

Distr.: General  
8 September 2017

Original: English

---

**Economic Commission for Europe**

Inland Transport Committee

**Global Forum for Road Traffic Safety**

**Seventy-fifth session**

Geneva, 19-22 September 2017

Item 3 (b) of the provisional agenda

**Convention on Road Traffic (1968)**

**Driving permits**

**Driving permits**

**Submitted by International Standards Organization**

This document provides ISO comments on secretariat's presentation concerning international driving permits (available at <https://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2017/wp1/ECE-TRANS-WP1-SEPT-2017-Presentation-1e.pdf>).

1. ISO supports the Secretariat's views expressed in the secretariat's presentation. However, it is noted that only the Option A of ECE/TRANS/WP.1/2016/2/Rev.1 is included as option 1 of the 6 options listed in response to Q3 (Annex 6 DDP, no IDP). From a technical perspective, this is the best solution for driving permits world-wide. Thus it is also the primary solution that ISO pursuing in the harmonisation project for the 21 African countries. (Since we shall also be incorporating other United Nations standards such as those relating to dangerous goods, it would be easier for these countries who are contracting parties to the 1968 Convention to actually become compliant and for others who are not to become contracting parties to the 1968 Convention).

2. The Option B of ECE/TRANS/WP.1/2016/2/Rev.1 was proposed by ISO (together with France and Luxembourg at the time) with a view to accommodate countries who do not use the Latin character set or have multiple uses of the driving permit, such as a picture ID, while only a small percentage of their drivers ever venture to drive internationally. ISO has listed the examples of Japan and the USA in a previous presentation, but Sudan and Ethiopia in the harmonisation project face the same challenge as they are not using Latin characters domestically either.

3. Although option 3 and option 6 in response to Q3 include elements of the Option B of ECE/TRANS/WP.1/2016/2/Rev.1, the following aspects thereof are problematic from a documentation and systems perspective:

- Option 3 (Annex 6 DDP, and Annex 7 IDP accompanied by national, non-Annex 6 DDP) requires the issuing of a third document, the Annex 7 IDP, and the associated complications (confusion) for contracting parties to have to recognise 2 alternative documents for international travellers – the Annex 6 DDP and/or the Annex 7 IDP accompanied by an undefined format of a non-Annex 6 DDP.
- Option 6 (Annex 6 DDP, national non-Annex 6 DDP for domestic use, and standalone Annex 7 IDP) also requires the issuing of a third document, the standalone Annex 7 IDP, and furthermore presents an overly complicated solution to manage 3 documents and the circumstances when 2 alternatives, the Annex 6 DDP or the standalone Annex 7 IDP, would be used and have to be recognised by contracting parties for international travel.

4. Option B of ECE/TRANS/WP.1/2016/2/Rev.1 presents a far more elegant solution than either of the above 2 options:

- An Annex 6 DDP (with some amendments to replace technical requirements with reference compliance with ISO standards) to be used for both domestic and international travel, and a simplified standard for a domestic DDP (national Non-Annex 6 in secretariat's presentation?) of which the minimum requirements are still stated in the Convention by way of a new Annex, including the fact that this DDP may not be used for international travel.

5. With regard to the other options in the secretariat's list under Q3:

- Option 2 is the current status and the question remains – why have an Annex 7 IDP if the Annex 6 DDP (which has to accompany the IDP) can be used on its own to travel internationally? Poorly informed holders of driving permits are led to believe that it is a requirement to have an IDP regardless of the status of their DDP and pay to have an unnecessary (and obsolete) document issued. Thus the status quo cannot continue.
- Option 4 proposes an amendment of the 1968 Convention to accommodate the 1949 Convention and becomes overly complicated, particularly in view of the fact that countries should not be encouraged to remain content with the outdated 1949

Convention. Perhaps a recommendation to contracting parties to the 1949 Convention to accept the Annex 6 DDP would be sufficient (similar to the previous arrangements regarding the change from the 1926 Convention)?

- Option 5 seems superfluous as the Annex 6 DDP already allows travelling internationally (Option 1) – why would there be a need for a standalone Annex 7 IDP to travel internationally?

---