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Background

• Informal Document no. 3 prepared by the UN ECE WP1 Secretariat, with the collaboration of ISO and FIA, was presented during the 69th Session.

• This document highlighted a series of issues and inconsistencies regarding International Driving Permits, and suggested options for a work plan outlining potential amendments to Annex 7 of the 1968 Convention on Road Traffic and Annex 10 of the 1949 Convention on Road Traffic.

• Work Plan objective: to achieve similar provisions for both 1968 and 1949 Conventions.
Issues

IRREGULARITIES IN IDP ISSUANCE

In 2013, after requesting copies of the authoritative translations of the text of the IDP from CPs to the 1968 and 1949 Convention on Road Traffic, the Secretariat found that:

• Only a small number of CPs is fully compliant with Annex 7 of the 1968 Convention.

• A number of CPs were issuing IDPs pursuant to the wrong Convention.
Issues

INCONSISTENCIES REGARDING IDPs AND THEIR CONVENTIONS

The Secretariat also found that:

• The 1949 IDP model (as prescribed in Annex 10 of the 1949 Convention) has not been updated in the same manner as its corresponding Annex 7 in the 1968 Convention.
1949 Convention
5 categories, text only - no pictograms
Never updated

1968 Convention
13 categories, pictograms only
Updated in 1993 and 2006
INCONSISTENCIES REGARDING IDPs AND THEIR CONVENTIONS

• The Conventions differ as to the mandatory languages into which Model 3 left hand page has to be translated:

  1949 Convention: all 6 official UN languages

  Pages 1 and 2 shall be drawn up in the national language or languages.
  The entire last page shall be drawn up in French.
  Additional pages of the International Driving Permit shall repeat in other languages the text of part I of the last page. They shall be drawn up in the following languages:
  (a) Language(s) prescribed by the legislation of the issuing State
  (b) The official languages of the United Nations,
  (c) At the most six other languages, chosen at the discretion of the issuing State.

  1968 Convention: FR, EN, ES and RU only

  “The outside and inside of the front cover shall conform, respectively, to model pages Nos. 1 and 2 below; they shall be printed in the national language, or in at least one of the national languages, of the issuing State. The last two inside pages shall be facing pages conforming to model No. 3 below; they shall be printed in French. The inside pages preceding these two pages shall repeat the first of them in several languages, which must include English, Russian and Spanish”. 
Issues

LIMITATIONS OF INTERNATIONAL DRIVING PERMITS

• IDPs contain no security features:
  – they can be easily copied and altered
  – difficult to detect fraudulent permits from genuine permits

• There is no register or directory of national motor vehicle agency contacts in order to verify the validity of a presented DDP or IDP.

• At the present time, the cancellation or suspension of the DDP does not result in an automatic cancellation of an IDP.
Conclusion

REVISIT INTERNATIONAL DRIVING PERMITS

• IDPs **have to be accompanied by a DDP** (1968 Convention):
  – Reliance on the validity of DDP
  – Dependence on the features of DDP to counter alteration or fraudulent reproduction
  – IDP serves as translation of DDP

• Instead of issuing 2 documents, contracting parties should be encouraged to improve the quality of the DDP which could be used internationally together with a translation.
Conclusion

DOES IT MEAN THAT EACH COUNTRY NEEDS TO ISSUE 2 DOMESTIC DRIVING PERMITS?

• NO – countries who already issue a DDP which is compliant with the requirements for international use do not need to issue a second Driving Permit

WHEN WOULD A COUNTRY NEED TO ISSUE A 2\textsuperscript{nd} DOMESTIC DRIVING PERMIT FOR INTERNATIONAL USE?

• Only countries that issue a domestic driving permit which is not compliant with the requirements for international use do need to issue a second Driving Permit
Examples of existing DDPs that are already compliant for International Use

Netherlands – suitable for international travel

Germany – suitable for international travel
Examples of existing DDPs that are already compliant for International Use

**Namibia** – suitable for international travel

**Malawi** – suitable for international travel
Examples of existing DDPs that are NOT compliant for International Use

Objective: similar provisions to 1968 Convention

• DDPs currently issued by a number of countries worldwide differ from the provisions of Annex 6 in the following respects:
  – entries on the DDP are not denoted by the numbers as stated in Annex 6, neither the compulsory nor the additional data provided for by the domestic legislation
  – entries are not in Latin characters and neither are such entries also transliterated into the Latin alphabet
Examples of existing DDPs that are NOT compliant with 1968 Convention

Signatories to the 1968 Convention

• Example – Brazil (not yet ratified) does not use the numbers to denote the entries on the DDP.
Examples of existing DDPs that are NOT compliant with 1968 Convention

Signatories to the 1949 Convention

• Example – Japan
  – Uses neither Latin characters for entries nor transliterate entries into Latin characters
  – Does not use the numbers to denote the entries on the DDP

![Sample Japanese Driver's License](image)
Examples of existing DDPs that are NOT compliant with 1968 Convention

Countries who have signed neither 1968 Convention nor 1949 Convention

- Example – Ethiopia
  - Uses neither Latin characters for entries nor transliterates entries into Latin characters
  - Does not use the numbers to denote the entries on the DDP
Examples of existing DDPs that are NOT compliant with 1968 Convention

Key reasons for “non-compliance”:

• Number of domestic drivers that will be driving internationally is so small that it does not warrant the issuing of a DDP that does not reflect the culture of the population, i.e. to record entries in Latin characters or to add the transliteration to the Latin alphabet on the DDP.

• Document is also used for other purposes domestically (e.g. as a picture ID) by a far larger number of citizens than the number of drivers that will ever drive internationally and hence it is in the national interest to issue a DDP which is not compliant with the UN Convention.
Examples of existing DDPs that are NOT compliant with 1968 Convention

Key reasons for “non-compliance”:

• Perspective of the numbers for Japan
  – DDPs issued – 82,150,008 (2015 figure)
  – IDPs issued annually – 304,000 (0.37% of DDPs)
Way Forward

For conformity of provisions in the 1968 & 1949 Conventions & compliance by largest number of countries possible

• Approaches by both CPs to the 1968 Convention and CPs to the 1949 Convention, as well as countries that have not yet become a CP to any of the conventions to be accommodated in the provisions of Annex 6 and Annex 7

• Clause 6 of Annex 6 of the 1968 Convention to be amended as follow for the DDP (showing track changes):

6. **It is preferred that** All the entries on the permit **shall** be made only in Latin characters. If other characters are used, **it is preferred that** the entries **shall** also be transliterated into the Latin alphabet.

• Clause 5 of Annex 7 of the 1968 Convention would still read as follow for the DDP for International Use:

5. **All the entries on the permit shall be made only in Latin characters. If other characters are used, the entries shall also be transliterated into the Latin alphabet.**
Way Forward

For conformity of provisions in the 1968 & 1949 Conventions & compliance by largest number of countries possible

• A similar amendment to the numbering requirement for the entries on the DDP would have to be made in paragraph 4 and 5 of Annex 6
• The number requirement for entries on the DDP for international use would remain in paragraphs 3 and 4 of Annex 7.