

e-Diagnostic Working Group Meeting
June 29, 2000

MEMBER COMPANY CAUCUS

- 300mm standards implementation cannot be compromised by this effort!!
- This set of capabilities needs to be managed by suppliers along with other priorities that equipment suppliers have.
- Guidelines are not complete, they need to be elaborated and expanded.
- Guidelines should not be designed out of the solutions
- The industry (suppliers and IC makers) should develop a roadmap for standards and implementations
- Suppliers should utilize those guidelines and standards that make sense for their equipment
- An IC maker assumption in the guidelines is that ‘self diagnostics’ exists ([clarify meaning of statement](#))
- Data control should be owned by the IC makers as data owners
- IC makers will work with the suppliers to solve security issues

[Thanks for your positive engagement and support!](#)

SUPPLIER SUMMARY

Topic – Explosive Growth

Issue: Difficulties supporting a new initiative

Topic - Segmentation of e-Diagnostics versus Host control

Issue: Who is in charge? (ie. Connections, who is responsible?)

Topic - How to do measure performance

Issue: a) Initially cost reduction is not the best metric. Service costs may not drop for suppliers or the Fabs. b) Reduction is cycle time on CIP improvements. c) Benchmarking benefits. d) Establish Targets, on a per tool type, after benchmarking is complete. E) Ultimately, the metric will be cost per wafer

Topic - Remote Control is not something that we can guarantee

Issue: The problem is that the network is controlled by the Fab. Sometimes there are interdependencies or tool clusters.

Topic - Costs

Issue: Are the Fabs convinced that these initiatives are worth the costs (share costs. MC, Suppliers, ISMT?)

Topic – We may still need access to process data (recipes) in order to diagnose.

Issue: Data restrictions are potentially problematic (wish restrictions weren't there)