

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

Region/Locale: **NA**

Global Technical Committee: **EHS**

TC Chapter Cochairs: **Sean Larsen/KLA, Chris Evanston/Salus, Lucian Girlea/Nikon, Eric Sklar/Safety Guru**

Standards Staff: **Kevin Nguyen**

	Scheduled in Background Statement	Actual
Date	05/14/2026	05/14/2026
Location	Albany, NY	Albany, NY
Reason for Change of Date and/or Location	N/A	

Document Information

I. Document Number, Title, List of Line Items

Document Number 7371B	Document Title Line Item Revision to SEMI S1-0824, Safety Guideline for Equipment Safety Labels
Line Item Line Item 1	Line Item Title Addition to §10.2 of a minimum size criterion for symbols and changes elsewhere in support of that change

Line Item 1 Adjudication

II. Tally

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

Voting Interest:	Returned Votes		Distribution		Return Rate	
Letter Ballot	84	÷	139	=	60.43%	≥60%
Intercommittee Ballot	31					
Voting Interest Reject(s)	3		Total Voters with Rejects		4	
Voting Interest Accept(s)	81					

III. Rejects

Voting Interest Reject 1 (Voting Interest Name: Hitachi)

Voter Reject 1 (Voter: Yoshihito Omomo, Hitachi High Tech)

Negative 1

Negative	Referenced Section/ Paragraph	*TF/TC Chapter to fill in, including text in the ballot if necessary.	
		NOTE 7 @ 5.1.7	
Negative	Negative Text	*Original complete Negative text (e.g., issue, justification, suggestion) should be copied.	
		<p>HHT-1: Line Item 1, Part 1 of 6 (formerly LI2 in Doc. 7371A)</p> <p>5.1.7 safe viewing location — a location from which relevant personnel are able to recognize and be informed by the label without being exposed to unacceptable risk.</p> <p>Please delete NOTE 7</p> <p>NOTE 7: The safe viewing location depends, in part, on the nature of the hazard and the consequences of being near the surface on which the safety label is placed. For example, the safe viewing location for a safety label on a guard that protects one from contact with moving parts needs to be a location far enough from the guard that one cannot remove the guard. The safe viewing location for a safety label on a guard that is, itself, a hot surface needs to be a location at which one cannot receive a burn from that guard.</p> <p>NOTE 7 may be misleading. It would be easier to understand without it (NOTE 7).</p>	
	TF input (optional)	<p>ES26apr19: I suggest we discuss this together with Lam-LC1</p> <p>TF26apr20: Agreed to modify the NOTE to one less confusing.(Shown as response to Comment Lam-LC1.)</p> <p>TF26may12: Recommend the TCC find this Related, Not Persuasive: 5Y 0N</p>	
	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		
Related	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	Agreed to modify the NOTE to one less confusing.
	Motion by/ 2nd by	By: Eric Sklar / Safety Guru, LLC Second: Lauren Crane / Lam Research	
	Discussion		

		Result: 14-Y 0-N Voting Result: Pass - 100.00%			
Result of Vote (check one)	<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 checked="" 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		
Final	<input type="checkbox"/>	(A)	Withdrawn (counted under h in disposition)		
	<input type="checkbox"/>	(B)	Not related (counted under i in disposition)		
	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	(F)	Addressed by technical change (counted under k disposition)		
(check if applicable)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Comment generated. Refer to V. Comments (Commenter 2 (Lauren Crane/Lam Research) - Comment 1)			

Negative 2

Negative	Referenced Section/ Paragraph	*TF/TC Chapter to fill in, including text in the ballot if necessary. 10.2.8.1			
	Negative Text	*Original complete Negative text (e.g., issue, justification, suggestion) should be copied. HHT-2: #2 Line Item 1, Part 4 of 6 Please delete the second item in section 10.2.8.1. The item may cause misunderstandings. Please delete yellow parts as follows: 10.2.8.1 The minimum size of each symbol should be such that the size of the pictogram (i.e., the greater of the height and width of the image inside the surround shape) is the greater of: • 10 mm and • the distance to the label from the farthest (from the label) location from which it needs to be understood for it to be protective, divided by 40.			
TF input (optional)		TF26apr20: Submitter appears not to have considered that there are labels one needs to be able to read before reaching, therefore, scaling with viewing distance is appropriate. Recommend the NA EHS TCC find this RNP. TF26may12: Concur TF26may12: Recommend the TCC find this Related, Not Persuasive: 4 Y 0N			
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	Submitter appears not to have considered that there are labels one needs to be able to read before reaching, therefore, scaling with viewing distance is appropriate.			
	Motion by/ 2 nd by	By: Eric Sklar / Safety Guru, LLC Second: Lauren Crane / Lam Research				
Discussion						
Result of Vote (check one)	Result: 12-Y 1-N Voting Result: Pass - 92.31%					
	<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 checked="" 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			
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 checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	(F)	Addressed by technical change (counted under k disposition)		
	(check if applicable)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment generated. Refer to Section V-(ii) Comment # X.			

Negative 3

Negative	Referenced Section/ Paragraph	*TF/TC Chapter to fill in, including text in the ballot if necessary. NOTE 7 @ 5.1.7
	Negative Text	*Original complete Negative text (e.g., issue, justification, suggestion) should be copied. HHT-0: : Please delete NOTE 7. Item may cause misunderstandings and confusion. Also, please delete the two items in section 10.2.1. These two items may cause misunderstandings

TF input (optional)		<p>ES26apr06: I have e-mailed Omomo-san, requesting clarification of his vote. Specifically the number of items in 10.2.1 he is asking be deleted and the “misunderstanding and confusion“ he believes NOTE 7 may cause. E-mail thread is at the end of this file.</p> <p>ES26apr06 Omomo-san has clarified his vote. He is asking that the second item, not both, be deleted. This Negative is a summary of HHT-1 and HHT-2, which are addressed below. I recommend we take no action under this item, deferring to the specific Negatives below.</p> <p>TF26apr20: No Change, Closed.</p> <p>TF26may12: Recommend the TCC find this Related, Not Persuasive: 7Y 0N</p>				
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>ES26apr06: I have e-mailed Omomo-san, requesting clarification of his vote. Specifically the number of items in 10.2.1 he is asking be deleted and the “misunderstanding and confusion“ he believes NOTE 7 may cause. E-mail thread is at the end of this file.</p> <p>ES26apr06 Omomo-san has clarified his vote. He is asking that the second item, not both, be deleted. This Negative is a summary of HHT-1 and HHT-2, which are addressed below. I recommend we take no action under this item, deferring to the specific Negatives below.</p>			
	Motion by/ 2nd by	By: Eric Sklar / Safety Guru, LLC Second: Lauren Crane / Lam Research				
	Discussion					
	Result of Vote (check one)	Result: 13-Y 0-N Voting Result: Pass - 100.00%				
	<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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	
Final	(check if applicable)	(A)	Withdrawn (counted under h in disposition)	
		(B)	Not related (counted under i in disposition)	
		x (C)	Related and not persuasive (significant)	
		(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. Refer to Section V-(ii) Comment # X.	

Disposition of Voting Interest Reject 1

Check only when the Document has not been failed.

3	Original number (#) of Negatives	(g)	
#	Number of Negatives withdrawn	(h)	
#	Number of Negatives found not related	(i)	
#	Number of Negatives found not significant	(j)	
#	Number of Negatives addressed by technical change (Negative becomes not significant)	(k)	
Final		$g - (h + i + j + k) = 0$	Reject is Not Valid and is not included in the denominator of § VI. Approval Conditions Check
	x	$g - (h + i + j + k) > 0$	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 ¶ 9.6.1.4.5.2)

Voting Interest Reject 2 (Voting Interest Name: Lam Research)

Voter Reject 1 (Voter: Lauren Crane, Lam Research)

Negative 1

Negative	Referenced Section/ Paragraph	*TF/TC Chapter to fill in, including text in the ballot if necessary.
		NOTE 7 @ 5.1.7
	Negative Text	*Original complete Negative text (e.g., issue, justification, suggestion) should be copied.

	<p>Lam-LC1: : I disagree with the implication that one is exposed to unacceptable risk is one is close enough to a guard to remove it. “needs to be” has too much of a normative tone. I think using the example of an unguarded hot surface with the hazard alert label directly applied (e.g., a 3D printer print-plate) would make the example better as it is more representative of actual cases, and avoids the semantic tangle of a guard becoming so hot that it, itself, is now a hazard. === Change to the Effect of “The safe viewing location depends, in part, on the nature of the hazard and the consequences of being near the surface on which the safety label is placed. For example, the safe viewing location for a safety label on a guard that protects one from contact with moving parts needs to be is a location far enough from the guard that one cannot remove the guard can appreciate the guard has a safety label before one takes action to remove the guard. The safe viewing location for a safety label on a guard that is, itself, a hot surface is needs to be a location at which one cannot receive a burn from that guard surface.”</p>	
TF input (optional)		
Withdrawal (check one)	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Negative withdrawal made by Voter. GO TO “Related” subsection
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Withdrawal document received by Standards staff on 04/27/2026. GO TO “Final” subsection → (A)

Disposition of Voting Interest Reject 2

Check only when the Document has not been failed.

1	Original number (#) of Negatives	(g)	
1	Number of Negatives withdrawn	(h)	
#	Number of Negatives found not related	(i)	
#	Number of Negatives found not significant	(j)	
#	Number of Negatives addressed by technical change (Negative becomes not significant)	(k)	
Final	<input 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 ¶ 9.6.1.4.5.2)

Voting Interest Reject 3 (Voting Interest Name: Applied Materials)

Voter Reject 1 (Voter: Carl Wong, Applied Materials)

Negative 1

Negative	Referenced Section/ Paragraph	*TF/TC Chapter to fill in, including text in the ballot if necessary.
		10.2.8.1

		<p>*Original complete Negative text (e.g., issue, justification, suggestion) should be copied.</p> <p>AMAT-CW1: Line Item 1, Part 4 of 6 There does not appear to be a basis for the 10 mm minimum size. A 4 mm minimum, which is about the same size as the letter height of a standard computer keyboard and larger than some of the pictograms on the keyboard, would seem more appropriate for a label that can actually be touched without being exposed to the hazard. Note: Standard Clarion electrical safety labels IS6010-PE (3/8" x 3/8") and the next size larger IS6010-PD for small parts would not meet the proposed 10 mm minimum size pictogram (i.e., pictogram E = 4 mm and D = 7 mm, respectively) and a larger label will not fit in some cases. Even the 3/8" x 3/8" label can easily be seen at arms length away.</p>		
	Negative Text			
	TF input (optional)	<p>ES26apr19: The 10 mm minimum was selected by the TF based on an (admittedly small, but very few people participated, despite the whole TF being asked) experiment. At a viewing distance of 0.5 m, the average recognition of a 5mm pictogram was 81%. For a 10mm pictogram, it was 94%. I point out that the pictogram provided by this voter (lightning bolt) is a relatively simple and well-recognized one. The experiment included pictograms of varying complexity and popularity.</p> <p>TF26apr20: SJ: Applied Material's position is that minimum size criteria should not be added. Current criterion is that size is based on viewing distance. ES: Do not believe such a criterion for pictogram size exists, challenged Applied Materials to identify the criterion. Also asked for a counterproposal to 10 mm.</p> <p>TF26apr27: LG: Looked for symbol height requirements. Found : https://www.chemsafetypro.com/Topics/GHS/GHS_label_size_requirement.html Which reports GHS label size requirements in several jurisdictions, although the web page appears to confuse symbol height and pictogram height.. The smallest is an area of 0.5 cm², equal to 7 mm height. LC: Keyboard objects are not intended to convey safety information, so aren't directly relevant. ES: Will attempt to contact CW directly.</p> <p>TF26may04: ES reported he had e-mailed CW, but gotten no reply. Nobody from Applied Materials participated, so this was not discussed further.</p> <p>TF26may12: Recommend the TCC find this Related, Not Persuasive: 8Y 0N</p>		
	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	The 10 mm minimum was selected by the TF based on an (admittedly small, but very few people participated, despite the whole TF being asked) experiment. At a viewing distance of 0.5 m, the average recognition of a 5mm pictogram was 81%. For a 10mm pictogram, it was 94%. I point out that the pictogram provided by this voter (lightning bolt) is a relatively simple and well-recognized one. The experiment included pictograms of varying complexity and popularity. Refer above section in the TF input for completed details.		
Motion by/ 2nd by	By: Eric Sklar / Safety Guru, LLC Second: Lauren Crane / Lam Research				
Discussion					
Result of Vote (check one)	Result: 15-Y 0-N Voting Result: Pass - 100.00%				
		[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)
	x	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		
Final		(A)	Withdrawn (counted under h in disposition)		
		(B)	Not related (counted under i in disposition)		
	x	(C)	Related and not persuasive (significant)		
		(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. Refer to Section V-(ii) Comment # X.		

Voting Interest Reject 3- Voter Reject 2 (Voter: James Hayford, Applied Materials)

Negative 1

Negative	Referenced Section/ Paragraph	*TF/TC Chapter to fill in, including text in the ballot if necessary. 10.2.8.1
	Negative Text	*Original complete Negative text (e.g., issue, justification, suggestion) should be copied. AMAT-JH1: The proposed minimum pictogram size of 10 mm is not supported by ISO 3864, ANSI Z535, or prior SEMI S1 revisions. All relevant standards rely on viewing-distance-based proportional sizing rather than fixed dimensional minima. No human-factors data, visibility studies, or historical SEMI justification are provided to substantiate the 10 mm value. The addition of an arbitrary minimum introduces unnecessary redesign burden without demonstrated safety benefit.
TF input (optional)	ES26apr19: This closely resembles AMAT-CW1 TF26may04: Nobody from Applied Materials participated, so this was not discussed further. TF26may12: Recommend the TCC find this Related, Not Persuasive: 7Y 0N	

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	The 10 mm minimum was selected by the TF based on an (admittedly small, but very few people participated, despite the whole TF being asked) experiment. At a viewing distance of 0.5 m, the average recognition of a 5mm pictogram was 81%. For a 10mm pictogram, it was 94%. I point out that the pictogram provided by this voter (lightning bolt) is a relatively simple and well-recognized one. The experiment included pictograms of varying complexity and popularity. Refer to Voting Interest Reject 3, voter 1, in the TF input for completed details.			
	Motion by/ 2nd by	By: Eric Sklar / Safety Guru, LLC Second: Lauren Crane / Lam Research				
	Discussion					
	Result of Vote (check one)	Result: 13-Y 0-N Voting Result: Pass - 100.00%				
<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 checked="" 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				
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	(C)	Related and not persuasive (significant)		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	(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. Refer to 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)	
#	Number of Negatives withdrawn	(h)	
#	Number of Negatives found not related	(i)	
#	Number of Negatives found not significant	(j)	
#	Number of Negatives addressed by technical change (Negative becomes not significant)	(k)	
Final		$g - (h + i + j + k) = 0$	Reject is Not Valid and is not included in the denominator of § VI. Approval Conditions Check
	x	$g - (h + i + j + k) > 0$	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 ¶ 9.6.1.4.5.2)

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 § 9.6.1.4.3 to make a technical change to the Document. (Regulations ¶ 9.6.1.4.2.5)

None

V. Comments

V- (i) Voters' Comments

Commenter 1 (Yu-Chen Yu/Individual Participant) - Comment 1

*TF/TC Chapter to fill in section/paragraph #, if necessary.
--

Comment	<p>YCY-1: This revision to introduce a minimum size criterion for symbols in §10.2 is supported, as it improves the visibility and effectiveness of safety labels in conveying hazard information. It may be helpful to clarify how the “distance to the label from the farthest location from which it needs to be understood” should be determined in practical applications, particularly in complex equipment configurations or where multiple viewing positions exist. Additionally, consideration could be given to providing guidance or examples for implementation in typical semiconductor manufacturing environments, to support consistent interpretation and application across different equipment types.</p>
	<p>ES26apr06: No specific change is requested or suggested in this Comment and I see no change to recommend based on it. TF26apr20: No Change, Closed. TF26may12: concur</p>
Action	<p>The TC Chapter agreed to do one of the following actions.</p>
	<p>*No motion is required in this step.</p>
	<p>Already addressed by Commenter #, Comment #</p>
	<p>x No further action was taken by the TC Chapter.</p>
	<p>Refer to the TF for more consideration.</p>
	<p>New Business</p>
<p>Editorial Change</p>	

Commenter 2 (Lauren Crane/Lam Research) - Comment 1

Comment	<p>*TF/TC Chapter to fill in section/paragraph #, if necessary. Note7@5.1.7</p>
	<p>Lam-LC1 I disagree with the implication that one is exposed to unacceptable risk is one is close enough to a guard to remove it. “needs to be” has too much of a normative tone. I think using the example of an unguarded hot surface with the hazard alert label directly applied (e.g., a 3D printer print-plate) would make the example better as it is more representative of actual cases, and avoids the semantic tangle of a guard becoming so hot that it, itself, is now a hazard. === Change to the Effect of “The safe viewing location depends, in part, on the nature of the hazard and the consequences of being near the surface on which the safety label is placed. For example, the safe viewing location for a safety label on a guard that protects one from contact with moving parts needs to be is a location far enough from the guard that one cannot remove the guard can appreciate the guard has a safety label before one takes action to remove the guard. The safe viewing location for a safety label on a guard that is, itself, a hot surface is needs to be a location at which one cannot receive a burn from that guard surface.”</p>

TE Input	<p>ES26apr19: The NOTE was not intended (at least by me) to imply that one is exposed to unacceptable risk by being close enough to a guard to remove it. It was intended to imply that one is (for some cases) at unacceptable risk being close enough to remove it <i>without</i> understanding the label advising of the safety consequences of removing it.</p> <p>That said, I'm not happy with the NOTE either and suggest we remove or replace it.</p> <p>TF26apr20: Agree to drop hot guard.</p> <p>Concern (re LC's proposal) that "appreciating" that there is a safety label is not protective. One must understand it in time to act appropriately.</p> <p>ES will draft NOTE for TF discussion, based on LC's proposal.</p> <p>ES26apr27: Propose:</p> <p>The safe viewing location depends, in part, on the nature of the hazard and the consequences of being near the surface on which the safety label is placed. For example, the safe viewing location for a safety label on a guard that protects one from contact with moving parts is a location on the approach path to the guard from which one can understand the safety label before one takes action to remove the guard. The safe viewing location for a safety label on a hot surface is a location at which one cannot receive a burn from that surface.</p> <p>TF26apr27: Tweaked ES's proposal to the text above. Accepted as an editorial change.</p> <p>LC: Will change this to a Comment.</p> <p>TF26may12: Concur</p>	
Action	<p>The TC Chapter agreed to do one of the following actions.</p>	
	<p>*No motion is required in this step.</p>	
		<p>Already addressed by Commenter #, Comment #</p>
		<p>No further action was taken by the TC Chapter.</p>
		<p>Refer to the TF for more consideration.</p>
	X	<p>Editorial Change</p>
	Options for editorial change (check one)	<p>Case 1: No vote in this section:</p> <p>To be included and voted on as a group in § VI. Editorial Changes Other than Those Voted on in § V.</p>
		<p>Case 2: Voted in this section:</p>
		<p>Original section number and at least one full sentence are required in "FROM" and "TO" fields.</p>
		X
Editorial Changes	1	<p>FROM:</p> <p>NOTE 7: The safe viewing location depends, in part, on the nature of the hazard and the consequences of being near the surface on which the safety label is placed. For example, the safe viewing location for a safety label on a guard that protects one from contact with moving parts needs to be a location far enough from the guard that one cannot remove the guard. The safe viewing location for a safety label on a guard that is, itself, a hot surface needs to be a location at which one cannot receive a burn from that guard.</p>
		<p>TO:</p> <p>NOTE 7: The safe viewing location depends, in part, on the nature of the hazard and the consequences of being near the surface on which the safety label is placed. For example, the safe viewing location for a safety label on a guard that protects one from contact with moving parts needs to be a location far enough from the guard that one cannot remove the guard. The safe viewing location for a safety label on a guard that is, itself, a hot surface needs to be a location at which one cannot receive a burn from that guard.</p> <p><u>The safe viewing location depends, in part, on the nature of the hazard and the consequences of being near the surface on which the safety label is placed. For example, the safe viewing location for a safety label on a guard that protects one from contact with moving parts is a location on the approach path to the guard from which one can understand the safety label before one takes action to remove the guard. The safe viewing location for a safety label on a hot surface is a location at which one cannot receive a burn from that surface.</u></p>

	Justification (If necessary) Editorial
Motion	To approve above editorial change(s)
Motion by/2nd by	By: Eric Sklar / Safety Guru, LLC Second: Lauren Crane / Lam Research
Discussion	XXXX
Vote	Result: 12-Y 0-N Voting Result: Pass - 100.00%

Commenter 2 (Lauren Crane/Lam Research) - Comment 2

Comment	*TF/TC Chapter to fill in section/paragraph #, if necessary. 10.2.8.1	
	<p>Lam-LC2</p> <p>The proposed wording in ¶10.2.8.1 introduces the term “size of the pictogram” as a new concept; the same requirement can be stated more directly by specifying minimum pictogram dimensions without the idea of the “size of the pictogram”. Also, the second bullet can be read to base the calculation on locations that are not safe to occupy; aligning it with ¶12.3 would avoid that interpretation.</p> <p>===</p> <p>Go straight to the size constraint without a new term/concept of ‘pictogram size’, and add the safety element into the second bullet as in...</p> <p>“10.2.8.1 The minimum size of each symbol should be such that the size of the pictogram (i.e., the greater of the height and width of the image inside the surround shape) is the greater of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 mm and • the distance to the label from the farthest (from the label) location from which it needs to be understood for it to be protective, divided by 40. • <u>the distance to the label from the farthest location from which it needs to be understood for it to be protective (which, per ¶ 12.3, should be a safe viewing location), divided by 40.”</u> <p>[for reference -no change proposed - 5.1.7 safe viewing location — a location from which relevant personnel are able to recognize and be informed by the label without being exposed to unacceptable risk.]</p>	
TF Input	<p>TF26apr20: Proposed change:</p> <p>10.2.8.1 The minimum size of each symbol should be such that the size of the pictogram (i.e., the greater of the height and width of the image inside the surround shape) is the greater of:</p> <p>Change Exception to refer to 10.2.8.1, not to “pictogram size” and move it to 10.2.8.1.</p> <p>TF26may12: In EXCEPTION, change “size” to “10.2.8”? This will, unfortunately, except safety alert symbols from the maximize size in permitted space criterion.</p> <p>Change thusly:</p> <p>EXCEPTION: The minimum pictogram size §10.2.8 criterion does <u>criteria do</u> not pertain to the general warning symbol where it is used inside a signal word panel, i.e., as the safety alert symbol.</p> <p>as an Editorial Change.</p>	
Action	The TC Chapter agreed to do one of the following actions.	
	*No motion is required in this step.	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Already addressed by Commenter #, Comment #
	<input type="checkbox"/>	No further action was taken by the TC Chapter.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Refer to the TF for more consideration.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	New Business
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Editorial Change	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Case 1: No vote in this section:

	Options for editorial change (check one)		To be included and voted on as a group in § VI. Editorial Changes Other than Those Voted on in § V.
		x	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:	10.2.8.1 The minimum size of each symbol should be such that the size of the pictogram (i.e., the greater of the height and width of the image inside the surround shape) is the greater of:
		TO:	10.2.8.1 The minimum size of each symbol should be such that the size of the pictogram (i.e., the greater of the height and width of the image inside the surround shape) is the greater of:
		Justification (If necessary)	Clarification
	2	FROM: Section 10.2.8.4	EXCEPTION: The minimum pictogram size criterion does not pertain to the general warning symbol where it is used inside a signal word panel, i.e., as the safety alert symbol.
		TO: Section 10.2.8.4	EXCEPTION: The minimum pictogram size §10.2.8 criterion does criteria do not pertain to the general warning symbol where it is used inside a signal word panel, i.e., as the safety alert symbol.
		Justification (If necessary)	Clarification
Motion	To approve above editorial change(s)		
Motion by/2 nd by	By: Lauren Crane / Lam Research Second: Eric Sklar / Safety Guru, LLC		
Discussion	XXXX		
Vote	Result: 15-Y 0-N Voting Result: Pass - 100.00%		

Commenter 3 (Brandy Miller/Intel) - Comment 1

Comment	*TF/TC Chapter to fill in section/paragraph #, if necessary. 5.1.7		
	Intel-1: {There was a numbered row, but no comment in the response Intel submitted.}		
TF Input	ES26apr19: No change is requested or suggested in this Comment and I see no change to recommend based on it. TF26apr20: No Change, Closed. TF26may12: Concur		
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		

Commenter 3 (Brandy Miller/Intel) - Comment 2

Comment	*TF/TC Chapter to fill in section/paragraph #, if necessary. NOTE 10	
	Intel-2: {There was a numbered row, but no comment in the response Intel submitted.}	
TF Input	<p>ES26apr19: No change is requested or suggested in this Comment and I see no change to recommend based on it.</p> <p>TF26apr20: No Change, Closed.</p> <p>TF26may12: Concur</p>	
Action	The TC Chapter agreed to do one of the following actions.	
	*No motion is required in this step.	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Already addressed by Commenter #, Comment #
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No further action was taken by the TC Chapter.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Refer to the TF for more consideration.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	New Business
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Editorial Change

Commenter 3 (Brandy Miller/Intel) - Comment 3

Comment	*TF/TC Chapter to fill in section/paragraph #, if necessary. 9.1.2.5	
	<p>Intel-3</p> <p>The suggested wording is long and could be confusing to non-native English speakers</p> <p><i>Proposal/suggestion:</i> "From a safe viewing location"</p>	
TF Input	<p>ES26apr19: Intel-3, -4, -5, and -6 all appear to refer to the same phrase "from each location from which it needs to be understood to be protective". In an earlier draft of the ballot, the phrase was "from a safe viewing location". It was changed because the existence of a safe viewing location does not ensure that the person who needs to understand the label will be in that location before reaching the hazard. That said, I'm amenable to different phrasing, as long as it captures the concept that the label needs to be understood from all of the relevant locations, not just that there be a safe location from which it can be understood.</p> <p>TF26apr20: ES: Key difference is that we need to make the point that each location from which it needs to be read is a safe viewing location, not just that there exists a safe viewing location.</p> <p>Will leave item open in hope of someone devising a shorter, but equally meaningful, solution.</p> <p>TF26may12: No inspired offering. No suggested action.</p>	
Action	The TC Chapter agreed to do one of the following actions.	
	*No motion is required in this step.	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Already addressed by Commenter #, Comment #
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No further action was taken by the TC Chapter.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Refer to the TF for more consideration.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	New Business
<input type="checkbox"/>	Editorial Change	

Commenter 3 (Brandy Miller/Intel) - Comment 4

	*TF/TC Chapter to fill in section/paragraph #, if necessary. 10.2.8
--	---

Com	Intel-4 The suggested wording is long and could be confusing to non-native English speakers <i>Proposal/suggestion:</i> "From a safe viewing location"
	ES26apr19: Intel-3, -4, -5, and -6 all appear to refer to the same phrase . TF26apr20: See Intel-3 TF26may12: No inspired offering. No suggested action.
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

Commenter 3 (Brandy Miller/Intel) - Comment 5

Comment	*TF/TC Chapter to fill in section/paragraph #, if necessary. 11.2.6
	Intel-5 The suggested wording is long and could be confusing to non-native English speakers <i>Proposal/suggestion:</i> "From a safe viewing location"
TF Input	ES26apr19: Intel-3, -4, -5, and -6 all appear to refer to the same phrase . TF26apr20: See Intel-3 TF26may12: No inspired offering. No suggested action.
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

Commenter 3 (Brandy Miller/Intel) - Comment 6

Comment	*TF/TC Chapter to fill in section/paragraph #, if necessary.
	Intel-6 The suggested wording is long and could be confusing to non-native English speakers <i>Proposal/suggestion:</i> "From a safe viewing location"
TF Input	ES26apr19: Intel-3, -4, -5, and -6 all appear to refer to the same phrase . TF26apr20: See Intel-3 TF26may12: No inspired offering. No suggested action.

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	

Commenter 4 (Qing Shi Chua/SGS Malaysia) - Comment 1

Comment	*TF/TC Chapter to fill in section/paragraph #, if necessary. 5.1.7	
	SGS-M1 Line Item 1, Part 1 of 6: §5.1.7 clearly described the safe viewing location.	
TF Input	ES26apr19: No change is requested or suggested in this Comment and I see no change to recommend based on it. TF26apr20: No Change, Closed. TF26may12: Concur	
	The TC Chapter agreed to do one of the following actions.	
	*No motion is required in this step.	
Action	<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

Commenter 4 (Qing Shi Chua/SGS Malaysia) - Comment 2

Comment	*TF/TC Chapter to fill in section/paragraph #, if necessary.	
	SGS-M2 Line Item 2, Part 2 of 6: Okay for the amendment on NOTE 10 "viewed FROM a safe viewing LOCATION"	
TF Input	ES26apr19: No change is requested or suggested in this Comment and I see no change to recommend based on it. TF26apr20: No Change, Closed. TF26may12: Concur	
	The TC Chapter agreed to do one of the following actions.	
	*No motion is required in this step.	
Action	<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

Commenter 4 (Qing Shi Chua/SGS Malaysia) - Comment 3

Comment	*TF/TC Chapter to fill in section/paragraph #, if necessary. 9.1.2.5	
	SGS-M3 Line Item 3, Part 3 of 6: Added NOTE 17 to ensure clear cross reference to 5.1.7 for the safe viewing location definition.	
TF Input	ES26apr19: No change is requested or suggested in this Comment and I see no change to recommend based on it. TF26apr20: No Change, Closed. TF26may12: Concur	
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

Commenter 4 (Qing Shi Chua/SGS Malaysia) - Comment 4

Comment	*TF/TC Chapter to fill in section/paragraph #, if necessary. 10.2.8	
	SGS-M4 Line Item 4, part 4 of 6: Clear explanation on measuring the pictogram height and width provided.	
TF Input	ES26apr19: No change is requested or suggested in this Comment and I see no change to recommend based on it. TF26apr20: No Change, Closed. TF26may12: Concur	
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

Commenter 4 (Qing Shi Chua/SGS Malaysia) - Comment 5

Comment	*TF/TC Chapter to fill in section/paragraph #, if necessary. 11.2.6	
	SGS-M5 Line Item 5, part 5 of 6: Added NOTE 32 to ensure clear cross reference to 5.1.7 for the safe viewing location definition.	

TE Input	<p>ES26apr19: No change is requested or suggested in this Comment and I see no change to recommend based on it.</p> <p>TF26apr20: No Change, Closed.</p> <p>TF26may12: Concur</p>
Action	<p>The TC Chapter agreed to do one of the following actions.</p> <p>*No motion is required in this step.</p>
	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Already addressed by Commenter #, Comment #</p>
	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No further action was taken by the TC Chapter.</p>
	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Refer to the TF for more consideration.</p>
	<p><input type="checkbox"/> New Business</p>
	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Editorial Change</p>

Commenter 4 (Qing Shi Chua/SGS Malaysia) - Comment 6

Comment	<p>*TF/TC Chapter to fill in section/paragraph #, if necessary. 12.1</p> <p>SGS-M6 Line Item 6, part 6 of 6: Ok</p>
TE Input	<p>ES26apr19: No change is requested or suggested in this Comment and I see no change to recommend based on it.</p> <p>TF26apr20: No Change, Closed.</p> <p>TF26may12: Concur</p>
Action	<p>The TC Chapter agreed to do one of the following actions.</p> <p>*No motion is required in this step.</p>
	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Already addressed by Commenter #, Comment #</p>
	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No further action was taken by the TC Chapter.</p>
	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Refer to the TF for more consideration.</p>
	<p><input type="checkbox"/> New Business</p>
	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Editorial Change</p>

V-(ii) Comments Created by Handling Negative

None

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.

None

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 ¶ 9.6.2.1.2*)

APPROVAL CONDITION 2: At least 90% of the sum of valid Voting Interest Accept and Voting Interest Reject Votes must be Accept. (*Regulations ¶ 9.6.2.1.3*)

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

		Accepts		(Accepts + Valid Rejects)			
Approval Rate	=	81		83	=	98%	≥90%

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

Note: Refer to *Regulations § 9.6.2* 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. Refer to § 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 ¶ 8.7.1</i>)
	<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 ¶ 8.7.2</i>)
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety Checklist (<i>Regulations ¶ 15.3</i>) is complete and has been included with the Document throughout the balloting process. (<i>Regulations ¶ 15.1.2</i>)
Motion by/2 nd by		By: Eric Sklar / Safety Guru, LLC Second: Lauren Crane / Lam Research
Discussion		XXXX
Vote		Result: 15-Y 0-N Voting Result: Pass - 100.00%

IX. Intellectual Property (IP) Check

Note: This Letter Ballot 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 including all the approved Line Items*. Refer to *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 (Refer to <i>Regulations ¶ 16.3.1.1</i>) to the Standard or Safety Guideline; or, any copyrighted items or trademarks that are used/reproduced (refer to <i>Regulations ¶ 16.4.1.2</i>) in the Standard or Safety Guideline. (Also refer to, <i>Regulations § 8.8</i>)			
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 X.		
	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 IX (a) "Patented Technology" subsection
			No	GO TO IX (b) "Copyright items" subsection

X. Action for This Document

Motion (Check all applicable items)		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.
	x	Line item(s) [1] passed TC Chapter review with editorial changes and will be forwarded to the ISC A&R SC for procedural review.
		Line item(s) [X], [X] and [X] 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.
		Line item(s) [X], [X] and [X] failed TC Chapter review and will be returned to the TF for rework.
		Line item(s) [X], [X] and [X] failed TC Chapter review and work will be discontinued.
Motion by/ 2nd by	By: Eric Sklar / Safety Guru, LLC Second: Lauren Crane / Lam Research	
Discussion	XXXX	
Vote	16 Y-0 N	
Final Action	x	Motion passed
		Motion failed

Note: If the use of PMPT or copyrighted item is justified by the TC Chapter, LOA or release form must be received before publication can proceed.