necessary)				
Motion		Negative is addressed by the technical change(s).				
Motion by/2 nd by		Nishiguchi (Company)/ Hidetoshi Sakura (Advisor)				
Discussion						
Result of Vote (check one)	7 Y-0 N; Motion passed					
	x	2/3 ≤ [Negative is addressed by the technical change(s).]	GO TO "Incorporation of the Technical Change" subsection			
		[Negative is not addressed by the technical change(s).] < 2/3	GO TO "Final" subsection → (E)			
Incorporation of the	Motion		To incorporate the technical change(s).			
	Motion by/2 nd by		Nishiguchi (Company)/ Hidetoshi Sakura (Advisor)			
	Discussion					
			7 Y-0 N; Motion passed			

		Result of Vote (check one)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	90% ≤ [Agree to incorporate.]	GO TO “Final” subsection → (F)	
				[Disagree to incorporate.] >10%	GO TO “Final” subsection → (E)	
Final	(check one)			(B)	Not related	
				(C)	Related and not persuasive	
				(E)	Related and persuasive and not addressed by technical change	DOCUMENT FAILS
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		(F)	Addressed by technical change	
	(check if applicable)			Comment generated. See Section V-(ii) Comment # X .		

V. Comments

V- (i) Voters' Comments

Commenter 1 (Swanson Scott / Intel Corporation) - Comment 1

Comment	(19)	
	The coefficients should not be based on the 1997 UBC – see above. They should be based on whichever controls, the current ASCE 7-10 standard used in the US, the current Taiwan Building Code or the current Japan requirements. Suggest that each code should be explicitly calculated out using equivalent parameters so that it is clear which one controls. While there is discussion included in R4-3, the actual coefficients are not included and they are inconsistent with the selected ones (they are strength based and not working stress based).	
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
Editorial Changes	Options for editorial change (check one)	Case 1: No vote in this section: To be included and voted on as a group in § VI. Editorial Changes Other than Those Voted on in § V.
		Case 2: Voted in this section: Original section number and at least one full sentence are required in "FROM" and "TO" fields.
		FROM: Section/Paragraph xxx
		TO: Section/Paragraph xxx
Editorial Changes	1	Justification (If necessary)
		FROM: Section/Paragraph xxx
		TO: Section/Paragraph xxx
	2	Justification (If necessary)
		FROM: Section/Paragraph xxx
		TO: Section/Paragraph xxx
Motion	To approve above editorial change(s)	
Motion by/2 nd by	Name (Company)/Name (Company)	
Discussion	XXXX	
Vote	XX Y-XX N; Motion passed/failed.	

This table is needed for each Comment.

Commenter 1 (Swanson Scott / Intel Corporation) - Comment 2

Comment	(R4-3.1.1)	
	The discussion of ASCE 7-10 uses an Rp of 1.5 which is no longer correct in the code. This coefficient should be 2.5. Also, it seems extreme to base these coefficients on near-field values that happen over a very small percentage of the US as a whole. I agree this approach is conservative and based on the previous version of the standard. However, it seems this could be listed as an exception. I realize that the US standard does not control.	
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. Rp =2.5 is used in the discussion of ASCE 7-10.
	<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 as a group in § VI. Editorial Changes Other than Those Voted on in § V.
	<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/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/2 nd by	Name (Company)/Name (Company)	
Discussion	XXXX	
Vote	XX Y-XX N; Motion passed/failed.	

Commenter 2 (Pochon, Stephan / TUVR) - Comment 1

Comment	19.1, Note XXX	
	I would suggest to add the word 'seismic' before forces to keep consistency with what is written in 19.1 and 19.2.	
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 as a group in § VI. Editorial Changes Other than Those Voted on in § V.
		<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 19.1 NOTE XXX NOTE XXX: Section 19.2 contains criteria for anticipated forces.
		TO: Section/Paragraph 19.1 NOTE XXX NOTE XXX: Section 19.2 contains criteria for anticipated seismic forces.
Justification (If necessary)		
2	FROM: Section/Paragraph xxx	
	TO: Section/Paragraph xxx	
	Justification (If necessary)	
Motion	To approve above editorial change(s)	
Motion by/2 nd by	Naokatsu Nishiguchi (SCREEN) / Hidetoshi Sakura (Advisor)	
Discussion		
Vote	7 Y-0 N; Motion passed	

Commenter 2 (Pochon, Stephan / TUVR) - Comment 2

Comment	19.5.1 (19.1.5).	
	The term 'facilities' is not defined, which make the requirement unclear. An example would be welcome to clarify this section.	
	The TC Chapter agreed to do one of the following actions.	

		*No motion is required in this step.	
		Already addressed by Commenter #, Comment #	
		No further action was taken by the TC Chapter.	
		Refer to the TF for more consideration.	
X		New Business	
		Editorial Change	
			Case 1: No vote in this section:
			To be included and voted on as a group in § VI. Editorial Changes Other than Those Voted on in § V.
			Case 2: Voted in this section:
			Original section number and at least one full sentence are required in "FROM" and "TO" fields.
Editorial Changes	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/2 nd by		Name (Company)/Name (Company)	
Discussion		XXXX	
Vote		XX Y-XX N; Motion passed/failed.	

Commenter 3 (Hicks, Julie/ Edwards) - Comment 2

Comment	NOTE XXX (19.1.3)
	NOTE XXX: SEMI S7 §8 highlights qualifications of personnel capable of reviewing and validating calculations or test results. A person may be qualified to perform such calculations by: education in mechanical, structural, civil, seismic, or architectural engineering; being licensed or certified as PE (USA), Chartered (UK), or Eur Ing (EU) or equivalent; or experience in design, construction, and analysis of such structures.
	the standard now asks for a C Eng to do the calculations – not sure how many C Eng we have in in the company, a more practical requirement would be if a CEng just had to approve the calculations ?

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 as a group in § VI. Editorial Changes Other than Those Voted on in § V.
		Case 2: Voted in this section: Original section number and at least one full sentence are required in "FROM" and "TO" fields.
Editorial Changes	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/2 nd by	Name (Company)/Name (Company)	
Discussion	XXXX	
Vote	XX Y-XX N; Motion passed/failed.	

Commenter 3 (Hicks, Julie/ Edwards) - Comment 4

Comment	(R4-3.1.1)
	IP = component importance factor. Generally speaking, equipment that contains toxic or explosive substances is assigned a value of 1.5, and a value of 1.0 otherwise (see ASCE 7-10 §13.1.3) my assumption here is that a pump / semi system would contain toxic / explosive substances – is this true in Semi’s view (this maybe a dumb question but you never know)
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. <i>Some pump/ semi systems would contain toxic/ explosive substances while some would not.</i>
		Refer to the TF for more consideration.
		New Business
		Editorial Change
	Options for editorial change (check one)	Case 1: No vote in this section: <i>To be included and voted on as a group in § VI. Editorial Changes Other than Those Voted on in § V.</i>
		Case 2: Voted in this section: <i>Original section number and at least one full sentence are required in "FROM" and "TO" fields.</i>
Editorial Changes	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/2 nd by	Name (Company)/Name (Company)	
Discussion	XXXX	
Vote	XX Y-XX N; Motion passed/failed.	

Commenter 3 (Hicks, Julie/ Edwards) - Comment 5

Comment	(R4-3.3.2)
	Generally speaking, users ask semiconductor manufacturing equipment to be Class A. this has implications for us understanding where in the fab out equipment is located – different fab floor heights have different classes and potential seismic loadings. Question – would our eqpt always be class A ?
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 as a group in § VI. <i>Editorial Changes Other than Those Voted on in § V.</i>
		Case 2: Voted in this section: Original section number and at least one full sentence are required in "FROM" and "TO" fields.
Editorial Changes	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/2 nd by	Name (Company)/Name (Company)	
Discussion	XXXX	
Vote	XX Y-XX N; Motion passed/failed.	

Commenter 4 (Schwab, Paul / TI) - Comment 1

Comment	((NOTEXX after 19.1.3)
	<p>Recommend moving Note XXX with reference to SEMI S7 from under Section 9.1.3 to under Section 19.1 "General" as follows:</p> <p>19.1 General — The equipment should be designed so that if it is anchored as specified in the documentation provided to the equipment user, and it experiences anticipated seismic forces, it will not overturn, and no parts will fail or yield such that there would be a the risk of injury to personnel, or adverse environmental impact of Medium or higher per SEMI S10.</p> <p>NOTE XXX: SEMI S7 §8 highlights qualifications of personnel capable of reviewing and validating calculations or test results. A person may be qualified to perform such calculations by: education in mechanical, structural, civil, seismic, or architectural engineering; being licensed or certified as PE (USA), Chartered (UK), or Eur Ing (EU) or equivalent; or experience in design, construction, and analysis of such structures.</p> <p>NOTE XXX: Section 19.2 contains criteria for anticipated forces.</p>
	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 as a group in § VI. Editorial Changes Other than Those Voted on in § V.
			Case 2: Voted in this section:
			Original section number and at least one full sentence are required in "FROM" and "TO" fields.
Editorial Changes	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/2 nd by		Name (Company)/Name (Company)	
Discussion		XXXX	
Vote		XX Y-XX N; Motion passed/failed.	

V-(ii) Comments Created by Handling Negative

Comment (Created by Handling Negative) NC – 1

Comment	*TF/TC Chapter to fill in	
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 type="checkbox"/>	Editorial change
Editorial Change	Options for editorial change (check one)	Case 1: No vote in this section: To be included and voted on as a group in § VI. Editorial Changes Other than Those Voted on in § V.
		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 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/2 nd by	Name (Company)/Name (Company)	
Discussion	XXXX	
Vote	XX Y-XX N; Motion passed/failed.	

VI. Editorial Changes Other than Those Voted on in § V

Original section/paragraph number and at least one full sentence are required in “FROM” and “TO” fields.

1	Origin of this editorial change (Check one)		Committer(s) / Comment(s) #
		X	Other [TF]
	FROM: Section/Paragraph Title of Table R4-1 Table R4-1 Standard Design Seismic Intensity (K _S)		
	TO: Section/Paragraph Title of Table R4-1 Table R4-1 Standard Design Seismic Intensity (K _S)		
Justification: (If necessary) Typographical error			
2	Origin of this editorial change (Check one)		Committer(s) / Comment(s) #
		X	Other [TF]
	FROM: Section/Paragraph R4-2 R4-2 Derivation of § 19, Seismic Load Guidelines		
	TO: Section/Paragraph R4-2 R4-2 Derivation of § 19, Seismic Force Guidelines		
Justification: (If necessary) “Seismic Load” is used. However, this terminology has not adjusted to other words in Section 19.			
3	Origin of this editorial change (Check one)		Committer(s) / Comment(s) #
		X	Other [TF]
	FROM: Section/Paragraph R4-2.1 The horizontal loadings(F_p) of 94% and 63% of the equipment weight (W_p), found in § 19.2.1 and § 19.2.2, were based on following assumptions for factors in the design lateral force formula 32-2 in § 1632.2 of the 1997 Uniform Building Code (UBC):		
	TO: Section/Paragraph R4-2.1 The horizontal forces (F_p) of 94% and 63% of the equipment weight (W_p), found in § 19.2.1 and § 19.2.2, were based on following assumptions for factors in the design lateral force formula 32-2 in § 1632.2 of the 1997 Uniform Building Code (UBC):		
Justification: (If necessary) “horizontal loadings” is used. However, this terminology has not adjusted to in Section 19.			
4	Origin of this editorial change (Check one)		Committer(s) / Comment(s) #
		X	Other [TF]
	FROM: Section/Paragraph R4-3.2.4 The vertical seismic load, F_{pv} is given by:		
	TO: Section/Paragraph R4-3.2.4 The vertical seismic force, F_{pv} is given by:		
Justification: (If necessary) "vertical seismic force" is used in TBC.			
Motion	To approve the above editorial change(s).		
Motion by/	Naokatsu Nishiguchi (SCREEN) / Hidetoshi Sakura (Advisor)		

2nd by	
Discussion	
Vote	7 Y-0 N; Motion passed

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	=	45	/	45	=	100.0%		≥90%	

VII. – (ii) Approval Level (check one)

Note: See *Regulations* § 9.7.2 for further information.

Globally Approved (No Ratification Ballot needed):

Line Item 1 meets the Letter Ballot approval conditions for the global technical committee.

Need a Ratification Ballot:

Line Item 1 meets the Letter Ballot approval conditions for the TC Chapter and a Ratification Ballot will be issued to validate technical changes.

Checks for Entire Document Including All Approved Line Items

VIII. Safety Check

Note: This Safety check applies to the entire Standard or Safety Guideline including all the approved Line Items. See § 15 of the *Regulations* for further information.

Motion	<input type="checkbox"/>	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)
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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)
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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		Nishiguchi (Company)/ Hidetoshi Sakura (Advisor)
Discussion		XXXX
Vote		7 Y-0 N; Motion passed

IX. Intellectual Property (IP) Check

Note: This IP check applies to the entire Standard or Safety Guideline including all the approved Line Items. See § 16 of the *Regulations* for further information.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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)	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No potentially material patented technology or reproduction of copyrighted items is known.	GO TO SECTION X.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially material patented technology or reproduction of copyrighted items is 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 X.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially material patented technology or reproduction of copyrighted items is 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	<input type="checkbox"/>	Ask ISC for special permission to publish.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Quit activity.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Wait for LOA for patented technology or release of copyrighted items.
Motion by/2nd by		Name (Company)/Name (Company)
Discussion		XXXX
Vote		XX Y-XX N
Final Action	<input type="checkbox"/>	Motion passed
	<input type="checkbox"/>	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 (Check all applicable items)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Line item(s) [X], [X] and [X] passed TC Chapter review as balloted and will be forwarded to the ISC A&R SC for procedural review.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Line item(s) [X], [X] and [X] passed TC Chapter review with editorial changes and will be forwarded to the ISC A&R SC for procedural review.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Line item(s) [1] passed TC Chapter review with technical changes and with or without editorial changes and will be forwarded to the ISC A&R SC for procedural review. A Ratification Ballot will be issued to verify the technical changes.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Line item(s) [X], [X] and [X] failed TC Chapter review and will be returned to the TF for rework.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Line item(s) [X], [X] and [X] failed TC Chapter review and work will be discontinued.
Motion by/ 2nd by	Nishiguchi (Company) / Hidetoshi Sakura (Advisor)	
Discussion		
Vote	7 Y-0 N	
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"/>	Line item(s) [X], [X] and [X] are Approved for publication
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Line item(s) [X], [X] and [X] are Approved pending acceptance of the Ratification Ballot
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Line item(s) [X], [X] and [X] are Not approved
	Reason:	