The current version of the IRG PnP (IRG N 1975) says in §C.2.b, regarding the UNC process, “A submission is deemed urgently-needed only if the submitter demonstrates urgency or a rationale for rapid standardization.”

While working on the current UNC proposal from the UTC (now IRG N 2005), it has become apparent that this statement provides insufficient guidance for the preparation of a UNC proposal. Outside of the fact that the statement is tautological (“a submission is deemed urgently-needed if it is demonstrated to be urgently-needed”), different individuals and organizations clearly have different standards of what constitutes an urgent need.

In looking over responses to the three UNC proposals handled by the IRG so far, it is clear that IRG members have some unspoken criteria in the back of their minds which are used to evaluate such proposals. In order to improve the UNC process in the future, we would recommend to the IRG to amend §C.2.b by appending the following:

“Evidence of current use is not in and of itself evidence of urgent need. The type of use also needs to be taken into account. For example, requirements of government, science, or scholarship would generally be taken as evidence of urgent need.”