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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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1949 Convention:</th>
<th>1968 Convention:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>all 6 official UN languages</td>
<td>FR, EN, ES and RU only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“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** (2006 amendment of 1968 Convention effective 29 March 2011):
  – 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

WHAT ARE THE MOST COMMON ASPECTS IN RESPECT OF WHICH DDPs FAIL TO COMPLY WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE 1968 CONVENTION?

• Latin characters are not used
• Entries are not transliterated into Latin characters
• Entries on the DDP are not denoted by the numbers as stated in Annex 6, neither the compulsory data nor the additional data provided for by the domestic legislation
Conclusion

HOW SHOULD THIS SITUATION BE ADDRESSED?

• Accommodation of a DDP that does not meet the requirements of the Convention for use in international traffic but only to be used domestically within the country of issue (DDP)

AND

• Providing for a DDP fully compliant with the requirements of the Convention for use in international traffic (DDP ready for international use)
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 world-wide fail to comply with 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
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 (cont)

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

• Clause 4 and 5 of Annex 6 of the 1968 Convention to be amended as follow for the DDP (showing track changes):

4. It is compulsory preferred to indicate ion the permit the data listed under the numbers given below:
5. If additional information is required by domestic legislation, it shall beis preferred to be entered on the driving permit under the numbers given below:

• Clause 3 and 4 of Annex 7 of the 1968 Convention would still read as follow for the DDP for International Use:

3. It is compulsory to indicate on the permit the data listed under the numbers given below:
4. If additional information is required by domestic legislation, it shall be entered on the driving permit under the numbers given below:

• Revisit Annex 7 to consolidate proposal by FIA
Way Forward (cont)

Next Revision of ECE/TRANS/WP.1/2016/2 Rev 1

- Remove “Option A”
- Expand “Option B” to include FIA proposal for more secure IDL in Annex 7 as an option for countries who choose to issue a DDP compliant with Annex 6.
Future Format of Driving Licences

UN Conventions on Road Traffic have to stay relevant to the needs of the day

• Amendments approved in 2017 will only come into effect in 2022
• Driving licences have to include machine readable properties for ease of authentication and verification driving privileges
• Most recent review of ISO specifications have removed magnetic stripe as machine readable property
• New Part being developed for mobile driving licence on smart phone or similar device
• Pilot projects for mobile driving licences underway by government driving licence administrations:
  ▪ TraFi in Finland
  ▪ DVLA in the United Kingdom
  ▪ RDW in the Netherlands has demonstrated proof of concept
  ▪ Several states in the USA
Future Format of Driving Licences (cont)

Electronic Driving Permit on a mobile phone

- Pilot application developed by the Österreichische Staatsdruckerei
Future Format of Driving Licences (cont)

Mobile (electronic) Driving Permit on a mobile/cellular phone

- User requirements compiled by American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators (AAMVA) in response to demand from their members (all the states in the USA, provinces of Canada and Mexico)
Future Format of Driving Licences (cont)

Examples of pilot projects for mobile driving licences by 19 States in the USA

- Alabama – licence holders can download digitized version of their DL and store it in Apple Passbook or Google Wallet upon renewal
- Colorado, Idaho, Maryland & District of Colombia – pilot will enable new security features, coupled with advanced in-field verification, as well as allow for enhanced privacy for citizens through better control of personal information
- Iowa – started testing a mobile app that allows the licence to be updated immediately with new authorisations or changes in personal particulars
- Tennessee – bill passed that permits development of a mobile application to display images of driver licences on cell phones; allows electronic driver licences to be accepted in lieu of physical driver licences
Future Format of Driving Licences (cont)

Standard for mobile driving licences under development by ISO

- Standardise the requirements
  - Security
  - Authentication
  - Presentation
  - Privacy
- Allow international recognition, authentication and validation of driving privileges in respect of compliant mobile driving licences
- Working draft to be submitted for 1st international ballot in 2018
- Publication of standard expected late in 2020 (upon completion of 3 rounds of international ballot)