

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 (if changed)	N/A	

Note: Refer to *Regulations* ¶ 9.5 Exceptions for allowable reason to change.

Document Information

I. Document Number, Title, List of Line Items

Document Number 7446	Document Title Line Item Revision of SEMI S14-0512, Safety Guideline for Fire Risk Assessment and Mitigation for Semiconductor Manufacturing Equipment	
Line Item Line Item 1	Line Item Title Reconciling SEMI S14 with SEMI S10	

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* ¶ 9.6.2.1.1)

Voting Interest:	Returned Votes		Distribution		Return Rate	
Letter Ballot	84	÷	139	=	60.43%	≥60%
Intercommittee Ballot	31					
Voting Interest Reject(s)	5		Total Voters with Rejects			5
Voting Interest Accept(s)	81					

Note: Refer to *Regulations* § 3.2.1 for definition of Voting Interest.

III. Rejects

Voting Interest Reject 1 (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.	
		5.1.16	
	Negative Text	<p>*Original complete Negative text (e.g., issue, justification, suggestion) should be copied.</p> <p>Lam-LC2: Definition of risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This definition is different from S10 yet still carries the '[SEMI S10]' tag. The goal of this ballot is to complete reconciling SEMI S14 with SEMI S10, but this definition is quite different from S10. Risk is not just an expectation expressed on the given scale, but is done so using the method of S10. <p>===</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I *think* the TF leader expressed a preference for this definition over the current S10 – if so, frame the expectation of a change to come, or why there is a difference, or at least acknowledge the difference with a note. Mention also the role of likelihood and severity as is in the current S10 definition. Remove the '[SEMI S10]' tag. <p>Such as "5.1.16 risk — the expected magnitude of losses from a hazard, as determined using SEMI S10, based on expected severity and likelihood of harm(s) from a hazard, and expressed on the scale: Very Low, Low, Medium, High, Very High. [SEMI S10]"</p> <p>NOTEXX: This definition is aligned with S10 principles but is not verbatim from SEMI S10. "</p>	
	TF input (optional)	<p>ES26apr21: See Lam-LC1.</p> <p>TF26apr23: Postpone discussion until ES compares this ballot with the to-be-published SEMI S10.</p> <p>ES26apr29: Definition in the ballot appears to match the definition in the S10 proof.</p> <p>TF26apr30: Do nothing, as target is to have the published documents match.</p> <p>LC to withdraw.</p> <p>TF26may12:</p>	
	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 04/30/2026. GO TO "Final" subsection → (A)
Final	(check if applicable)	<input checked="" 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 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.

Disposition of Voting Interest Reject 1

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"/> x	$g - (h + i + j + k) = 0$	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 2 (Voting Interest Name: National Institute of Chemical Safety)

Voter Reject 1 (Voter: Sunmin Lee, National Institute of Chemical Safety)

Negative 1

Negative	Referenced Section/ Paragraph	*TF/TC Chapter to fill in, including text in the ballot if necessary. None specified by voter.	
	Negative Text	*Original complete Negative text (e.g., issue, justification, suggestion) should be copied. NICS-1: In light of the relatively short history of semiconductors, accurately assessing the risks of potential accidents remains challenging; accordingly, the relaxation of safety standards is not considered appropriate	
TF input (optional)		ES26apr14: I have e-mailed the submitter requesting clarification. ES26apr21: I have received no reply from the submitter. I propose we recommend this be found RNP, as it does not provide enough information for us to understand and address the submitter's concern. TF26apr23: Recommend the TCC find this RNP. TF26may12: Still no reply to ES's query. Recommend that the TCC find this Related, Not Persuasive: 10Y 0N	
Withdrawal (check one)	<input type="checkbox"/> x	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 type="checkbox"/> x	'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)	Negative is related and persuasive. (Needs >1/3 votes to pass.)			
		x	Negative is related and not persuasive. (Needs ≥2/3 votes to pass.)		
		Reason	it does not provide enough information for us to understand and address the submitter's concern.		
	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	(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 2

Check only when the Document has not been failed.

1	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

	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	$g - (h + i + j + k) > 0$	Reject is included in the denominator of § VI. <i>Approval Conditions Check</i>
	<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: AMEC)

Voter Reject 1 (Voter: John Wang, AMEC)

Negative 1

Negative	Referenced Section/ Paragraph	*TF/TC Chapter to fill in, including text in the ballot if necessary. 6.1.3	
	Negative Text	*Original complete Negative text (e.g., issue, justification, suggestion) should be copied. AMEC-1: Accept line items 1-7 and 9-11. Do not accept line item 8. Considering the "reasonably foreseeable single-point" failures is the core philosophy of SEMI Safety standards, we should not change it.	
TF input (optional)		ES26apr21: Related to HDTS-1 I believe this Negative should be found RNP, as well TF26apr23: Recommend to the TCC that this be found RNP TF26may12: Recommend to the TCC that this be found Related, Not Persuasive. 8Y 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)	<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	There is a limit to the assessment because, once one has identified a subset of failures that have a Likelihood of Not Reasonably Foreseeable, then there is no need to consider that subset of failures or any set of failures including that subset of failures. Refer to the Voting Interest Reject 4 in the TF input section 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	<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)		
	<input type="checkbox"/>	(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.

1	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	<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 checked="" 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 4 (Voting Interest Name: High Tech Design Safety)

Voter Reject 1 (Voter: Steve Barcik, High Tech Design Safety)

Negative 1

Negative	Referenced Section/ Paragraph	*TF/TC Chapter to fill in, including text in the ballot if necessary.	
		6.1.3	
	Negative Text	<p>*Original complete Negative text (e.g., issue, justification, suggestion) should be copied.</p> <p>Negative: This creates an unlimited and never ending loop of risk assessment as accumulation of single point failures into many level failures would result in massive risk assessments and there is no boundary or limit to depth a review would need to go. Suggest adding 2 point failures, as most fires would be release of or overheating of some substance then ignition. This would cover most normal risks without the burden of looking at and ranking 3,4,5 or more level failures. Line Item 1 (Part 8 of 11) :</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">6.1.3 The risk assessment should include both normal operation and the consequence of reasonably foreseeable, [Struck single-point] failures within the equipment. It should not include exposure to fire or external ignition sources not within the intended use environment.</p> <p>NOTE 8: Previous Revisions of SEMI S14 limited risk assessment to single-point failures.</p>	
	TF input (optional)	<p>ES26apr21: Related to AMEC-1</p> <p>The long-standing doctrine of "single-point failure" has been agreed by the S02 Major Revision Task Force to be an incorrect approach, as it is not a valid predictor of the likelihood of an event.</p> <p>My favorite example of this is to ask under which, if you were obligated to choose, would you sit:</p> <p>a) a pickup truck suspended by one length of anchor chain from the QE II or</p> <p>b) a pickup truck suspended by two lengths of dental floss?</p> <p>I point out that, in the a) case a single failure will drop the truck on you, but in the b) case it will require multiple failures.</p> <p>I am, for what it's worth, willing to offer the option of a truck suspended by three lengths of dental floss to demonstrate why limiting to two failures doesn't work, either.</p> <p>There is a limit to the assessment because, once one has identified a subset of failures that have a Likelihood of Not Reasonably Foreseeable, then there is no need to consider that subset of failures or any set of failures including that subset of failures.</p> <p>Also, single-point-failure doctrine does not appear in SEMI S10.</p> <p>I recommend the NA EHS TCC find this Related, Not Persuasive.</p> <p>TF26apr23: Recommend to the TCC that this be found RNP.</p> <p>TF26may12: Recommend to the TCC that this be found Related, Not Persuasive. 8Y 0N</p>	
	Withdrawal (check one)	x	<p>No Negative withdrawal made by Voter. GO TO "Related" subsection</p> <p>Withdrawal document received by Standards staff on MM/DD/YYYY. GO TO "Final" subsection → (A)</p>
Related	Motion and Reason (check one)	x	<p>'Related' is mutually agreed upon. (Needs no motion.) GO TO "Persuasive" subsection</p> <p>Negative is not related. (Needs ≥2/3 votes to pass.)</p>
		Reason	XXXX
	Motion by/ 2nd by	Name (Company)/Name (Company)	
	Discussion		
		XX Y-XX N; Motion passed/failed.	

	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.)				
		<input type="checkbox"/>	Reason	There is a limit to the assessment because, once one has identified a subset of failures that have a Likelihood of Not Reasonably Foreseeable, then there is no need to consider that subset of failures or any set of failures including that subset of failures. Refer above in the TF input section for completed details.			
	Motion by/ 2nd by	By: Eric Sklar / Safety Guru, LLC Second: Lauren Crane / Lam Research					
	Discussion						
			Result: 13-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	(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.				

Disposition of Voting Interest Reject 4

Check only when the Document has not been failed.

1	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. <i>Approval Conditions Check</i>
	x	$g - (h + i + j + k) > 0$	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 ¶ 9.6.1.4.5.2*)

Voting Interest Reject 5 (Voting Interest Name: Tokyo Electron, Ltd)

Voter Reject 1 (Voter: Supika Mashiro, TEL)

Negative 1

Negative	Referenced Section/ Paragraph	*TF/TC Chapter to fill in, including text in the ballot if necessary.
		1.1
	Negative Text	<p>*Original complete Negative text (e.g., issue, justification, suggestion) should be copied.</p> <p>TEL-SM1: Proposed change to 1.1 significantly changes the purpose of this Safety Guideline. Such change is not acceptable for a Line Item Ballot.</p> <p>[Justification] Procedure Manual (PM) requires use of major revision when a revision involves technical revisions to the purpose section. (Refer to PM ¶ 3.6.1) The use of Line Items is not permitted for major revisions to published Standards or Safety Guidelines; these shall be balloted as a single unit. (Refer to PM ¶ 3.5.2.6)</p> <p>[Suggestion] As all other proposed changes seem to be closely related to the change in purpose and scope, I'd recommend major revision for the entire document. Even if a Line Item Ballot that is removed of the changes in ¶ 1.1 and ¶ 2.2 is proposed under a new SNARF it will not pass because of contradiction to the purpose and scope (which should be without those changes.)</p>

		<p>ES26apr21: I do not agree that the PM requires any ballot including a proposed change to the Purpose Section to be a Major Revision Ballot.</p> <p>I believe the submitter is referring to the second bullet in ¶3.6.1:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">3.6 <i>Major Revisions</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">3.6.1 Major revisions are substantial changes to the text of published Standards or Safety Guidelines for the purpose of updating the Standard or Safety Guideline, modifying its application, clarifying the language, or correcting errors. As a practical matter, a Major-Revision Letter Ballot is one that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • requires more than ten Line Items, or • involves technical revisions to the title (including change of Standard’s Subtype), purpose, scope, limitations, or any other section that affects the overall Standards Document. <p>is ambiguous, as it allows for the possibility that a change to one of the listed sections does not “affect the overall Standards Document”. In the case of this ballot, the changes affect the procedure for assigning risk levels, but there are portions of SEMI S14 that are unaffected by the proposed change.</p> <p>That said, the <i>realpolitik</i> of this matter is that, regardless of whether the TF or the TCC agrees with me, the upper echelons of the SEMI Standards Program are likely to agree with the submitter.</p> <p>The foreseen downside to a Major Revision ballot is that it opens all of SEMI S14 to Negatives and Comments. Substantively, that might well be useful. It is, however, likely to result in a substantial workload.</p> <p>TF26apr23: Recommend that the TCC find this Related and NOT Persuasive, based on the argument above and that the Negative is about rule interpretation, not the change to the Document.</p> <p>TF26may12: LC: Applying the “affects the overall Standards Document” test strictly would render all LI ballots invalid.</p> <p>ES: Furthermore, the changes to scope and purpose occurred when, a Revision ago, the use of the S10 criteria was imposed by S14. The changes to Purpose and Scope sections are, effectively, cleanup of residual errors in those section.</p> <p>Recommend that the TCC find this Related, but Not Persuasive: 7 Y 1N</p>	
		<p>TF input (optional)</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	The changes to scope and purpose occurred when, a Revision ago, the use of the S10 criteria was imposed by S14. The changes to Purpose and Scope sections are, effectively, cleanup of residual errors in those sections. Refer to TF input section above for complete details.

	Motion by/ 2nd by	By: Eric Sklar / Safety Guru, LLC Second: Lauren Crane / Lam Research			
	Discussion	Supika Mashiro pointed out per the Procedure Manual technical revisions to the purpose or scope section would be considered major revision. If the TF feels the changes are editorial, they should omit these changes in this ballot and consider Type 2 editorial changes.			
	Result of Vote (check one)	Result: 11-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"/>	[Negative is related and not persuasive.] < 2/3	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y GO TO "Address by Technical Change Option" subsection
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2/3 ≤ [Negative is related and not persuasive.] < 90%	<input type="checkbox"/>	N GO TO "Final" subsection → (E)
		<input type="checkbox"/>	90% ≤ [Negative is related and not persuasive.]	GO TO "Final" subsection → (C)	
		<input type="checkbox"/>		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 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.		

Disposition of Voting Interest Reject 5

Check only when the Document has not been failed.

1	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	<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 checked="" 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)

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 (JeonGah Yu, Samsung Electronics) - Comment 1

Comment	*TF/TC Chapter to fill in section/paragraph #, if necessary. NOTE 4 @ 5.1.5	
	SE-1: Part 3 of 11 : I think if we delete 5.1.5 downtime, we also have to delete NOTE4 below Part 6, 7 of 11 I understand that we make consistency with SEMI S2 and SEMI S10 But why the change of part 6, 7 is different with them?	
TE Input	ES26apr06: The submitter is correct. The good news is that this is a NOTE and this ballot response was a Comment, so we can fix this in the adjudication meeting. TF26apr23: Fix Editorially 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 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"/>	
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. <i>Editorial Changes Other than Those Voted on in § V.</i>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Case 2: Voted in this section: Original section number and at least one full sentence are required in "FROM" and "TO" fields.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Editorial Changes	1	FROM: NOTE 4: Downtime may be considered according to the definition of SEMI E10, assuming committed availability of the parts in question.
		TO: NOTE 4: Downtime may be considered according to the definition of SEMI E10, assuming committed availability of the parts in question.
		Justification (If necessary) NOTE pertained to a paragraph that was deleted by the ballot. Deletion of the NOTE should have been included in the ballot, but was overlooked.
Motion	To approve above editorial change(s)	
Motion by/2 nd by	By: Eric Sklar / Safety Guru, LLC Second: Lauren Crane / Lam Research	

Discussion	XXXX
Vote	Result: 13-Y 0-N Voting Result: Pass - 100.00%

Commenter 2 (Yu-Chun Yeh, Individual Participant) - Comment 1

Comment	*TF/TC Chapter to fill in section/paragraph #, if necessary. General		
	<p>YCY-1: The proposed revision to align SEMI S14 with SEMI S10 provides a more consistent and structured framework for fire risk assessment, particularly in the use of severity, likelihood, and risk categorization. From a product compliance and audit perspective, it would be beneficial to further clarify expectations for documentation, including the level of detail required in the final fire risk assessment report and summary report, to support consistency across different equipment suppliers. Additionally, guidance on documenting key assumptions (e.g., use conditions, facility dependencies, and single-fault scenarios) would improve traceability, reproducibility, and auditability of the risk assessment process.</p>		
TE Input	<p>ES26apr06: No change is requested in this Comment and I see no specific change to recommend based on it. TF26apr23: No change 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	
	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.

Commenter 3 (Michael Wotta, TEL) - Comment 1

Comment	*TF/TC Chapter to fill in section/paragraph #, if necessary. NOTE 4 @ 5.1.7	
	<p>TEL-MW1: Note 4 is related to the definition of "Downtime" which is proposed to being deleted, so note 4 should be deleted as well. See attached document.</p>	
TE Input	<p>ES26apr06: See SE-1 TF26apr23: Fix Editorially TF26may12: Concur</p>	
Action	The TC Chapter agreed to do one of the following actions.	
	*No motion is required in this step.	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Already addressed by Commenter #1, Comment #1

	No further action was taken by the TC Chapter.
	Refer to the TF for more consideration.
	New Business
	Editorial Change

Commenter 4 (Lauren Crane, Lam Research) - Comment 1

Comment	<p>*TF/TC Chapter to fill in section/paragraph #, if necessary. 5.1.10</p> <p>Lam-LC1: Definition of likelihood. The purpose of the ballot is to complete reconciling SEMI S14 with SEMI S10. This definition aligns with S10 but does not have the bracket-tag. ==== Add the '[SEMI S10]' tag.</p>										
	<p>TF Input</p> <p>ES26apr21: One of the challenges in preparing this ballot is that SEMI S10 is in Publications Limbo. It was approved about a year ago, but has yet to be published. As of 21 April, I was awaiting a second proof from SEMI Publications. IIRC, we attempted to align with the approved, but yet unpublished SEMI S10, as we anticipated it being published before this ballot was completed. Adding correct tags is Editorial. ES26apr29: Definition in the ballot appears to match the definition in the S10 proof. TF26apr30: Do nothing, as target is to have the published documents match. 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>										
	<table border="1"> <tr> <td></td> <td>Already addressed by Commenter #, Comment #</td> </tr> <tr> <td>x</td> <td>No further action was taken by the TC Chapter.</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Refer to the TF for more consideration.</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>New Business</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Editorial Change</td> </tr> </table>		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
		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										
	Already addressed by Commenter #, Comment #										
	No further action was taken by the TC Chapter.										
	Refer to the TF for more consideration.										
	New Business										
	Editorial Change										

Commenter 4 (Lauren Crane, Lam Research) - Comment 2

<p>*TF/TC Chapter to fill in section/paragraph #, if necessary. 5.1.16</p>

Comment	<p>Lam-LC2: (This was submitted as a Negative and changed by the voter to a Comment)</p> <p>Definition of risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This definition is different from S10 yet still carries the '[SEMI S10]' tag. The goal of this ballot is to complete reconciling SEMI S14 with SEMI S10, but this definition is quite different from S10. Risk is not just an expectation expressed on the given scale, but is done so using the method of S10. <p>===</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I *think* the TF leader expressed a preference for this definition over the current S10 – if so, frame the expectation of a change to come, or why there is a difference, or at least acknowledge the difference with a note. Mention also the role of likelihood and severity as is in the current S10 definition. Remove the '[SEMI S10]' tag. <p>Such as "5.1.16 risk — the expected magnitude of losses from a hazard, <u>as determined using SEMI S10, based on expected severity and likelihood of harm(s) from a hazard, and expressed on the scale: Very Low, Low, Medium, High, Very High.</u> {SEMI S10}</p> <p>NOTEXX: This definition is aligned with S10 principles but is not verbatim from SEMI S10. "</p>
	<p>ES26apr21: See Lam-LC1.</p> <p>TF26apr23: Postpone discussion until ES compares this ballot with the to-be-published SEMI S10.</p> <p>ES26apr29: Definition in the ballot appears to match the definition in the S10 proof.</p> <p>TF26apr30: Do nothing, as target is to have the published documents match.</p> <p>LC to withdraw.</p> <p>TF26may12:</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 4 (Lauren Crane, Lam Research) - Comment 3

Comment	<p>*TF/TC Chapter to fill in section/paragraph #, if necessary. 5.1.18</p>
	<p>Lam-LC3:</p> <p>Definition of severity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The goal of this ballot is to complete reconciling SEMI S14 with SEMI S10, but this definition is different from S10. <p>===</p> <p>Frame the expectation of a change to come in S10, or why there is a difference, or at least acknowledge the difference with a note.</p> <p>Such as "NOTE: This definition is aligned with S10 principles but is not verbatim from SEMI S10."</p>
TF Input	<p>ES26apr21: See Lam-LC1</p>
	<p>ES26apr29: Definition in the ballot appears to match the definition in the S10 proof.</p>
	<p>TF26apr30: Do nothing, as target is to have the published documents match.</p>
	<p>TF26may12: Concur</p>
Acti	<p>The TC Chapter agreed to do one of the following actions.</p>
	<p>*No motion is required in this step.</p>

	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 4 (Lauren Crane, Lam Research) - Comment 4

Comment	*TF/TC Chapter to fill in section/paragraph #, if necessary. Appendix 1
	<p>Lam-LC4: With the deletion of Appendix 1, Appendix 2 should be renumbered. === Renumber Appendix 2 as Appendix 1, and change the reference in NOTE3 and 6.2.2.2 3rd bullet.</p>
TF Input	<p>ES26apr21: Yes, but such renumbering is done by SEMI Publications, not by ballot. I recommend no change in response to this item. TF26apr23: No change TF26may12: Concur</p>
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 5 (Brandy Miller, Intel) - Comment 1

Comment	*TF/TC Chapter to fill in section/paragraph #, if necessary. 1.1
	<p>Intel-1: {There was a numbered row in the worksheet Intel submitted, but no comment.}</p>
TF Input	<p>ES26apr21: This item appears to result from a misunderstanding of the voting instructions. I recommend no change in response to this item. TF26apr23: No change TF26may12: Concur</p>
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 5 (Brandy Miller, Intel) - Comment 2

Comment	*TF/TC Chapter to fill in section/paragraph #, if necessary. 2.2	
	Intel-2: {There was a numbered row in the worksheet Intel submitted, but no comment.}	
TF Input	<p>ES26apr21: This item appears to result from a misunderstanding of the voting instructions. I recommend no change in response to this item.</p> <p>TF26apr23: No change</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 5 (Brandy Miller, Intel) - Comment 3

Comment	*TF/TC Chapter to fill in section/paragraph #, if necessary. 5.1.5	
	Intel-3: {There was a numbered row in the worksheet Intel submitted, but no comment.}	
TF Input	<p>ES26apr21: This item appears to result from a misunderstanding of the voting instructions. I recommend no change in response to this item.</p> <p>TF26apr23: No change</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 5 (Brandy Miller, Intel) - Comment 4

Comment	*TF/TC Chapter to fill in section/paragraph #, if necessary. 5.1.7	
	Intel-4: {There was a numbered row in the worksheet Intel submitted, but no comment.}	
TF Input	<p>ES26apr21: This item appears to result from a misunderstanding of the voting instructions. I recommend no change in response to this item.</p> <p>TF26apr23: No change</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 5 (Brandy Miller, Intel) - Comment 5

Comment	*TF/TC Chapter to fill in section/paragraph #, if necessary. 5.1.10	
	Intel-5 {There was a numbered row in the worksheet Intel submitted, but no comment.}	
TF Input	<p>ES26apr21: This item appears to result from a misunderstanding of the voting instructions. I recommend no change in response to this item.</p> <p>TF26apr23: No change</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 5 (Brandy Miller, Intel) - Comment 6

Comment	*TF/TC Chapter to fill in section/paragraph #, if necessary. 5.1.16	
	<p>Intel-6: Definition of risk should be the same as S10 (5.1.22) and include both severity and likelihood. Outcomes could be mentioned, but inputs should be used as the definition.</p>	
TF Input	<p>ES26apr21: See Lam-LC1. ES26apr29: Definition in the ballot appears to match the definition in the S10 proof. TF26apr30: As for other S10 mismatch items. 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 5 (Brandy Miller, Intel) - Comment 7

Comment	*TF/TC Chapter to fill in section/paragraph #, if necessary. 5.1.18	
	<p>Intel-7: Align definition with S10</p>	
TF Input	<p>ES26apr21: See Lam-LC1. ES26apr29: Definition in the ballot appears to match the definition in the S10 proof. TF26apr30: As for other S10 mismatch items. 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 5 (Brandy Miller, Intel) - Comment 8

Comment	*TF/TC Chapter to fill in section/paragraph #, if necessary. 6.1.3	
	Intel-8: {There was a numbered row in the worksheet Intel submitted, but no comment.}	
TF Input	<p>ES26apr21: This item appears to result from a misunderstanding of the voting instructions. I recommend no change in response to this item.</p> <p>TF26apr23: No change</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 5 (Brandy Miller, Intel) - Comment 9

Comment	*TF/TC Chapter to fill in section/paragraph #, if necessary. 6.1.5	
	Intel-9: {There was a numbered row in the worksheet Intel submitted, but no comment.}	
TF Input	<p>ES26apr21: This item appears to result from a misunderstanding of the voting instructions. I recommend no change in response to this item.</p> <p>TF26apr23: No change</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 5 (Brandy Miller, Intel) - Comment 10

Comment	*TF/TC Chapter to fill in section/paragraph #, if necessary. 6.5.3.1	
	Intel-10: {There was a numbered row in the worksheet Intel submitted, but no comment.}	
TF Input	<p>ES26apr21: This item appears to result from a misunderstanding of the voting instructions. I recommend no change in response to this item.</p> <p>TF26apr23: No change</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 5 (Brandy Miller, Intel) - Comment 11

Comment	*TF/TC Chapter to fill in section/paragraph #, if necessary. A1	
	Intel-11: {There was a numbered row in the worksheet Intel submitted, but no comment.}	
TF Input	<p>ES26apr21: This item appears to result from a misunderstanding of the voting instructions. I recommend no change in response to this item.</p> <p>TF26apr23: No change</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 6 (Qing Shi Chua, SGS Malaysia) - Comment 1

Comment	*TF/TC Chapter to fill in section/paragraph #, if necessary. 1.1
	SGS-M1: Line Item 1 (Part 1 of 11): § 1.1 stated clearly about the purpose of fire risk covering personnel, equipment and environment.
TF Input	ES26apr21: This item appears to result from a misunderstanding of the voting instructions. I recommend no change in response to this item. TF26apr23: No change 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 6 (Qing Shi Chua, SGS Malaysia) - Comment 2

Comment	*TF/TC Chapter to fill in section/paragraph #, if necessary. 2.2
	SGS-M2: Line Item 1 (Part 2 of 11): § 2.2 stated clearly about the fire risk scope covering injury of personnel, equipment and environment.
TF Input	ES26apr21: This item appears to result from a misunderstanding of the voting instructions. I recommend no change in response to this item. TF26apr23: No change 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 6 (Qing Shi Chua, SGS Malaysia) - Comment 3

Comment	*TF/TC Chapter to fill in section/paragraph #, if necessary. 5.1.5
	SGS-M3: Line Item 1 (Part 3 of 11): Removal of downtime as covered in SEMI E10.

TE Input	ES26apr21: This item appears to result from a misunderstanding of the voting instructions. I recommend no change in response to this item.
	TF26apr23: No change 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 6 (Qing Shi Chua, SGS Malaysia) - Comment 4

Comment	*TF/TC Chapter to fill in section/paragraph #, if necessary. 5.1.7
	SGS-M4: Line Item 1 (Part 4 of 11): hazard - referring to SEMI S2 standard Line
TE Input	ES26apr21: This item appears to result from a misunderstanding of the voting instructions. I recommend no change in response to this item. TF26apr23: No change 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 6 (Qing Shi Chua, SGS Malaysia) - Comment 5

Comment	*TF/TC Chapter to fill in section/paragraph #, if necessary. 5.1.10
	SGS-M5: Item 1 (Part 5 of 11): Amended to the percentage of unit-years and this statement is clear.
TE Input	ES26apr21: This item appears to result from a misunderstanding of the voting instructions. I recommend no change in response to this item. TF26apr23: No change 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 6 (Qing Shi Chua, SGS Malaysia) - Comment 6

Comment	*TF/TC Chapter to fill in section/paragraph #, if necessary. 5.1.16
	SGS-M6: Line Item 1 (Part 6 of 11): Ok
TF Input	ES26apr21: This item appears to result from a misunderstanding of the voting instructions. I recommend no change in response to this item. TF26apr23: No change 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 6 (Qing Shi Chua, SGS Malaysia) - Comment 7

Comment	*TF/TC Chapter to fill in section/paragraph #, if necessary. 5.1.18
	SGS-M7: Line Item 1 (Part 7 of 11): Clear explanation on 5.1.18 by replacing the previous statement
TF Input	ES26apr21: This item appears to result from a misunderstanding of the voting instructions. I recommend no change in response to this item. TF26apr23: No change 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 6 (Qing Shi Chua, SGS Malaysia) - Comment 8

Comment	*TF/TC Chapter to fill in section/paragraph #, if necessary. 6.1.3	
	SGS-M8: Line Item 1 (Part 8 of 11): Removal of "single-point" - Accepted	
TF Input	<p>ES26apr21: This item appears to result from a misunderstanding of the voting instructions. I recommend no change in response to this item.</p> <p>TF26apr23: No change</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 6 (Qing Shi Chua, SGS Malaysia) - Comment 9

Comment	*TF/TC Chapter to fill in section/paragraph #, if necessary. 6.1.5	
	SGS-M9: Line Item 1 (Part 9 of 11): Added of "accordance with" means direct refer to SEMI S10 standard - Accepted	
TF Input	<p>ES26apr21: This item appears to result from a misunderstanding of the voting instructions. I recommend no change in response to this item.</p> <p>TF26apr23: No change</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 6 (Qing Shi Chua, SGS Malaysia) - Comment 10

Comment	*TF/TC Chapter to fill in section/paragraph #, if necessary. 5.1.10
	<p>SGS-M10: Line Item 1 (Part 10 of 11) & (Part 11 of 11): Removal of Appendix 1 is relevant as different SEMI equipment has different risks and should not only specific on Appendix 1 only.</p>
TF Input	<p>ES26apr21: This item appears to result from a misunderstanding of the voting instructions. I recommend no change in response to this item. TF26apr23: No change 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 7 (Mark Fessler, ASM) - Comment 1

Comment	*TF/TC Chapter to fill in section/paragraph #, if necessary. A1
	<p>ASM-1: 7446 – SEM1 S14 – Approve editorial, Appendix numbering to be corrected due to removal of appendix 1</p>
TF Input	<p>ES26apr21: Yes, but such renumbering is done by SEMI Publications, not by ballot. I recommend no change in response to this item. TF26apr23: No change 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	

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		85	=	95%	≥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. (Regulations ¶ 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. (Regulations ¶ 8.7.2)
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety Checklist (Regulations ¶ 15.3) is complete and has been included with the Document throughout the balloting process. (Regulations ¶ 15.1.2)

Motion by/2nd by	By: Eric Sklar / Safety Guru, LLC Second: Lauren Crane / Lam Research
Discussion	XXXX
Vote	Result: 16-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</i> ¶ 16.3.1.1) to the Standard or Safety Guideline; or, any copyrighted items or trademarks that are used/reproduced (refer to <i>Regulations</i> ¶ 16.4.1.2) in the Standard or Safety Guideline. (Also refer to, <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 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 applicable items) (Check all)		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.