

Procedural Review Voting Sheet 2011 Cycle 7

REGION: **Japan**
 COMMITTEE: **Silicon Wafer**
 EVENT: **SEMICON Japan 2011**
 DATE OF MEETING: **2011/12/08**
 PLACE OF MEETING: **Makuhari Messe, Chiba, Japan**
 COMMITTEE CO-CHAIRS: **Naoyuki Kawai/ University of Tokyo, Tetsuya Nakai/SUMCO**
 SEMI STAFF: **Akiko Yamamoto**

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

I. Document Number & Title

Document 5253A	Revision of SEMI M49-0311, Guide for Specifying Geometry Measurement Systems for Silicon Wafers for the 130 nm to 22 nm Technology Generations
---------------------------	---

II. Tally (Staff to fill in)

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

A minimum of 60% of the voting interests that have voting members within the technical committee must return votes. (Regulations ¶ 9.6.1)

	Return		Distribution		Return Rate	
Yellow	52	÷	86	=	60.5%	>=60%
Lilac & Others	0					
Total Vote	52					
Reject	0					
Accept	21					

A&R		Not approved
		Reason:

III. Rejects

None.

IV. Comments

Comment 1

Comment	Referenced Section	Table 1 Section 1.6
	From	Noel Poduje (SMS)
	Comment	Table 1, Section. 1.6 These clarify the documents, making them consistent with current SEMI Standards usage and do not change technical meaning.
	Discussion	
Action proposed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The committee agreed to do one of the following actions.
		*No motion is required in this step.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	No further action was taken by the committee.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Refer to the task force for more consideration.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	New Business
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other
Editorial Change		
Action proposed		Case 1: No vote in this section :
		To be included and voted on in <u>§ 5. Summary of Editorial Changes.</u>
		Case 2: Voted in this section :
		Original section number and at least one full sentence are required in "FROM" and "TO" fields.
	1	FROM: Section xxx
		To: Section xxx
	Justification (If necessary)	
2	FROM: Section xxx	
	To: Section xxx	
	Justification (If necessary)	

Motion by/2nd	Name (Company)/Name (Company)	
Vote	XX-XX Motion passed (or failed)	
A&R	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not approved
	Reason:	

V. Summary of Editorial Changes

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

1	FROM: Table A1-2 Note#4 #4 ITRS does not include materials technology requirement for near-edge geometry (ERO). The value for ESFQR at the 45 nm node is common industry practice; the 32 nm and 22 nm values are scaled. ITRS does not include near-edge geometry (ERO). The value for ESFQR at the 45 nm node is common industry practice; the 32 nm and 22 nm values are scaled.	
	TO: Table A1-2 Note#4 #4 ITRS does not include materials technology requirement for near-edge geometry (ERO). The value for ESFQR at the 45 nm node is common industry practice; the 32 nm and 22 nm values are scaled.	
	Justification: (If necessary) In note #4, there are duplicated sentences.	
2	FROM: Section XXX	
	TO: Section XXX	
	Justification: (If necessary)	
Motion To approve the above editorial changes		
Motion by/2nd by Masanori Yoshise (KLA-Tencor Japan)/ Friedrich Passek (Siltronic AG)		
Discussion None.		
Vote 18-0 Motion passed.		
A&R	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not approved
	Reason:	

VI. Approval Conditions Check

APPROVAL CONDITION 1: All negatives have been discussed and were withdrawn, found not related, or not persuasive. (Regulations ¶ 9.6.2)

APPROVAL CONDITION 2: At least 90% of the sum of the valid accept and reject votes must be accept. (Regulations ¶ 9.6.3)

Note: if both approval conditions are not satisfied, the document fails.

	Accepts		(Accepts + Valid		Approval Rate	
	= 21	/	= 21	=	= 100.0%	>=90%

A&R		Not approved
		Reason:

VII. Safety Check

See § 14 of the Regulations for further information

Motion:	X	This is not a Safety Document: when all safety-related information is removed, the document is still technically sound and complete.
		This is a Safety Document: when all safety-related information is removed, the document is not technically sound and complete.
		Safety Checklist (Regulations ¶ 14.3) is complete and has been included with the document throughout the balloting process.
Motion by/2nd by		Masanori Yoshise (KLA-Tencor Japan)/ Friedrich Passek (Siltronic AG)
Discussion		None.
Vote		17-0 Motion passed.
A&R		Not approved
		Reason:

VIII. Intellectual Property Check

Note: This ballot may be all or part of a Standard or Safety Guideline. This IP check applies to the entire Standard or Safety Guideline. See § 15 of the Regulations for further information

X	The meeting chair asked those present in person or by electronic link, if they were aware of any potentially material patented technology or copyrighted items* in the Standard or Guideline.	
	No potentially material patented technology or copyrighted items are known	GO TO SECTION IX
	Potentially material patented technology or copyrighted items are known but a Letter of Assurance (LOA) or copyright release for such material has been obtained or presented to the committee.	GO TO SECTION IX
X	Potentially material patented technology or copyrighted items are known but an LOA or copyright release for some of the material(s) has NOT been obtained or presented to the committee	
MOTION	<input type="checkbox"/>	Ask ISC for special permission to publish
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Quit activity
	X	Wait for LOA for patented technology or release of copyrighted items.
	Motion by/2nd by	Masanori Yoshise (KLA-Tencor Japan)/ John Vally (MEMC)
	Discussion	<p>Potentially material patented technology is known and a Letter of Assurance (LOA) for such material was obtained for the current published version of SEMI M49. No new potentially material patented technology is known to this revision. However, the current SEMI Standards Regulations are not clear on the point whether or not the LOA should be obtained again when it is revised. Therefore, the above motion is made just in case.</p> <p><i>Staff Note:</i> <i>After the committee meeting, both SEMI staff and Regulations Subcommittee expressed the same position that LOA is not necessary to be obtained again unless any new potentially material patented technology is known to this document. As the LOA was obtained in the past and still applicable to this document, the committee does not have to wait for LOA for publication.</i></p>
	Vote	10-2
	Final Action	X Motion Passed
		<input type="checkbox"/> Motion Failed
A&R	Not approved	
	Reason:	

* Note: Such potentially material patented technology or copyrighted items might have become known since the Standard or Safety Guideline was last reviewed, or might become relevant due to this ballot.

IX. Action for this document

Motion	<input type="checkbox"/>	This document passed committee review as balloted and will be forwarded to the A&R for procedural review.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	This document passed committee review with editorial changes and will be forwarded to the A&R for procedural review.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	This document failed committee review and will be returned to the task force for rework.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	This document failed committee review and work will be discontinued.
Motion by/2nd by		Masanori Yoshise (KLA-Tencor Japan)/ Friedrich Passek (Siltronic AG)
Discussion		None.
Vote		14-0
Final Action	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Motion passed
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Motion failed
A&R	<input type="checkbox"/>	Approved
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not approved
	Reason:	