



# Economic and Social Council

Distr.: General  
13 July 2020

Original: English

---

## Economic Commission for Europe

Inland Transport Committee

### Global Forum for Road Traffic Safety

#### **Eighty-first session**

Geneva, 21-25 September 2020

Item 3 (b) of the provisional agenda

**Convention on Road Traffic (1968):**

Driving Permits

### **Use of domestic and international driving permits**

**Submitted by the Experts of Belgium, Brazil, Canada, France, Luxembourg, Russian Federation, United Kingdom of, Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Fédération Internationale de l'Automobile and International Organization for Standardization**

At the eightieth session, WP.1 discussed and commented on the amalgamated approach as set out in Informal Document No.15/Rev.1. Discussions concluded with WP.1 requesting the submission of this formal paper, ECE/TRANS/WP.1/2018/1/Rev.3 for this session.

## I. Introduction

1. At the seventy-ninth session, WP.1 discussed and commented on ECE/TRANS/WP.1/2018/1/Rev.2 which proposed an amalgamated approach combining the elements of the three options (a), (b) and (c) in ECE/TRANS/WP.1/2018/Rev.1.

2. WP.1 indicated general support for the amalgamated approach and requested that the Informal Group of Experts prepare an amendment proposal for the necessary changes in relation to the 1968 Convention as follows (paragraph 14 of ECE/TRANS/WP.1/2018/1/Rev.2/):

- A DDP compliant with Annex 6 (of the 1968 Convention) and with minimum security features which are recognised at international level, or
- An IDP compliant with Annex 7 (of the 1968 Convention) and with minimum security features recognised at international level.
- A DDP not compliant with Annex 6 could only be used domestically. This may be interpreted that there would be no requirement for enhanced security features to be included in the DDP for national use. However, the Convention addresses road traffic safety both domestically and internationally. Thus, from a road safety perspective, there must always be security feature requirements for a DDP, even if the permit is only used domestically.
- Countries who wish to retain a DDP not compliant with Annex 6 would have to issue an IDP compliant with Annex 7 to drivers who wish to travel internationally.
- To facilitate this approach, a change in the 1968 Convention is needed. Currently the Convention requires, “any international permit conforming to the provisions of Annex 7 to this Convention, on condition that it is presented with the corresponding domestic driving permit”.

3. The Informal Group of Experts noted this would require agreement on the minimum security features. And WP.1 requested that the proposed minimum security features be further elaborated in the proposal amendment.

4. At the eightieth session, WP.1 further discussed the amalgamated approach, and commented on Informal Document No.15/Rev.1 which described the proposed amendments to Article 41 and Annex 6 of the 1968 Convention relating to the DDP recognised at international level and Annex 7 of the 1968 Convention relating to the IDP recognised at international level in accordance with the Report of the Seventy-Ninth Session of WP.1 (paragraph 16 of ECE/TRANS/WP.1/169).

5. WP.1 requested the submission of a formal paper, ECE/TRANS/WP.1/2018/1/Rev.3 for the next session. As requested, this updated Rev.3 contains an amendment proposal, showing the necessary changes in relation to the 1968 Convention based on the Group’s proposed amalgamated approach. This combines elements of the three options (a), (b) and (c) in ECE/TRANS/WP.1/2018/1/Rev.1 (paras 14 and 15, ECE/TRANS/WP.1/169). The paper also elaborates on minimum security features for driving permits that were recommended by the Informal Group of Experts (para 16, *ibid*).

6. Despite the amalgamated approach getting general support during the WP.1 meeting of September 2019 (paragraph 16 of the report), and repeated during the March 2020 session (paragraph 8 of the report), there appears to be some confusion about this meaning a standalone IDP. Thus, it is essential that this is clarified by WP.1 that either the preference is a standalone IDP, or the option of an IDP that merely serves as a translation of a DPP which is not compliant with Annex 6 and therefore is presented with such DDP.

7. WP.1’s decision on this point will not change any aspect relating to the DDP, which if compliant the Annex 6 to the 1968 Convention could be used without the

need for an IDP (irrespective of the IDP being a standalone document or to have to be accompanied by a DDP).

8. But it does have an impact on the IDP, and whether the IDP is recognised as a standalone document or a “translation” of the DDP. As a standalone document, the IDP must have the same minimum-security features as the DDP, and there needs to be a close link between the two documents to ensure that the IDP is suspended or cancelled when the DDP has been suspended or cancelled. As a “translation” accompanying the DDP, the security requirements may not have to be the same as the DDP and there would be no need for the close link, because the IDP would not have any standing if not accompanied by the DDP.

9. This formal document has been prepared in response to the previous discussions, and presupposes that WP.1 continues to support a standalone IDP. It summarises the background and proposes an approach of amalgamating the three options which WP1 members are invited to discuss. To do this, it proposes amendments (additions in bold, deletions in strike through) to Article 41 and Annex 6 of the 1968 Convention relating to the DDP recognised at international level; and Annex 7 of the 1968 Convention relating to the IDP at international level (Appendix A).

10. In addition to the amendments in Appendix A, we propose additional amendments to Annex 6 of the 1968 Convention relating to the DDP recognised at international level (replicated in the proposed amendment to Annex 7 of the 1968 Convention relating to the IDP at the international level). These propose amending the vehicle categories and subcategories, and introducing special endorsement of restrictions and their pictograms. These are contained in Appendix B, and we ask WP.1 for its opinion on these.

## II. Background history

11. The Informal Group of Experts on Driving Permits, began their work at the request of WP.1 during its sixty-fourth session. The initial request asked the group to propose suitable solutions on the mutual recognition of driving permits issued under the 1968 Convention and the EU third Driving Licence Directive. This work is concluded and the brochure, entitled “International Driving Permit Categories”, has been published.

12. Since the sixty-ninth session of WP.1, the Group has been considering broader issues related to Domestic Driving Permits (DDPs) and International Driving Permits (IDPs). These include the following:

(a) Only a small number of Contracting Parties are fully compliant with the requirements of Annex 7 of the 1968 Convention on Road Traffic (“1968 Convention”) relating to IDPs;

(b) A number of Contracting Parties to the 1949 Convention on Road Traffic (“1949 Convention”) are incorrectly issuing IDPs. For example, they are issuing IDPs pursuant to the 1968 Convention when that contracting party is party to the 1949 Convention only;

(c) The model IDP (as prescribed in Annex 10 in the 1949 Convention) has not been updated in the same manner as its corresponding Annex 7 in the 1968 Convention – that is, Annex 10 in the 1949 Convention contains only text without any pictograms;

(d) The specifications for the mandatory languages, into which Model 3’s left-hand page must be translated into, differ:

(i) for the 1968 Convention, they are English, French, Russian and Spanish; and

(ii) for the 1949 Convention, they are the official languages of the United Nations (i.e. English, French, Russian, Spanish, Arabic and Chinese).

(e) There is inconsistent standing/status of IDPs depending on whether they are issued under the 1949 or 1968 Convention. For example:

(i) for the 1968 Convention, the IDP must be accompanied by a valid DDP<sup>1</sup>; and

(ii) for the 1949 Convention, the IDP is a standalone document (i.e. does not need to be accompanied by a valid DDP)<sup>2</sup>.

13. Besides the inconsistencies in the model DDPs and IDPs (issued under both the 1949 and 1968 Conventions) mentioned above; as a rule, when IDPs are issued by non-governmental bodies, IDPs to date contain the following identical limitations:

(a) The documents contain no security features and can be easily copied or altered. The lack of security features makes it difficult for law enforcement authorities to detect fraudulent permits from genuine permits;

(b) In most cases, there is no central register or directory of national motor vehicle agency contact details (telephone, email or postal addresses) for the enquiry and exchange of information between national traffic police and licensing authorities to verify the validity of a presented IDP; and

(c) The issue of paper-style IDPs under both the 1968 and 1949 Conventions makes it difficult to automatically cancel or suspend an IDP when a driver's DDP has been suspended or cancelled. This is mitigated to some extent under the 1968 Convention.

14. At the seventy-fifth session of WP.1, the Secretariat delivered a presentation summarizing the discussions of the Group of Experts, initially comprised of Belgium, Canada, France, Luxembourg, Russian Federation and United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Fédération Internationale de l'Automobile (FIA) and International Organization for Standardization (ISO). Japan, Spain and United States of America were new additions at that time to the Informal Group.

15. The presentation included a list of six possible options related to prospective future changes to DDPs and IDPs pursuant to the 1968 Convention.

16. WP.1 invited the Informal Group, supported by the Secretariat, to prepare a document with background and information on options 1, 2 and 6 as well as a preliminary set of principles to accommodate IDPs issued by Contracting Parties to the 1949 Convention. The intention was to facilitate discussions and to reach consensus on a preferred option.

17. The Group of Experts prepared ECE/TRANS/WP.1/2018/1 which was presented at the seventy-sixth session of WP.1. This document covered the background, description of the options, and a set of principles to accommodate IDPs issued by Contracting Parties to the 1949 Convention. The set of principles guiding the options were: harmonization, security, and acceptability to Contracting Parties.

---

<sup>1</sup> Article 41, paras 2(a)(ii) and 5:

“2(a) Contracting Parties shall recognize: (ii) any international permit conforming to the provisions of Annex 7 to this Convention, on condition that it is presented with the corresponding domestic driving permit.

5. An international driving permit shall be issued only to the holder of a domestic permit for the issue of which the minimum conditions laid down in this Convention have been fulfilled”.

<sup>2</sup> Article 24, para 2:

“A Contracting State may however require that any driver admitted to its territory shall carry an international driving permit conforming to the model contained in Annex 10, especially in the case of a driver coming from a country where a domestic driving permit is not required or where the domestic permit issued to him does not conform to the model contained in Annex 9”.

WP.1 expressed support for the document and requested that it be updated with a more detailed comparison and with the benefits and costs of the three options.

18. Accordingly, the group of experts prepared ECE/TRANS/WP.1/2018/1/Rev1 which was presented and discussed at the seventy-seventh session of WP1. WP1 discussed the pros and cons of the three options and asked the informal group to consider the comments made.

### **III. Options discussed for the way forward for driving permits under the 1968 Convention**

19. For ease of reference, the three options described in ECE/TRANS/WP.1/2018/1/Rev1 are set out below:

*Option (a) One driving permit for both international and domestic travel*

20. Under this option, only one type of driving permit - a DDP compliant with Annex 6 - would be issued and used by Contracting Parties to the 1968 Convention. As the 1968 Convention already/currently provides, a DDP would be valid for both domestic and international traffic.

*Option (b) Two alternative forms of driving permits for international and domestic travel: (1) DDPs compliant with Annex 6 and (2) IDPs accompanied by DDPs not compliant with Annex 6*

21. Under this option a DDP compliant with Annex 6 would be issued and used by Contracting Parties to the 1968 Convention (as described in option (a). If the DDP is not compliant with Annex 6 it must be accompanied by an IDP.

*Option (c) IDPs valid as a standalone document for international travel, with a system of (1) DDPs compliant with Annex 6 valid for international and domestic travel and (2) DDPs (not necessarily compliant with Annex 6) for domestic use only (i.e. three types of driving permits for international and domestic travel, international travel only and domestic travel only).*

22. Under this option, there would be three types of driving permits: (1) a DDP compliant with Annex 6 that would be valid for both domestic and international travel; (2) a DDP for domestic use only which would not have to be compliant with Annex 6; and (3) a standalone IDP that is compliant with Annex 7, and which is valid for international travel (i.e. it does not have to be accompanied by a valid DDP).

### **IV. Consideration of an amalgamated approach**

23. These options were discussed further at the seventy-ninth session, where the amalgamated approach combining elements of these was agreed.

24. Considering the amalgamated approach, this will require agreement on the minimum-security features required at international level. It allows Contracting Parties who have a DDP which is not compliant with Annex 6 and do not wish to change, to continue to use the DDP domestically.

25. The Contracting Parties to the 1949 Convention would need to recognise compliant DDPs (through a voluntary agreement) in order to achieve greater global harmonisation of driving permits. If they do not recognise compliant DDPs under the 1968 Convention, they would need to recognise a compliant IDP under the 1968 Convention (again through a voluntary agreement). The need for an IDP (and no requirement to present a DDP) is closer in spirit to the 1949 Convention which only requires drivers to have an IDP when driving internationally.

26. Based on the understanding that the minimum security features of the DDP do not need to be as stringent as the minimum security features prescribed for the EU

driving licence in Directive 2006/126/EC, it is noted that Annex 1 to Directive 2006/126/EC is a stricter implementation of the minimum security requirements specified in ISO/IEC 18013-1:2018. For example, ISO/IEC 18013-1:2018 allows selection of the card material based on the required life (validity period) of the card, instead of prescribing the use of Polycarbonate (as is the case for the EU driving licence). Since it is flexible and generally being used as a standard world-wide, it is proposed that ISO/IEC 18013-1:2018 be adopted as the minimum-security requirements. These minimum-security features will apply to a DDP or an IDP and can help countries understand how close their current security features/formats are to a global standard. Harmonisation of the security features at international level may also encourage Contracting Parties to adopt a new DDP format.

## A. Explanation for referencing the ISO Standard in the Convention, provided by the International Organization for Standardization

27. The ISO/IEC 18013 suite of standards specific to driving licences reflects the participation of the spectrum of ISO Member States worldwide and thus it is a truly global standard. As a result, the ISO standards acknowledge and support different local needs. For example, the standards recognize that the validity period of a driving license varies, and that some driving licences include data in machine readable form. Consequently, the standards are not prescriptive to a single card material, method of printing (also referred to as personalisation) or the security features to be incorporated in the card. Instead, the standards allow the card material, personalisation method and security features to be matched to the validity period of the card and machine readable technologies included in the card.

28. To accommodate such differences, yet maintain a minimum level of quality on terms of durability and security that are fit for the validity of the card, the ISO 18013 suite of standards allows selection of a number of options in accordance with the service life of the card desired by the issuing authority. As a result of the various options included, the individual parts are quite extensive:

- **Part 1:** Physical Characteristics and Basic Data Set. This describes the basic terms for this standard including physical characteristics, durability to match the validity period, basic data elements in conformance with the enumeration and vehicle categories prescribed in the 1968 Convention, layout options for the front and back of the card, together with options for the physical security features. (81 pages).
- **Part 2:** Machine-Readable Technologies. This describes the machine-readable technologies that may be used for this standard, such as a 2-dimensional barcode, contact chip or proximity chip, including the logical data structure and data mapping for each technology to ensure international interoperability. (66 pages).
- **Part 3:** Access Control, Authentication and Integrity Validation. This describes the electronic security features that may be incorporated in the machine-readable technologies under this standard, including mechanisms for controlling access to data, authenticating/verifying the origin of a driving licence and confirming data integrity. (80 pages).
- **Part 4:** Test Methods. This describes the test methods that can be used to determine if a driving licence card conforms to the requirements for machine readable technologies specified in Part 2 and to the electronic security features specified in Part 3. (197 pages).

29. The nature of the options included in the ISO standards and the difficulty in selecting from the options to incorporate in the proposed amendment is illustrated by examples contained in Appendix C. Thus, the Informal Group of Experts proposes the inclusion of references to the standards rather than incorporate sections of the standards into the Convention and its annexes 6 and 7.

30. In response to concerns about the inclusion of ISO Standards references, it is common to find these in agreements, treaties, legislation and regulations. Should there be concern that the ISO Standards may be amended in a way not favourable to us, a similar approach to the practice followed regarding the ISO references in the ADR may also be applied; namely that the reference is restricted to the current published versions, with the inclusion of the Standard's date of publication.

## **B. Explanation for proposed format of a standalone IDP, provided by the International Organization for Standardization**

31. The provisions of the 1968 Convention are clear regarding the recognition of a DDP which complies with Annex 6 by the other contracting parties to the Convention. Thus, contracting parties who issue an Annex 6 compliant DDP do not have to issue an IDP to the holders of such a DDP who wish to travel internationally. They may simply present their compliant DDP to any law enforcement authority or service provider, such as a car rental agency when travelling abroad.

32. Notwithstanding this significant benefit, there are a number of contracting parties to both the 1949 and 1968 Conventions who will not be issuing a DDP compliant with Annex 6. Upon investigation, ISO found that the key reasons for the continued issuing of such non-compliant DDPs include the following:

- The number of domestic drivers that will be driving internationally is so small that it does not warrant the issuing of an Annex 6 compliant DDP which does not reflect the culture of the population, i.e. to record entries in Latin characters or to include the transliteration to the Latin alphabet on the DDP, when Latin characters are not used in the domestic language(s) of the Contracting Party. The following statistics supplied to ISO by the National Police Agency of Japan (the DDP issuing authority) provide a perspective on the quantum of domestic drivers relative to international drivers in that country:
  - DDPs issued – 82 150 008 (2015 figure)
  - IDPs issued per annum – 304 000 (0.37% of DDPs in 2015)

33. The driving licence document is also used for other purposes domestically, such as a picture ID, by a far larger number of the population than the number of drivers that will ever drive internationally, and hence it serves other purposes in the national interest to issue a DDP which is not compliant with Annex 6.

34. Although such contracting parties to the 1949 and 1968 Conventions may not find it meritorious to issue an Annex 6 compliant DDP, there is significant merit in such contracting parties issuing an annex 7 compliant standalone IDP of which the format corresponds to Annex 6. The benefits of such IDP are not limited to the issuing Contracting Party but also extend to other Contracting Parties as follows:

- For contracting parties who do not issue a DDP compliant to Annex 6:
  - Cost of issuing an annex 7 compliant IDP, the format of which corresponds to Annex 6 would be much smaller than an IDP in the form of a passport with the costly security features of a polymer based title page. This conclusion is drawn from the fact that the dimensions of an ID-1 sized card, is almost half the size of the passport and thus the amount of material used for a card size IDP is less than half of that of a passport style IDP with corresponding security features. In addition, for contracting parties issuing an ID-1 sized DDP (not compliant with Annex 6) that opt to issue the IDP themselves instead of contracting a third party, the ability to leverage existing raw material, security features and production infrastructure will also make issuing an Annex 6 compliant IDP less expensive than a passport format IDP.
  - Harmonisation of the legal instruments for international driving as a single format driving permit – either:

- An annex 6 compliant DDP, or
  - an annex 7 compliant IDP card the format of which corresponds to Annex 6 (issued by contracting parties who do not issue a compliant DDP), is used for international travel.
  - All drivers travelling abroad carry a single document of a compact card format instead of 2 documents – the IDP and the corresponding DPP.
- For contracting parties who issue a DDP compliant to Annex 6:
    - No need to issue such an IDP as their compliant DDP already conforms to the requirements for recognition by other Contracting Parties, and their DDP can readily be interpreted by law enforcement officers and car rental agents alike domestically and internationally.
    - Ease of recognition and interpretation of the IDP issued by countries who issue a non-compliant DDP by law enforcement officers and car rental agents alike, because the format and content of such an IDP would correspond with the format of their own DDP in Latin characters, with numbered data fields on the card and corresponding vehicles categories without the need for a translation.
    - All drivers on the road in such contracting party's jurisdiction carry a single document of the same format, either the Annex 6 compliant DDP or the Annex 7 compliant IDP (of which the format corresponds to Annex 6) by foreign drivers travelling abroad instead of two documents – both the non-compliant DDP and compliant IDP.

35. In conclusion, it needs to be emphasised that a contracting party who issues a DDP compliant with Annex 6 would not have to issue an IDP. However, a contracting party who does not issue an Annex 6 compliant DDP for any of the reasons mentioned above, will have to issue an Annex 7 compliant IDP (the format of which corresponds to Annex 6), or contract a duly empowered association to issue such IDP on its behalf.

## **V. Additional proposed amendments**

36. In addition to the above amendments to introduce the amalgamated approach, the Informal Group of Experts also considered the vehicle categories and subcategories, and driver and vehicle restrictions. The Informal Group of Experts proposes amendments to the 1968 Convention and Annexes 6 and 7 as a result of these considerations (Appendix B).

### **A. Contracting out of IDP production**

37. This change explicitly allows agents of Contracting Parties to issue IDPs.

### **B. Validity period of DDPs**

38. To reflect photocard driving licences becoming the norm around the world, the Convention requires amendment to reflect this, by inserting validity periods for licences along the lines of those required for passports.

39. The proposed validity periods are that a DPP shall be valid for at least five years, but in general no more than ten years. There are two exceptions, the first stating that in the case of a medical condition the validity period may be shorter; the second noting that in some countries the maximum validity can go up to fifteen years.

### **C. Limitation for licences for newly qualified drivers**

40. This proposed change, allows Contracting Parties to impose restrictions on newly qualified drivers. There is nothing in the Convention which says that such restrictions cannot be applied to newly qualified drivers from other countries.

### **D. Limitations for licences – medical and offences**

41. This proposed change allows Contracting Parties to reduce the validity period of driving licences for medical reasons and to allow for punishments to be imposed on a driver for road safety related reasons. This brings the Convention more into line with what Contracting Parties already do.

### **E. Limits to under 21s to drive certain vehicles**

42. While the Conventions permits Contracting Parties to allow those aged 18-20 to drive larger vehicles, the amendment will allow other Contracting Parties the right not to recognise these drivers as being legal on their territory. This relates to the new sub-categories that are proposed.

### **F. Changes to the IDP**

43. The principle change would be to make the IDP a blue (or another colour) polymer card. The final choice of the colour has not been agreed by WP.1 yet; the informal group of experts thinks that these should not be pink so as not to confuse with the DDP.

### **G. Proposed amendments to the vehicle categories and subcategories**

44. Having reviewed the current vehicle categories and subcategories, the Informal Group of Experts proposes elevating subcategories to full categories and the inclusion of new categories. This means updating section 8 and deleting section 9 of Annex 6, so that subcategories A1, B1, C1 and D1 are set out as intermediate categories for categories A, B, C and D to reflect extensive existing practice.

45. In addition, the Informal Group of Experts proposes the introduction of new categories which are already used by the European Union and others. These are:

- AM: This category is included to require a driving licence for persons who drive 2 and 3 wheelers and light quadricycles in traffic, in the absence of which persons without any experience would simply rent and drive such vehicles, often with disastrous outcomes.
- A2: There is a gap between 125cc category A1 and A. This is too large, allowing a driver (who may not be able to safely control a 1000cc motor cycle) to obtain a category A driving licence upon being tested on a 175cc motor cycle, and get on the road on a 1000cc motor cycle.

46. This amendment is also for Annex 7 as per the amalgamated approach. And will result in amended sections 8 – 11 that replicates Annex 6.

### **H. Proposed inclusion of driver and vehicle restrictions**

47. There is an extensive list of restrictions in use internationally, and ISO has assessed these lists of regional institutions and published lists with codes without the duplication of codes. ISO analysed these restrictions used more than 99 per cent worldwide, and based on this the Informal Group of Experts proposes their inclusion

in both Annexes 6 and 7 to the 1968 Convention to include these in new section 11's in both.

## VI. Conclusionary remarks

48. This paper proposed amendments to the 1968 Convention and its accompanying annexes 6 and 7, based on the amalgamated approach agreed at the 79th session of WP.1, and in line with the agreed principles (paragraph 2 of this paper). This together with the requested minimum-security features that were also asked for by WP.1 at the 79th session.

49. As raised in the introduction to this paper, this is a standalone IDP. But, is this still what WP.1 wants?

50. The proposed amendments presuppose that acceptance by WP.1, that there will be a standalone IDP. But, as noted, the decision by WP.1 will not impact on the DPP. It will impact on the IDP as set out in paragraph 8 of this paper.

51. As part of the amendments, we propose the inclusion of reference to ISO/IEC 18013, and ask for WP.1's agreement to this approach to deal with the minimum-security features. There are two options on how this can done:

(a) Without date; so that the security requirements update in line with updates made to the standards suite;

(b) With date; so that the security requirements are frozen in time to the selected version of the standards suite;

(c) With date as an alternative of II, by including a qualifying phrase after the standard. For example, standards ISO/IEC18013-2:2020 and ISO/IEC18013-3:2017 or any subsequent version of these standards.

52. The Informal Group of Experts has incorporated the three approaches as an option to agree in the proposed amendments to annex 6 (section 6 and 7) and annex 7 (section 8) to the Convention. The Group understands that some members of WP.1 might be nervous to take the route of not including a date, because they are in theory sacrificing their ability to choose what the minimum-security features are in the Convention. As such, the Informal Group of Experts does not have a fixed recommendation, and welcomes WP.1 to select the approach that we implement.

53. In addition, the Informal Group of Experts, as discussed previously in this paper proposes amalgamating the subcategories of vehicles into the categories so that they are recognised as such, and their update to reflect modern conditions. In addition, as is modern practice in many Countries, the Informal Group of Experts also proposes the inclusion of driver and vehicle restrictions and their codes and pictograms. The Informal Group of Experts views both sets of amendments as important to keep the Convention up to date.

54. Finally, many countries are Contracting Parties to both the 1949 and 1968 Conventions. However, countries who are only Contracting Parties to the 1968 Convention need to be willing to recognise compliant DDPs or IDPs from 1949 Contracting Party countries to ensure a harmonised approach. However, the standalone IDP of the 1949 Convention does not have any security features. In addition, some of the 1949 Contracting Parties are not issuing DDPs in compliance with the 1949 Convention. Consequently, such parties should be encouraged to issue DDPs and/or IDPs in compliance with 1968 Convention which may then be considered for recognition by the 1968 Contracting Parties.

---