



**TECHNICAL ADVISORY GROUP ON MACHINE READABLE  
TRAVEL DOCUMENTS (TAG/MRTD)**

**TWENTY-FIRST MEETING**

**Montréal, 10 to 12 October 2012**

**Agenda Item 2: Activities of the NTWG**

**STANDARDS FOR EMERGENCY/TEMPORARY PASSPORTS**

Presented by New Technologies Working Group (NTWG)

**1. INTRODUCTION**

1.1.1 Over the last ten years or so, travel document security features have now become more complex and difficult to counterfeit or forge. At the same time, lost and stolen passports are being routinely reported to Interpol, and real-time access to this data is now possible. As such, it is appropriate to review the current position in relation to emergency travel documents (ETDs). Such documents in general are not produced to the same standard as full validity passports and vary significantly in terms of their security and quality. Consequently, they may be a target for fraudulent use, being easier to counterfeit or alter.

**2. BACKGROUND**

2.1 As part of the research undertaken for this paper, a number of states were contacted and asked to provide details of the emergency (or similarly named) documents they issue. This revealed a plethora of such documents with many inconsistencies and variations (even within countries) in areas such as security features, format, validity periods, and name of document. In many cases (where booklets are used) the security standards are in line with ICAO standards.

2.2.1 Crises and natural disasters occurring worldwide continue to mean that ETDs have to be issued, often in less than ideal conditions, and possibly within the framework of missions that do not have the sophisticated equipment that enables printing of full validity passports. The number of different names and formats that ETDs take may be a source of confusion for border inspectors, and where there is confusion there is the potential for weakness.

2.2.2 Whilst there is no hard evidence that ETDs are currently being misused, there is clearly the potential for this to take place. There is a strong case for bringing a degree of standardisation to the format of ETDs.

2.2.1 At TAG20 (September 2011), the New Technologies Working Group presented a paper which highlighted the work taking place within the NTWG regarding the current lack of standards relating to issuance of ETDs, consequent variations in the documents issued, and the level of threat that such documents pose. The appendix to the working paper was a discussion paper which included considerations in relation to issuance and format of both booklet and one-page-format documents. This discussion paper was issued to invite feedback from stakeholders across governments, including travel document issuers, consular departments, border control and immigration, international organisations, and contacts within the aviation industry.

Areas addressed in the discussion paper included:

- Issuance considerations
- Minimum security standards for a one-page document (a booklet should conform to MRP standards)
- Use of a standard name
- Possibility of a logo
- Period of validity

2.2.2 The TAG-MRTD noted the work done to date, agreed that there is a continuing need for standards and best practices to be developed for the issuance, format and security features of emergency travel documents in order to protect them from potential abuse, and approved further work to be carried out by the NTWG to develop a set of standards or best practices to be included in a forthcoming supplement and in the next edition of Volume 1 of Doc 9303.

### 3. CURRENT STATUS

3.1.1 The discussion paper was issued in July 2011, and responses were presented to the NTWG by the sub-working group in June 2012. Responses were received from 16 states; the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC); 3 airline carriers; and the British Air Transport Association. The appendix to this paper contains the Discussion Paper and responses which advance the discussion (rather than those that simply describe current practice). General principles and themes which have emerged from the responses and the work carried out so far include:

The emergency travel document must:

- Be valid for as short a period as possible;
- Be of limited value to fraudsters;
- Be only available in certain circumstances;
- Be distinctive and recognisable – for facilitation and security;
- Offer flexibility – often issued in less than ideal circumstances;
- And the most secure document that can be issued should be issued – a secure document securely issued.

3.2.1 Work to turn the responses to the discussion paper into recommendations and best practice is currently being undertaken by the sub-working group. The aim is to have standards for ETDs which protect them from potential abuse by fraudsters. These common standards should be flexible enough to reflect individual states' practices, and differing circumstances of issuance, and allow recognition and use of ETDs at borders.

4. **ACTION BY THE TAG/MRTD**

4.1 The TAG/MRTD is invited to:

- a) Note the work done so far, including the attached Discussion Paper and responses.
- b) Agree that there is a continuing need for standards/best practice to be developed for the issuance, format and security features of emergency travel documents in order to protect them from potential abuse, while protecting their humanitarian added value.
- c) Approve further work to be carried out by NTWG to develop a set of standards or best practice with the aim of their inclusion within a forthcoming Supplement and in the next edition of Document 9303, Volume 1.

— END —

## **APPENDIX A**

### Responses to Emergency Travel Documents Discussion Paper

#### **1. INTRODUCTION**

The Emergency Travel Documents (ETDs) discussion paper was issued in July 2012, and explained the background to the project, putting forward suggested recommendations and areas for comment.

We received comments from the following states, international organizations, and carriers/industry colleagues:

##### **States**

Australia  
Belgium  
Canada  
Czech Republic  
Denmark  
Hungary  
Ireland  
Italy  
Japan  
Netherlands

New Zealand  
Norway  
Slovakia  
Sweden  
Switzerland  
UK

##### **International Organisations**

International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC)

##### **Carriers etc**

Air Canada  
British Air Transport Association  
British Airways  
Virgin Atlantic

A selection of the responses from states and international organisations are included below. Many responses from states gave background information on their own practice. This is considered to be helpful background information; however it has not been included in this paper unless it advances the discussion regarding how the recommendations should look.

#### **2. Principles and themes**

General principles and themes which have emerged from the responses and the work carried out so far include:

The emergency travel document must:

- Be valid for as short a period as possible;
- Be of limited value to fraudsters;
- Be only available in certain circumstances;
- Be distinctive and recognisable – for facilitation and security;
- Offer flexibility – often issued in less than ideal circumstances;
- And the most secure document that can be issued should be issued – a secure document securely issued.

## Responses received

### 3.1 Issuance

At present there is no standard for Emergency Travel documents, and they are produced in a variety of formats. Whilst some countries have introduced documents that meet existing MRP standards, there are many others where this is not the case. In some cases it is not possible to provide a booklet in sufficient time for the needs of the citizen. Such a document may also be used for exceptional events (e.g. evacuation of citizens). There will always be the potential for situations to arise where it is impossible to produce a booklet. However, the aim should be to reduce these as much as possible by making issue of a booklet the standard, primary document.

Responses:

Canada - The guidance should reflect that at all times **the most secure document that can be issued should be issued while meeting all entitlement and security requirements**. For example if a country issues an ePpt this document should be issued, if not a regular MRTD, if not a limited validity MRTD etc.

The **decision regarding which document should be issued should always reside with the travel document issuing authority (TDIA)**. The applicant should not have a choice. For example if an ETD is less expensive than a regular passport the applicant may prefer the less secure, less expensive document.

Netherlands: In general, the Netherlands is in favour of recommendations that are applicable to emergency travel documents. However, the Netherlands is also of the opinion that recommendations of ICAO must be **limited to the topics of the security level of emergency documents** and / or the way of checking and verifying emergency documents.

New Zealand: **ETDs must be machine-readable, and there should be no exceptions** – particularly in the context of Doc 9303 and Annex 9. Good quality machine-readable ETDs are technically achievable, and mobile solutions are low cost. Accessing electricity is perhaps the only condition, but most issuance (even evacuations) take place in robust and controlled environments such as airports.

Switzerland: **Fully agree that the booklet should be the standard, primary document.**

ICRC: There will always be the potential for **situations to arise where it is impossible to produce a machine-readable booklet**. This is very much true for the ICRC TD as the situations in which the ICRC would issue travel documents are often related to emergencies, e.g. conflicts, disasters

### 3.2 Issuance Situations

At present, emergency travel documents are issued in a number of situations, for both first-time and renewal applications:

- Emergency situation for the individual traveller, such as family illness
- Emergency situation abroad, such as war, flood, earthquake, etc, to get the traveller home
- Lost and stolen passports while abroad
- As contingency arrangements if a full validity passport cannot be issued in-country

- Deportation, removal, repatriation
- Unrepresented foreign nationals who cannot access their own consular services

It should be noted that the type of document issued in the above situations will not be the same in all cases.

Responses:

Australia: An Australian Provisional Travel Document (PTD) can be issued to an Australian citizen overseas who is in a country that does not have an Australian mission physically located in that country and there is no other option. A PTD can be issued by a resident Canadian mission on behalf of the Australian government to allow the **Australian to travel only to the nearest Australian mission to obtain a replacement travel document**. A PTD is not valid for travel to Australia.

Belgium: European ETD's are not intended for Belgian citizens but for **other European citizens** which would allow them to return to their home country.

Canada: The **traveller's situation** should be taken into consideration when the TDIA determines which travel document should be issued.

Italy: (add) Lost, stolen or destroyed documents

Netherlands: In general, the Netherlands is in favour of recommendations that are applicable to emergency travel documents. However, the Netherlands is also of the opinion that recommendations of ICAO must be limited to the topics of the security level of emergency documents and / or the way of checking and verifying emergency documents. In the opinion of the Netherlands, **the topic of issuance situations is not linked to these topics**, and does not belong to the mandate of ICAO. In the opinion of the Netherlands, ICAO should refrain from giving recommendations on this topic.

Norway: (add) Unrepresented foreign nationals

Slovakia: In a few and special cases ETD with the validity maximum 6 months can be **issued as an ID** during the period for waiting for a new regular passport applied through the Slovak mission (example: a student on his 8-months study stay abroad lost his passport soon after starting the study and needs an ID until a new regular passport will be sent from Slovakia to the Slovak mission abroad).

Switzerland: It should always be **clearly marked**, when a country issues a emergency travel document to a **foreign national**.

ICRC: Suggested extra category of persons to whom the ETDs are issued:  
Vulnerable persons (displaced, refugees, asylum seekers, stateless persons, migrants, etc) who have no valid passport or other suitable travel document and are not able to obtain or renew any such document.

### 3.3 Place of Issuance

As the name implies, emergency travel documents are often issued in locations abroad where access to the type of equipment that can produce a very secure passport may not be present. Emergency travel documents may be issued from a number of locations including:

- Issued abroad:
  - From an embassy, high commission or honorary consul
  - From a remote area in crisis – the person issuing the documents must work in tandem with his/her home office to ensure that all required eligibility and security procedures are met
  - From airports in crisis situations
- Issued Domestically - e.g. Sweden at the airport

It should be noted that the type of document issued in the above locations will not be the same in all cases.

Responses:

Australia: The PTD is only issued by respective Canadian missions on the Australian government's behalf and Australian Honorary Consuls, or by an **Australian Emergency Response Team (ERT)** sent directly to an affected area during a crisis (they would take blank PTDs with them).

Canada: The **traveller's situation** should be taken into consideration when the TDIA determines which travel document should be issued.

Netherlands: In general, the Netherlands is in favour of recommendations that are applicable to emergency travel documents. However, the Netherlands is also of the opinion that recommendations of ICAO must be limited to the topics of the security level of emergency documents and / or the way of checking and verifying emergency documents. In the opinion of the Netherlands, **the topic of place of issuance is not linked to these topics**, and does not belong to the mandate of ICAO. In the opinion of the Netherlands, ICAO should refrain from giving recommendations on this topic.

UK: The UKBA would have some concern if the practice of issuing ETD's **domestically at airports** was expanded upon.

Something to additionally consider under Place of Issuance and Issuance System is that each ETD should clearly state **which Government/State has issued the ETD and the location of issuance** i.e. an ETD issued by the Nigerian Authorities should indicate that the document was issued by NGA in London, not just London.

ICRC: Agree

Several states also noted that documents are or should be issued both abroad and **in-country**: Austria, Belgium, Denmark, New Zealand, Norway, Switzerland

### 3.4 Issuance Systems

While states of emergency may necessitate issuance of document in less than ideal circumstances, and in short timescales, it is important that issuance staff are able to be assured that applicants for emergency travel documents are genuinely entitled to such documents, and that the process does not have less integrity than that of a regular passport application process. There may be different issues to consider for renewals and first-time applicants.

## **Recommendation**

- **Verification:** It is recommended that arrangements exist so that such documents can be easily checked (if needed) to ensure they were properly issued. In many domestic passport systems, border authorities have access to the national passport database system. However this may not include overseas issued documents and especially emergency travel documents which may be issued overseas on a different system to the standard passport
- **Enrolment / Application:** It is recommended that details of the emergency travel document application, and of the document issued, are recorded on the applicant's file for future reference. It is important that, even (or perhaps especially) in cases of manual issuance, issuance or application for such documents form part of the applicant's case history.
- It is recommended that issuers satisfy themselves that proper checks are carried out against Interpol and national databases where possible.

Responses:

### Agreement to recommendations from:

- Canada
- Hungary
- Ireland
- New Zealand
- Switzerland
- UK
- ICRC

Netherlands: In the opinion of the Netherlands, the topic of issuance systems is not linked to these topics, and does not belong to the mandate of ICAO. In the opinion of the Netherlands, ICAO should refrain from giving recommendations on this topic.

## **3.5 Fees**

Fees charged to applicants for an emergency travel document vary. While it is possible to provide such a document for free, it is not wise to implement a system where it becomes more cost-effective for the citizen overseas to acquire an emergency travel document rather than a full validity passport under false pretences. Options include:

- Free travel document – possibly in crisis situations only
- Fees significantly less than that of a full validity passport
- Fees same as that of a full validity passport
- Fees include the application for a full validity passport
- Fees significantly more than a full validity passport

Responses:

### Don't include guidance on Fees:

- Japan
- Netherlands
- Switzerland

Canada: Fees should not be defined however, a general recommendation to make a less secure document less desirable (higher fee) could be appropriate if the applicant is permitted to select the type of document to be issued (see also 3.1).

Netherlands: In the opinion of the Netherlands, the topic of fees is not linked to these topics, and does not belong to the mandate of ICAO. In the opinion of the Netherlands, ICAO should refrain from giving recommendations on this topic.

UK: No consideration appears to have been given to ensuring that the fee for passport issuance is equal to the cost of the operation, regardless of how this compares with the cost of issuing a full validity passport.

ICRC: As a humanitarian tool aimed at protecting/assisting the most vulnerable categories of population, The ICRC Travel Document is issued free of charge and the ICRC would very much like to continue doing so. Since the ICRC issues only several thousands of TDs annually, this approach makes sense.

At the same time, this might not be the most sensible solution for the States. Therefore, we believe the decision on the fee should be at the discretion of the issuing authority, with a recommendation for a free travel document in crisis situations.

### **3.6 Terminology**

#### **Background**

The terminology used to define a so-called emergency travel document varies considerably, with a number of countries using different names to identify multiple types of emergency documents.

These include:

- Emergency Passport
- Temporary Travel Document
- Emergency Travel Document for a Single Journey
- Emergency Travel Certificate
- Temporary Passport
- Provisional Passport
- Provisional Travel Document

This project will recommend using a consistent approach to naming of such documents, and this discussion paper seeks views on what that name should be.

There are arguments in favour of having a standard approach to naming all emergency travel documents, where national legislation allows it. It is acknowledged that some states refer to the current name of the book in national legislation (for example a Passports Act). However in order to remove confusion and improve security it is recommended to standardise the name of the document, while accurately describing the uses to which the document is put. Whilst it is recommended that only one descriptor be used, it is recognised that states often issue more than one type of emergency travel document. Advantages of denoting ETDs as such on the front cover of the document when it is in booklet form would include alerting border inspectors and other authorities that the holder is carrying an ETD which may need to be impounded.

#### **Consideration / Question**

Should there be a consistent approach to naming of documents?

Yes

- Canada
- Denmark
- Hungary
- Netherlands
- New Zealand
- Slovakia
- Switzerland
- UK
- ICRC

Canada: It may be useful to standardise names based on the **purpose of issuance** rather than seeking out a single name to address documents issued for different situations.

Hungary: we would like to draw attention to the fact that the “**emergency travel document**” naming and the “**ETD**” abbreviation are not suitable, and can be confusing for the member states of the European Union.

The European Union established a uniform format document issuing by a consulate of a MS which, in every case, doesn't correspond to the applicant's EU nationality.

Netherlands: It should be recognized that states may have different types of emergency travel documents. It should be possible to name an emergency document depending on the **type of the emergency travelling document**. In that regard, the Netherlands is of the opinion that it is not possible to pick a single name for all emergency travel documents. **Different names for different documents** should be allowed.

Notwithstanding this, the Netherlands can agree to a **consistent approach** to naming these type of documents in general.

UK: We believe that ETD should be used to **describe all documents**, but then Emergency Travel Passport and Emergency Travel Certificate should be utilised according to the **nature of the document issued**.

### **Descriptor**

Which is your preferred descriptor?

- a. Emergency, Temporary, Short-Term, or Provisional?
- b. Passport, Travel Document, or Certificate?

### **Emergency Passport**

Australia, Austria, Czech Republic, Ireland, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland

### **Emergency Travel Document**

Slovakia, New Zealand, Netherlands, UK

### **Provisional Passport**

Belgium

### **Travel Document**

Norway

## **Temporary Passport**

Hungary

## **Emergency Travel Certificate**

Ireland: (for one page)

### **3.7 Format and personalisation**

At present, emergency travel documents are commonly being issued in 2 formats, a passport-sized book, and an A4 or letter sized one-page sheet. There may be reasons to continue to have two options for format.

Should be 2 formats:

Australia, Canada, Sweden, UK

Should be 1 format (book only):

New Zealand

### **3.8 Format option: Passport-sized Book**

Advantages:

- The booklet can be personalised in a more secure manner than a one page document
- It provides greater scope for inclusion of security features
- The inclusion of an MRZ will ensure that the document can be 'swiped' through a passport reader and automatically checked against watch lists, the check digit provides added security etc
- The placing of a second (at present optional) letter as well as P in the MRZ is an opportunity to alert border authorities and whoever it may concern that the document is an emergency travel document.

Disadvantages

- Cost – more expensive than a one page document
- Security – If a book is used, its component parts could potentially be used in producing fraudulent documents. A single page has little value in this respect
- In crisis situations, it may be that it is not possible to issue books, due to unavailability or inability to access the required printing equipment

Responses: Broad Agreement

### **3.9 Format option: Single Page/Non booklet format**

Advantages

- Cost – cheaper than a passport-sized book
- Quicker to personalise than passport-sized book
- Can be issued in crisis situations where facilities to personalise a book are inaccessible/unavailable

- If issued securely, with secure photo, of little value to fraudsters

#### Disadvantages

- Typically, one sheet A4 paper documents are extremely insecure as many of them still rely on photos that are stapled or glued. They may also be printed on non-watermarked paper and contain few if any security safeguards.

#### Recommendations

The preferred format is a passport-sized book. A one page document:

- should only be issued in situations where it is not possible or practical to issue a full validity passport or passport-sized book
- should normally only be valid for single journey only
- Validity should be minimum necessary to make the journey
- The document should be impounded on arrival at the destination, if state legislation permits it, by the border agency to avoid it being ‘recycled’. The document should be endorsed to the effect that it is to be impounded on arrival at the final destination by the border authority. As a further precaution, consideration should be given to returning the impounded document to the parent issuing Department (usually the Consular Department of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs) to confirm that the document was used.
- Minimum security features should be present
- Should contain biographical data as on a passport data page (photo, name, date of birth, etc.)

It is acknowledged that where a single sheet paper document is being used, the use of ‘stick in’ photos may in some cases be necessary but the guidance relating to security features contained in Document 9303 Part 1 is relevant. The physical security of the document should be as high as can be achieved given the type of document and the circumstances surrounding its issue. For example, use of high quality watermarked paper, use of a dry seal on the attached photograph, micro text printing, fibres, planchettes all of which should highlight disturbance should the attached photo be removed. In all cases the document should be numbered so that checks can be made to confirm the document was issued from stock held by a specific Post.

Responses:

Switzerland; Hungary: Agree

Hungary: We propose the application of the uniform format booklet, and we agree the recommendations following the 3.9

Canada: This document type should **be limited to use for single journeys** given the very limited number of security features that they can contain and the ease with which they can get damaged. Standards should probably be devised for A4/Letter sized travel documents and could include definitions for an MRZ to be added to documents that are printed digitally.

Ireland: Agree it should only be issued in circumstances **where it is not possible or practical** to issue a passport-sized book.

Netherlands: The Netherlands has taken note of the observations of ICAO and can agree with the mentioned advantages and disadvantages. However, the Netherlands is of the opinion that it **should always be possible to issue single page emergency documents** if circumstances make

this necessary. Also, in the same regard, the Netherlands is of the opinion that it should always be possible to issue handwritten emergency travel documents (without MRZ and sometimes even without a photograph), if circumstances make this necessary (e.g. crisis situations, war or a comprehensive IT-failure).

### **3.10 Period of validity**

#### **Background**

As the name implies, Emergency Travel documents are issued for a variety of reasons and it is no longer the case that they are used for single journeys from one country back to the country of nationality/citizenship. Some countries insist upon travellers having at least 6 months' validity in their passports in order to issue visas or leave to enter.

#### **Recommendation**

Given the various uses of the document, it would not be appropriate to set a standard validity.

- However for books there should be a maximum validity of 12 months but it is recommended that issuing states should restrict validity to the minimum period required consistent with the purpose for which the document was issued. The use of a single journey restriction observation would be consistent with this type of document – if required.
- For one-page documents it is recommended that issuing states should restrict validity to the minimum period required consistent with the purpose for which the document was issued. The use of a single journey restriction observation is recommended.

Responses:

**Agreement** from Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, New Zealand, Sweden, Switzerland, UK

Netherlands: In the opinion of the Netherlands, ICAO should refrain from giving recommendations on this topic.

### **3.11 Numbering**

Numbering on both passport-sized books and one-page documents means that there can be an audit trail of which documents were issued to who. This can be particularly important where documents, either pre- or post-issuance, are lost or stolen.

#### **Recommendation:**

All emergency travel documents, both passport book sized and one-page, should be numbered pre-issuance, i.e. by the manufacturer.

Responses: Broad Agreement

### **3.12 Security features**

#### **Recommendations**

Guidance on security features currently exists in ICAO Document 9303 Part1, Volume 1 and it is not proposed to re-iterate that guidance which can be found using the following link:

<http://www2.icao.int/en/MRTD/Downloads>. It is recommended that Emergency Travel documents when issued in booklet form should be consistent with the guidance on security features

Current guidance in ICAO Doc 9303 Volume 1 III-10, 5.4.1 states that stick in photos are ‘not recommended’ due to the ease with which they can be removed. Given that emergency travel documents may not contain the same or as many security safeguards/features as a standard MRP, steps need to be taken to protect the emergency document where it may be relatively easy to do so. Consequently, the integration of the photo into the emergency travel document booklet should be a standard requirement given the widespread recognition of the weakness of ‘stick in’ photos.

States shall provide to other States and concerned organisations such as airlines information on the design and security features of emergency and short term passports.

Responses: Broad Agreement

Several comments regarding how to make the photo more secure, e.g. by using a laminate

Netherlands: The Netherlands can not agree with these recommendations of ICAO. It should be noted that the ICAO guidance on security features has been composed for regular travel documents. The ICAO guidance has not been composed for emergency travel documents. In the opinion of the Netherlands, it would be both unrealistic and undesirable to apply every aspect of the ICAO guidance on security features (even the ‘basic features’) to emergency documents. There are several reasons for this opinion. First, the emergency travel documents often have to be produced and personalised in less than optimal conditions and circumstances. Also, the period of validity of emergency travel documents is less than the period of validity of ‘normal’ travel documents. Notwithstanding these arguments, the Netherlands is of the opinion that the ‘basic features’ as mentioned in the ICAO guidance on security features could be used as a starting point for the development of security requirements applicable to emergency travel documents.

ICRC: we are of course aware and supportive of having a set of obligatory security features but at the same time we believe that these security features should be lower compared to those for the Machine Readable Travel Documents.

### **3.13 Logo (book only)**

It has been suggested that use of a logo/symbol would also help border inspectors immediately recognise the document.

Arguments against this include:

- Is this needed? In many cases the document is already clearly different – for example colour, name on the cover, number of pages
- A small number of countries do not distinguish the document at first glance as an emergency travel document
- If the name was standardised, would the use of a logo/symbol be superfluous?
- If emergency travel documents in the future become ePassports, there would be two logos on the front, which would be confusing

Advantages of having a logo would mean that the logo denotes:

- The document is a emergency travel document

- The validity period will be shorter than normal
- The document may need to be impounded on arrival
- The number of pages in the document will be less than the standard number
- It may have different (or unique) security features than a standard passport
- It may have been issued in less than ideal circumstances

Responses:

**Yes**

- Denmark
- Japan
- Netherlands

**No**

- Australia
- Belgium
- Canada
- Ireland
- New Zealand
- Sweden

**Maybe**

- Hungary
- Switzerland
- UK

### 3.14 Cover colour (book only)

It is acknowledged that in many cases, the front cover of the book and the limited number of pages clearly defines the book as a non-standard document. Nevertheless, a number of countries now issue Emergency Travel documents in a different colour to their national passport for the reason that this may make the book even less attractive to a fraudster. Using a different colour from that on the national passport can act as a deterrent to those who may attempt to misuse travel documents since it is likely to be subject to more interest at border inspection or airline check in.

Responses:

#### Uniform Colour

- Hungary
- New Zealand

#### Different Colour to national passport

- Austria
- Belgium
- Canada
- Ireland
- Netherlands
- Norway
- Sweden
- UK

#### Same Colour

- Australia
- Switzerland

Belgium: The dark green is the current colour of the Belgian provisional passport. We can keep that colour for the ICAO new document to come, if not yet used for ordinary passports in other countries. Otherwise we suggest a general colour: e.g. Black or White.

### 3.15 Book size and number of pages (book only)

#### Recommendation

- It is recommended that books comply with the requirements for MRTD passport books.
- It is recommended that there is a maximum of 8 visa pages.

Responses:

Agreement from Belgium, Canada, Ireland, New Zealand, Sweden and ICRC

Japan: We understand that validity period of ETD is shorter than that of ordinary TD, however, there is no ground to recommend “maximum of 8 visa pages”, and it should be considered about the case that both ordinary TDs and ETDs may be produced / personalised by the same system. Therefore, it would not be preferable to recommend the maximum number of pages.

Netherlands: The Netherlands is of the opinion that it is unnecessarily strict and unrealistic to apply the ICAO guidance on emergency travel documents. In particular, because emergency travel documents often have to be produced in less than optimal conditions and circumstances. As an example: ICAO Doc 9303 states that the passport should have an MRZ. In some circumstances (for example in circumstances with a lack or disruption of IT-facilities) it is not possible to generate emergency travel documents that are machine readable.

Concerning the recommendation with respect to the maximum number of VISA pages in emergency travel documents the Netherlands has two remarks:

1. no reasoning is given for the recommendation that there is a maximum of 8 VISA pages;
2. in the opinion of the Netherlands the topic of maximum number of VISA pages in emergency travel documents does not belong to the mandate of ICAO.

### 3.16 Post-issuance / Usage

Practices of resolving used emergency travel documents with issuance systems vary widely, particularly depending on whether documents need to be retained by the traveller in order to collect a full validity passport, and also depending on whether emergency travel documents are issued by a different ministry or department than those issuing passports.

The question of whether documents should be retained by border authorities once the traveller has arrived at their destination will need to take the following into account:

- Does the document have any value post-usage for a potential fraudster?
- Will the traveller need to continue to carry the document until the issuance of a full validity passport, e.g. for identification purposes, or to swap for a new document?
- Are there other ways of resolving the used travel document with the issuance system(s)?
- Are there any valid visas?

Responses:

Broad agreement that the document should be taken out of circulation unless required by the traveller.

Ireland: The book should be seen as an emergency travel document and should not be seen as providing any other status e.g. identity.

Norway: ‘Emergency Passports’ are known to have been misused by fraudsters.

#### Other Comments:

Hungary: If the data page is a sticker, it should be compatible with the ICAO document security requirements for the visas.

The layout of the data page must be compatible with the passport requirements, and must contain passport-specified data.

We propose to unify the character in the MRZ, which defines the type of the document, and can emphasize the temporary status of the document during the machine reading (i. e. PT).

Japan: As described in the previous work in this area of Doc 9303 draft in 2005;

“20.3.7. Security Information: States shall provide to other States and concerned organisations such as airlines information on the design and security features of emergency and shorter passports.”

It is really important for every State to provide information about ETDs to other States and concerned organisations. So, we suggest that it should be added in the recommendation.

Canada: A standard terminology and look is essential and a minimum set of security features and control standards as well.

Security features should be developed for single-sheet travel documents.

Netherlands: The Netherlands is in favour of developing recommendations that are applicable to emergency travel documents. In order to do so it is of importance to determine the topics for which recommendations will be developed. In this respect the Netherlands adopts the following reasoning.

The Netherlands has the opinion that ICAO must not develop recommendations that bear on the policy with respect to the (maximum) validity period of travel documents, the application and issuance process of travel documents and the number and kind of emergency documents that a country issues.

Recommendations of ICAO must be limited to recommendations that refer to the security level of emergency documents and to recommendations that refer to the way of checking and verifying emergency documents.

It is the opinion of the Netherlands that ICAO does not explain satisfactorily in the present version of the discussion paper why it is of the opinion that it does have the mandate and is able to develop recommendations on the aforementioned topics.

Belgium: 1) a provisional passport is a document of which the cost can not be too expensive.  
2) since we call it an emergency document, what kind of techniques can we use in emergency situations for the personalization : preferably techniques that do not need a centralization of the process.

UK: It would be helpful, to put this paper into context, to have some background on the work that NTWG have undertaken so far, the objectives, who will be consulted and timescales involved, especially if the aspiration is to put through SARPs to ICAO.

Throughout this paper is the statement that no Annex 9 Standards presently exist for the production of ETD's. Reading Annex 9, it would appear, in the main, not to differential between ETD's and full validity passports/other travel documents.

ICRC: 1) In the part 2.2 on terminology, it is said that the term emergency travel document "*also includes documents issued by state or non-state entities to citizens of other states or non-state entities*". We assume this refers to ETDs for foreign nationals. Would it be useful to actually specify all the travel documents to which the formulation ETD refers to? Or even specifying all ETDs to which this guidance will refer to?

2) The document underlines the large number of authorities delivering ETD and the plethora of practices, with many States and some international (humanitarian) organizations involved. Among the latter (international humanitarian organizations), none are explicitly mentioned; maybe it would be useful to mention in an annex or a footnote which are the organizations issuing ETDs. Again, we are not aware of other organizations, besides the ICRC, who are issuing ETDs.