

# Procedural Review Voting Sheet

## Editorial Change(s) to a published Standard or Safety Guideline (Independently from a Letter Ballot)

REGION/LOCALE: **North America**  
GLOBAL TECHNICAL COMMITTEE: **Silicon Wafer**  
EVENT: **SEMICON West**  
DATE OF MEETING: **07/09/2019**  
PLACE OF MEETING: **San Francisco, CA**  
TC CHAPTER CO-CHAIRS: **Dinesh Gupta/STA, Noel Poduje/SMS**  
SEMI STANDARDS STAFF: **Kevin Nguyen**

A&R Voter:  
Date:

### I. Document Title

**SEMI M58-1109 (Reapproved 0614)**  
**TEST METHOD FOR EVALUATING DMA BASED PARTICLE DEPOSITION SYSTEMS AND PROCESSES**

### II. Type 1 Editorial Change

Editorial changes that meet the requirements of the Regulations (see *Regulations ¶¶ 8.9.4 & 8.9.5*) are approved by a simple majority vote in a regularly scheduled meeting of the TC Chapter. [See PM 2.11.4]

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

1	FROM: Section/Paragraph	
	TO: Section/Paragraph	
	Justification:	
2	FROM: Section/Paragraph	
	TO: Section/Paragraph	
	Justification:	
Motion		To approve the above editorial change(s).
Motion by/ 2 <sup>nd</sup> by		Name (Company)/Name (Company)

Discussion	XXXX
Vote	XX Y-XX N ; If Y > 50% Motion passes, GO TO VI

### III. Type 2 Editorial Change

Editorial changes that meet the requirements of the Regulations (see *Regulations* ¶¶ 8.9.4 & 8.9.5) are approved by a simple majority vote in a regularly scheduled meeting of the TC Chapter. [See PM 2.11.4]

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

1	<p><b>FROM: §8, Reagents and Materials</b></p> <p>¶8.1.1.1 Bottle A is a CRM that contains a suspension of PSL spheres with a relative expanded peak diameter uncertainty much less than 3% and a FWHM less than 5%. It is used in the measurement of (1) peak diameter repeatability and (2) peak diameter bias of the deposition system.<sup>2</sup></p> <hr/> <p><sup>2</sup>At the present time, NIST SRM 1963 meets these requirements.</p>
	<p><b>TO: Section/Paragraph §8, Reagents and Materials</b></p> <p>¶8.1.1.1 Bottle A is a CRM that contains a suspension of PSL spheres with a relative expanded peak diameter uncertainty much less than 3% and a FWHM less than 5%. It is used in the measurement of (1) peak diameter repeatability and (2) peak diameter bias of the deposition system.<sup>2</sup></p> <p><b>Change footnote 2 to read:</b></p> <hr/> <p><sup>2</sup> <del>At the present time, NIST SRM 1963 meets these requirements.</del> NIST SRM 1963a has a FWHM that is 5.5% of the certified modal diameter, slightly exceeding these requirements. Nevertheless, 1963a is currently the best-known CRM for this Test Method.</p>
	<p><b>Justification:</b> NIST CRM 1963 no longer available; 1963a is the best-known alternative.</p>
2	<p><b>FROM: §8, Reagents and Materials</b></p> <p>¶8.1.1.2 Bottle B contains a suspension of PSL spheres with a single well defined peak diameter that is at least 20% smaller than that of the spheres in Bottle A, and a FWHM that is significantly larger than 5%. It is used in the measurement of (1) peak diameter repeatability and (2) FWHM of the deposition system when filtering a smaller diameter with a broad diameter distribution.</p>
	<p><b>TO: §8, Reagents and Materials</b></p> <p>¶8.1.1.2 (Add new footnote 3)</p> <p>...with a broad diameter distribution.<sup>3</sup></p> <hr/> <p><sup>3</sup> NIST SRM 1964 meets these requirements.</p>

	<b>Justification:</b> Bottle B need not be a CRM, but NIST SRM 1964 is an example of available material that meets the requirements of 8.1.1.2
<b>Motion</b>	To approve the above editorial change(s).
<b>Motion by/ 2<sup>nd</sup> by</b>	Kurt Haller (KLA)/Masami Ikota (Hitachi High Tech)
<b>Discussion</b>	None
<b>Vote</b>	9 Y-0 N ; If Y > 50% Motion passes, <b>GO TO IV</b>

## IV. Safety Check

**Note:** See *Regulations* § 15 for further information.

<b>Motion</b>	x	<b>This is not a Safety Document</b> , when all safety-related information is removed, the Document is still technically sound and complete. ( <i>Regulations</i> ¶ 8.7.1)	
		<b>This is a Safety Document</b> , when all safety-related information is removed, the Document is not technically sound and complete. ( <i>Regulations</i> ¶ 8.7.2)	
		Safety Checklist ( <i>Regulations</i> ¶ 15.3) is complete and has been included with the Document throughout the balloting process. ( <i>Regulations</i> ¶ 15.1.2)	
<b>Motion by/2<sup>nd</sup> by</b>		Kurt Haller (KLA)/Fritz Passek (Siltronic)	
<b>Discussion</b>		None	
<b>Vote</b>		9 Y-0 N; Motion passed	

## V. Intellectual Property Check

**Note:** This Document may cover all or part of a Standard or Safety Guideline. Regardless of the coverage, this IP check applies to the entire Standard or Safety Guideline\*. See *Regulations* § 16 for further information.

x	The TC Chapter meeting chair asked those participating, if they were aware of any patented technology that might be relevant (see <i>Regulations</i> ¶ 16.3.1.1) to the Standard or Safety Guideline; or, any copyrighted items or trademarks that are used/reproduced (see <i>Regulations</i> ¶ 16.4.1.2) in the Standard or Safety Guideline. (Also see, <i>Regulations</i> § 8.8)			
	x	The question is NOT answered in affirmative (No potentially material patented technology or use/reproduction of copyrighted items/trademarks is known.)	GO TO SECTION VI.	
		The question is answered in affirmative	Is any of the known IPs a patented technology?	Yes, at least one of them is a patented technology
				GO TO V (a) "Patented Technology" subsection

				No	GO TO V (b) “Copyright items” subsection
--	--	--	--	----	--

## V (a) Patented Technologies subsection

### V (a1) Total numbers of Patented Technologies to be dealt with

# Fill number	(l) Known Patented Technology that might be relevant to the Standard/Safety Guideline	# Fill number	(m) Number of patented technologies first became known to the TC Chapter on or after the day of the issuance of this Letter Ballot	Postpone assessment of such patented technologies to be performed at the next scheduled TC Chapter meeting.
		# Fill number	(n) Number of patented technologies first became known to the TC Chapter before the day of the issuance of this Letter Ballot	GO TO V (a2)

### V (a2) Assessment of disclosed patented technologies

Disclosed patented technology #1 (Brief description, e.g., patent title and number):			Date of Assessment (If different from the date of Letter Ballot adjudication) MM/DD/YYYY		
Is disclosed patented technology #1 found to be “might be material” to the Standard/Safety Guideline?		YES (It is a PMPT)	Is the use of this PMPT technically justified?	YES	PROCEED to assess NEXT one, or if this is the last one, GO TO V (a3)
				NO	The Document is failed and returned to the TF
		NO	No further action is needed for patented technology #1		

*This table is needed for each disclosed patented technology.*

### V (a3) LOA status check of PMPT of which inclusion assessed to be justified

LOA Status of PMPT #1					
Has an LOA for this patented technology been received from		YES	PROCEED to check NEXT one, or if this is the last one, GO TO V (b)		
		NO	≤		Ask ISC for special permission to publish.

every owner ?					Quit activity.	The Document is failed and returned to the TF
					Wait for LOA	PROCEED to check NEXT one, or if this is the last one, GO TO V (b1)
			Motion by/ 2 <sup>nd</sup> by		Name (Company)/Name (Company)	
			Discussion		XXXX	
			Vote		XX Y-XX N; Motion passed (or failed)	

*This table is needed for each PMPT of which inclusion assessed to be justified.*

### V (b1) Total numbers of copyrighted items to be dealt with

# Fill number	(o) Known copyrighted items that are used or reproduced to the Standard/Safety Guideline	o > 0 There is at least one known copy righted items that might be relevant to the Standard/Safety Guideline	GO TO V (b2)
		o = 0 There is no disclosed copyrighted item	GO TO V (c)

### V (b2) Assessment of disclosed copyrighted items

Disclosed copyrighted item #1 (Brief description of its use in the Document):					
Is disclosed copyrighted item #1 used or reproduced in the Standard/Safety Guideline?		YES	Is the use/reproduction of this copyrighted item technically justified?	YES	PROCEED to assess NEXT one, or if this is the last one, GO TO V (b3)
				NO	The Document is failed and returned to the TF
		NO	No further action is needed for copyrighted item #1		

*This table is needed for each disclosed copyrighted item.*

### V(b3) Copyright release status check of copyrighted item of which inclusion assessed to be justified

Copyright release Status of copyrighted item #1
---

Has the copyright release been received from its owner ?.		YES	PROCEED to assess NEXT one, or if this is the last one, GO TO V (c)			
		NO	MOTION		Ask ISC for special permission to publish.	
					Quit activity.	The Document is failed and returned to the TF
					Wait for copyright release letter	PROCEED to check NEXT one, or if this is the last one, GO TO V (c)
			Motion by/ 2 <sup>nd</sup> by		Name (Company)/Name (Company)	
			Discussion		XXXX	
			Vote		XX Y-XX N; Motion passed (or failed)	

*This table is needed for each copyrighted item of which use/reproduction assessed to be justified.*

### V (c) Assessment of disclosed (identified) trademark

Is there any trademark in the Standard/Safety Guideline?		YES	Is every instance of trademark use technically justified?		YES	GO TO V (d)
					NO	The Document is failed and returned to the TF
		NO	GO TO V (d)			

### V (d) IP check completion condition check

The co-chair checks if any Patented Technologies first become known to the TC Chapter on or after the day of the issuance of this Letter Ballot? i.e., m>0 in V(a1)		YES	Sections V(a2) and V(a3) shall be completed and recorded for such patented technologies at next scheduled meeting of the TC Chapter. Until then, the TC Chapter shall NOT go to VI (making motion to pass/fail this Document) (see Regulations ¶ 16.4.1.2) Until then this Letter Ballot Review is on hold.			
		NO	GO TO VI			

## VI. Action for this Document

Motion	x	This Document passed TC Chapter review and will be forwarded to the ISC A&R SC for procedural review.
		This Document failed TC Chapter review and will be returned to the TF for rework.

		This Document failed TC Chapter review and work will be discontinued.
<b>Motion by/ 2nd by</b>	Kurt Haller (KLA)/Fritz Passek (Siltronic)	
<b>Discussion</b>	None	
<b>Vote</b>	9 Y-0 N	
<b>Final Action</b>	x	Motion passed
		Motion failed