

## PROPOSALS FOR RULES CHANGES OF DRIVING & PARA DRIVING RULES 2022

### Introduction

Further to the approval of the FEI Periodical Rules Revision Policy at the 2019 General Assembly (available here: <https://inside.fei.org/fei/about-fei/governance/rules-revision-process>) the full revision of the Driving & Para Driving Rules took place in 2021. Consequently for this year's revision process NFs and MOU stakeholders were invited to propose only modifications that fulfilled the following criteria:

1. Urgent repairs, i.e., changes in the Rules that cannot await because of their impact on the welfare of the Horses or the safety of the Athletes;
2. Correction of inconsistencies, manifest errors, contradictions, etc.
3. New/recently introduced rule that has proven to be problematic in its implementation;
4. Implementation of new technology development(s) relevant to the specific set of Rules;
5. IOC, IPC, WADA, ASOIF and similar organisations' policies' implementation;
6. Other scenarios not foreseen by this Policy as considered and approved by the Board.

In addition, the FEI Headquarters and the Eventing Committee have a number of proposals put forward based also on the above mentioned criteria.

In the present document you will find 2 sections as follows:

- A. Rules Proposals received from NFs/MOU Stakeholders by 1 March 2021.** In this section you will find each of the Rules Proposals received from NFs/MOU Stakeholders addressed by the FEI with the relevant feedback from the Eventing Committee; and
- B. Rules Proposals put forward by the FEI**



Manuel Bandeira de Mello,  
Driving & Para Driving Director

## Table of contents

### Proposed by the NFs

Art. 901.11 Trial of new Scoring System .....	3
Art. 913.2 Minimum Eligibility Requirements / Qualification criteria .....	5
Art. 916.3.3. Entries for CAIs and CAIOs .....	6
Art. 927 Additional Entries for Championships and CAIOs .....	7
Art. 928 Dress , Safety and whips .....	8
Art. 933 Welfare Of The Horse .....	9
Art. 935 Examinations and Inspections of Horses .....	10
Art. 936 Permitted Carriages, Art. 937 Weights and Dimensions .....	11
Art. 940 Harness, carriage and horses .....	14
Art. 940.4 Connecting straps .....	14
Art. 942 Safety .....	15
Art. 948 Starting order.....	16
Art. 953.6 Dressage protocols.....	19
Art. 959 Marathon General .....	20
Art. 960 The Course .....	20
Art. 963.3.6 Times .....	20
Art. 960 The Course – 7.....	22
Art 965.7.1 Timing (Marathon) .....	24
Art 975.10.1. Timing (Cones) .....	24
Art. 966 Judges .....	25
Art. 973.7 Obstacles; inspection of the course .....	26
Art. 974 Cones Competition Summary .....	27
Art. 975.10.2 Judging Cones Competition; digital display .....	28
Art. 981 Summary of Penalties in Cones .....	29
Art. 984 Conflict of Interest .....	30

### Proposed by the FEI

Art. 925.6 Entries World Driving Singles Championship for Para Driving .....	32
Art. 928.2.2 .....	32
Art 928.2.3.....	32
Art. 935 .4.1 In-harness Examination .....	33
Art. 937.2.2. ....	33
Art. 940.3.1 1.Nosebands, ancillary equipment and blinkers .....	33
Art. 940 Harness, carriage and Horses .....	34
Art. 954.15 Stretching of the Frame .....	34
Art. 960.1.7 .....	35
Art. 964. 7.4.....	35
Art. 961.4.1. ....	35
Art. 964.2 Error of Course .....	36
Art. 965.7.3. Time Limit.....	36
Art. 965.8.2 Hold Ups .....	37
Art. 973.1.6 .....	37
Art. 981 / 928.1.6. ....	38
Art. 993 Para Driving Classifiers .....	39

## A. Rules Proposals received from NFs/MOU Stakeholders by 1 March 2022

<b>Proposal from (Name of National Federation or MOU Stakeholder)</b>
<b>AUT, BEL, FRA, GER, USA</b>
<b>Article No.–Article Name</b>
<b>Art. 901.11 Trial of new Scoring System</b>
<b>Explanation for Proposed Change. Specify the Criteria of the Periodical Rules Revision Policy</b>
<p><b>AUT:</b>  The planned new scoring system, for which we do not see any realistic necessity, looks extremely difficult to understand for especially the public. The final Cones' Test will result in a hazardous race on Sunday. In our "neighbouring" discipline of Eventing, a competitor cannot "actively" gain a better result by riding faster than the others in the Jumping phase - and nobody ever asked for a change during the last decades. Why should this be necessary in Driving?  In addition, the impact of the last phase in a combined competition would raise dramatically and totally change the philosophy behind the current system: The Cones competition will be the "ninth Marathon obstacle", even when taking into account the new rules for the construction of carriages and obstacles' width, both mentioned above.  Last but not least, it is quite frustrating to realise that a great number of critical comments to the proposed changes by the major Driving NFs have not been considered by the FEI Driving TC for the final draft of rule modifications.  We would be thankful for re-opening the FEI rules revision process for the Driving and Para-Driving Rules during 2022 to avoid major damage to the sport, its Athletes and its Horses.</p> <p><b>BEL:</b>  New scoring system: we remain at our view , that the scoring system is not yet really easy to understand and not easy at all , many things still need to be improved , thought over Cones will result in this version of the system in flat races, excessive speeding and dangerous situations    If the new scoring competition C must always be the last. In the actual scoring OC's, can for lower level competition keep on day 1 : Dressage + cones and Day 2: marathon</p> <p><b>FRA:</b>  Due to the lack of feedbacks from competition as the date we have to submit this document all the following numbers might concern : 1, 2, 3, 4, 6 the project of new scoring system which has not been yet tested.    Depending of the analysis from the new scoring system feedbacks, the following suggestions might be helpful to improve it, border drifts...    As mentioned in the rules revision process from last year, we support the FEI proposal to offer an alternative new scoring system to the current one when 2022 trials are successful. If not or if the support is partial, we would recommend to keep it as an alternative only.    In the case the current system will still be in the rules we recommend to amend:    - Art 974, by decreasing cones width by 5cm for H1-P1 which will be beneficial in terms of safety and horse welfare. This is a way to avoid extreme speed as drivers will need more accuracy and also a way to help course designer to not feel forced to build courses not always horse friendly in order to see enough penalties.    Art 975.3.9, 975.3.5 by changing from 3 to 4 points the penalties for knocking down a ball which will be beneficial in terms of safety and horse welfare</p> <p><b>GER:</b>  A detailed evaluation can only be made after a sufficient number of test events in all classes has taken place. The new value of the Cones competition makes it "the 9th Marathon obstacle" and poses a number of speed-related risks. The new format contradicts the original philosophy of the Cones</p>

competition which was meant to be similar to the Jumping phase in Eventing, where fitness, obedience and suppleness of the Horses are checked. It was not meant to be a speed competition. The calculation of penalties only in seconds is likely to be just not comprehensible by the spectators and poses new challenges for organisers. It is a strange classification system in comparison to the ones used in other FEI disciplines. We will be happy to contribute constructively to new ideas on the scoring system after the test events have been evaluated. As we had already proposed in February 2021, we are in favour of a classification system similar to the one in Eventing.

**USA:**

As the new scoring system has not been used in a trial yet, but the rule revision process requires change proposals by the 1<sup>st</sup> of March, the USA Driving Sport Committee repeats our strong objection with the New Scoring System as currently written.

The issue is not with the results calculations, but specifically with the changes that affect the **Cones competition**.

**Without a time allowed** to limit the speed and **without any course design regulations**, the concept for the Cones competition will push competitors to take unsafe risks on course. The tight turns in a modern Cones course are NOT safe to take at speeds much faster than time allowed. While it is exciting to think that competitors have a new chance to jump ahead on the scoreboard, it will certainly open the door for risk that the sport is not yet prepared for.

Additionally, it is confusing which times will show on scoreboard during Cones – whether the clock times each round or whether the countdown is showing for the current top score.

It needs to be acknowledged that when a new scoring system is adopted by the FEI, it will inevitably affect National levels as well. In the U.S., this is a major concern as our FEI events always involve National levels for sustainability. It will be impossible to run two scoring systems for different levels at one event & it is not safe for National levels to have a speed race in Cones. There must be a solution that can be safe for all levels.

**Proposed Wording**

N/A.

**FEI Feedback**

The aim of the new Alternative Scoring System is to be tested in 2022 and only implement it if deemed successful.

The scoring system document was updated in order to modify the concept, and following the NFs and community feedback, the FEI proposes to keep the Time Allowed. The FEI will also support select OCs in providing the scoring provider.

**FEI Proposed Wording (if applicable)**

**11. Trial of New Scoring System**

- 11.1. As of 1 January 2022, the FEI can, with the prior agreement of the relevant Organising Committee, apply a new scoring system on a trial basis at selected CAI1\*, CAI2\* and CAI3\* (excluding FEI World Cup Qualifiers) events. Where an Event has been selected for the trial of the new scoring system, the Schedule of the Event must make it clear that the new scoring system will be used at the Event.
- 11.2. The details/explanation of the new scoring system will be published on the Driving page of [inside.fei.org](https://inside.fei.org). The FEI, in consultation with the FEI Driving Committee, can make revisions to the new scoring system from time to time provided that any changes must also be published on the Driving page.
- 11.3. If the FEI Driving Committee and the FEI decides that the trial of the new scoring system has been successful, it will be proposed for inclusion in the FEI Driving Rules 2024~~3~~.

<b>Proposal from (Name of National Federation or MOU Stakeholder)</b>
<b>AUT, GER</b>
<b>Article No.–Article Name</b>
<b>Art. 913.2 Minimum Eligibility Requirements / Qualification criteria</b>
<b>Explanation for Proposed Change. Specify the Criteria of the Periodical Rules Revision Policy</b>
<p><b>AUT:</b> We do not see enough CAI 2* Events worldwide to provide the necessary competitions to qualify for the 3* level.</p> <p><b>GER:</b> We have a worldwide lack of 2* Events because it means a lot of effort for organisers of CAI3* to schedule an additional CAI 2*. This is added by Covid-19 restrictions that make it even harder to compete in one of the needed qualifying Event. From 2022 on, a qualification for Championships (Certificate of Capability) is only possible at Three-Star Events. We support the proposal made by some NFs to have the required qualification from a two-star to a three-star Athlete related to the class he/she drives.</p>
<b>Proposed Wording</b>
<p>Athletes are required to qualify in the same Class as they intend to compete in at the Championship. One (instead of two) qualification results in CAI1* of the same class to qualify for 2* Athletes, one (instead of three) successfully completed CAI2* of the same class to qualify for 3* Athletes. See also original proposal of FRA NF for the 2022 rules as an alternative proposal.</p>
<b>FEI Feedback</b>
<p>Star Qualifications for Athletes are acquired for life, meaning that they don't need to qualify every year. In 2022, there are 36 Venues that organise CAI2* events across many classes.</p>
<b>FEI Proposed Wording (if applicable)</b>
N/A.

<b>Proposal from (Name of National Federation or MOU Stakeholder)</b>
<b>AUT</b>
<b>Article No.–Article Name</b>
<b>Art. 916.3.3. Entries for CAIs and CAIOs</b>
<b>Explanation for Proposed Change. Specify the Criteria of the Periodical Rules Revision Policy</b>
We would like to ask for more flexibility with regards to Entries for Championships and CAIO, as it was until a few years ago.
<b>Proposed Wording</b>
N/A.
<b>FEI Feedback</b>
In order to be in line with the FEI Policy on equality on Field of Play, the maximum number of Participants has to be the same for every National Federation across all events.
<b>FEI Proposed Wording (if applicable)</b>
N/A.

<b>Proposal from (Name of National Federation or MOU Stakeholder)</b>
<b>BEL NF</b>
<b>Article No.–Article Name</b>
<b>Art. 927 Additional Entries for Championships and CAIOs</b>
<b>Explanation for Proposed Change. Specify the Criteria of the Periodical Rules Revision Policy</b>
<p>Criterion No. 2 - Correction of inconsistencies, manifest errors, contradictions, etc.</p> <p>We consider these unnecessary regulations, they are also not common in other disciplines, see also our comments from last year’s proposals. A final new formulation for entries for all kinds of Championships without any need for this complicated special rule is useful and necessary.</p>
<b>Proposed Wording</b>
<p>Delete existing article. Instead</p> <p>Article 927: After consultation with the FEI Driving Department, the OC of a Championship/CAIO is free to invite (additional) individual Athletes in relation to the total number of expected competitors (which should not exceed 100 starters). Each NF entering a team may enter the same maximum number of (additional) individual Athletes.</p>
<b>FEI Feedback</b>
<p>This proposed change does not fit into any of the Rules Revision Policy criteria and therefore cannot be considered for the Rule Changes.</p>
<b>FEI Proposed Wording (if applicable)</b>
<p>N/A.</p>

<b>Proposal from (Name of National Federation or MOU Stakeholder)</b>
<b>BEL NF</b>
<b>Article No.–Article Name</b>
<b>Art. 928 Dress , Safety and whips</b>
<b>Explanation for Proposed Change. Specify the Criteria of the Periodical Rules Revision Policy</b>
<p><b>Criteria 6: Other scenarios</b></p> <p>Request to keep still traditional hats allowed in dressage for tradition of our driving sport          Protective headgear per own choice in dressage of the driver (he takes the risk himself in doing so – nobody can be blamed)</p>
<b>Proposed Wording</b>
N/A.
<b>FEI Feedback</b>
The FEI has not proposed to remove Dressage Hats.
<b>FEI Proposed Wording (if applicable)</b>
N/A.

<b>Proposal from (Name of National Federation or MOU Stakeholder)</b>
<b>SWE</b>
<b>Article No.–Article Name</b>
<b>Art. 933 Welfare Of The Horse</b>
<b>Explanation for Proposed Change. Specify the Criteria of the Periodical Rules Revision Policy</b>
<p>1. Urgent repairs, i.e., changes in the Rules that cannot await because of their <b>impact on the welfare of the Horses</b> or the safety of the Athletes.</p> <p>It appears that bleeding from one or two nostrils is not covered in current regulations. Nose blood can occur from bleeding in upper and/or lower airways (in racing horses not unusual with even lung bleeding, Exercise Induced Pulmonary Haemorrhage, EIPH, but usually after exercise).</p> <p>To distinguish from a suspected minor bleeding due to a small laceration of a nostril, the horse should be checked by an FEI Veterinarian after the ride.</p> <p>Nose blood should be a reason for elimination because of the impact on Horse welfare, but also for general perception, i.e., Social License to Operate (SLO).</p>
<b>Proposed Wording</b>
<p><b>2. Wounds and Lacerations</b></p> <p>2.1. Blood on Horses may be an indication of abuse of Horse and must be investigated case by case by any member of the Ground Jury.</p> <p>2.2. Such horses may be eliminated from the Competition. In extreme cases where abuse is evident, further sanctions will be taken against the Athlete, such as a Yellow Warning Card.</p> <p>2.3. In minor cases of blood in the mouth, such as where a Horse appears to have bitten its tongue or lip, or minor bleeding on limbs, after investigation the Athlete may be authorized to continue.</p> <p><b>2.4. Horses bleeding from nostril (airways) will result in Elimination</b></p>
<b>FEI Feedback</b>
<p>Article 2.1 already covers the aim of this Article. Blood on Horses must immediately be checked and investigated. Therefore the FEI propose to keep the wording as it currently is.</p>
<b>FEI Proposed Wording (if applicable)</b>
<p><b>N/A.</b></p>

**Proposal from (Name of National Federation or MOU Stakeholder)**

**BEL, GER**

**Article No.–Article Name**

**Art. 935 Examinations and Inspections of Horses**

**Explanation for Proposed Change. Specify the Criteria of the Periodical Rules Revision Policy**

**BEL:**  
**Criteria 6**

We would like to raise the question or open the discussion if it makes sense to have horses inspected before going into the marathon.  
Can lameness, problems with heart or any other veterinary problem be seen on a horse just leaving the stable area without any effort having been made?

**GER:**

Criterion No. 2 - Correction of inconsistencies, manifest errors, contradictions, etc.

The 1<sup>st</sup> Horse Inspection should be deleted for CAI 1\* to 3\* (similar to CCI Short in Eventing) and replaced by an in-harness inspection before the Dressage Test. This would save time for OCs and competitors, a factor that is important against the background that there are fewer and fewer Driving Athletes. Costs would be reduced because OCs have to pay one day less for Veterinary Commission and Judges. We do not think it is necessary if for example a veterinary inspection for Four-in-Hands is made on Wednesday, when it is made for all classes, and then they have their first competition only on Friday. By then, it is no longer secured that they are fit to compete. Therefore it would be better to reduce it to an in-harness inspection that takes place directly before the driven Dressage.

This proposal was already discussed at length during 2021.

**Proposed Wording**

For CAI1\* to 3\* the First Horse Inspection is conducted as "In-Harness Inspection", see Article 935.5

**FEI Feedback**

This Rule was discussed last year, and an In-Harness inspection is not feasible in terms of Horse Welfare.

A HI format similar to Eventing short format was proposed last year but rejected by the National Federations. This therefore cannot be changed in the minor revision.

**FEI Proposed Wording (if applicable)**

**Proposal from (Name of National Federation or MOU Stakeholder)**

**AUS, AUT, BEL, FIN, GER, USA**

**Article No.–Article Name**

**Art. 936 Permitted Carriages, Art. 937 Weights and Dimensions**

**Explanation for Proposed Change. Specify the Criteria of the Periodical Rules Revision Policy**

**AUS:**

*Criteria of the Periodic Rules revision Policy - 3. New/recently introduced rule(s) that has(ve) proven to be problematic in its implementation;*

Equestrian Australia supports the keeping for the weights for pairs and four-in-hands as it has been previously, no change as stated to be implemented as of 1 July 2023. There are two reasons to support this-

1. The changing of the weights may decrease the safety and horse welfare for drivers and horses, as the risk of carriage overturns will increase.
2. The changing of the weights will mean that current carriages will be disadvantaged. Those with the financial means to get a new lower weight carriage will be advantaged unfairly.

**AUT:**

The new rules open the door for a third carriage to be used in the Cones competition what causes high investments and laborious logistics for the Athletes. We unanimously prefer the traditional Dressage carriage to be used for the cones competition.

The lower weight for 4-in-hand and Pairs Marathon carriages produces an enormous risk for the drivers 'health and their Horses' welfare due to the high speed actually driven in usual obstacles. The high costs for a new Marathon carriage and the loss of worth of the formerly used ones is another aspect as well as the fact that so far, no results from realistic practical tests with these new carriages do exist.

**BEL:**

**Criteria 1**

We would suggest we keep the actual weights on marathon carriages ( 600 – 350 – 225 kgs) , first of all for safety reasons

Secondly , loss of value of old carriages out of use and extra costs for drivers, we would not want to loose people in sport because of financial expenses due to new rules

We would also suggest to keep same carriage in dressage and cones

**FIN:**

The same Carriage can be (not compulsory) used for Dressage, Cones and Marathon, provided they meet the requirements set under Art 937.3 and 937.4 for CAI2\* and above (See Article 936). For Single classes, the groom must sit in the middle behind or beside the Driver during the Cones Competitions. For Pair Classes, the groom must seat in the middle when using a Marathon-type carriage

As it is for now you can use 3 different carriages specially made for each competition and drive dressage with a nice looking presentation carriage giving high score's and use the marathon carriage for the cones, giving advantage in today's tricky cones courses. Raising costs and also transportation costs.

**GER:**

Criterion No. 1 - Urgent repairs, i.e., changes in the Rules that cannot await because of their impact on the welfare of the Horses or the safety of the Athletes  
 Criterion No. 3 - New/recently introduced rule(s) that has(ve) proven to be problematic in its implementation

These aspects should be discussed again:

Are there any practical experiences with the required carriage weights and dimensions? Are Marathon carriages with less weight safe enough?

Loss of tradition and aesthetics in Dressage and Cones; since the beginning of the sport, it has been a tradition that the Dressage vehicles had to be used in the Cones competition. The same applies to the weights of the Marathon vehicles. Particularly the weight of the Four-in-Hand carriages has always been the same.

**Weight:**

Are there any practical experiences with the required carriage weights and dimensions? Are Marathon carriages with less weight safe enough?

Loss of tradition and aesthetics in Dressage and Cones; since the beginning of the sport, it has been a tradition that the Dressage vehicles had to be used in the Cones competition. The same applies to the weights of the Marathon vehicles. Particularly the weight of the Four-in-Hand carriages has always been the same.

As in the previous rules. In addition, we propose to set up a realistic practical testing scenario with reduced carriage weight under competition conditions

**USA:**

The USA Driving Sport Committee is concerned with the lighter carriage weights for Horse Four-in-hand & Horse Pair Marathon carriages (500 kg & 300 kg). With the power of multiple horses, it is recommended to not make those carriages lighter for speed work.

**Proposed Wording**

**AUS:**

Class	Wheels	Min Weight	Grooms	Min Width
Horse Four in Hand	4	<del>500</del> 600kgs		
Pony Four in Hand		300kgs	2 Behind	125cm
Horse Pair	4	<del>300</del> 350kgs		
Pony Pair		<del>200</del> 225kgs	1 behind	125cm
Horse single	4	150kgs		
Pony Single		90kgs	1 behind	125cm

**FIN:**

Dressage and cones must be driven with the same carriage . The carriage used in marathon can be used in dressage and cones provided they meet the requirements set under Art 937.3 and 937.4 for CAI2\* and above (See Article 936).

**GER:**

As in the previous rules. In addition, we propose to set up a realistic practical testing scenario with reduced weight under competition conditions.

**USA:**

Class	Wheels	Min. Weight	Grooms	Min. Width
Horse Four-in-hand	4	<del>500</del> <b>600 kg</b>	2 behind	125 cm
Pony Four-in-hand		300 kg		
Horse Pair	4	<del>300</del> <b>350 kg</b>	1 behind	125 cm
Pony Pair		200 kg		
Horse Single	4	150 kg	1 behind	125 cm
Pony Single		90 kg		

## FEI Feedback

### **WEIGHT**

Current Rule:

CLASS	P1	P2	P4
Weight	90	225	300
Ratio of percentage from Single Pony	100%	245 %	330 %

Approved Rule for implementation in 2023:

CLASS	P1	P2	P4
Weight	90 kg	200 kg	300 kg
Ratio of percentage from Single Pony	100%	220 %	330 %

CLASS	H1	H2	H4
Current weight	150 kg	350 kg	600 kg
Percentage from Single Class	100%	233 %	400%
Weight with current ratio	150 kg	367 kg	495 kg
Percentage from Pony class	100%	220%	330%
Weight for 2023	150 kg	330 kg	500 kg

In order to keep the same ratio for all classes, the above is proposed for the 2023 Rules.

1. Horse welfare. In the interest of the variability of equine heights seen in competition, the reduction of the weight of carriages leaves room for Athletes to assess and use carriages that are adapted to their whole turnout.
2. Cost. The Rules state a Minimum weight, not a maximum weight. Therefore the existing carriages can still be used under the new criteria.
3. Stability. The stability depends on the design, the centre of gravity and is influenced by the friction, gravitation, weigh, balance and momentum.
4. Ease of pull. This is influenced by the weight of the carriage, but is also influenced by friction. Width of the wheels, ground, bearings, breaks, use of the pedals etc.

The proposal to reduce the Carriage Weight was made in an effort to support Horse Welfare and the evolution of the Carriage as seen in recent technological improvements (turn delay, rear wheel steer, design, etc.)

**Number of carriages**

The FEI proposes to keep the maximum number of carriage to 2.

**FEI Proposed Wording (if applicable)**

Class	Wheels	Min Weight	Grooms	Min. Width
Horse Four-in-Hand	4	500 kg <sup>1</sup>	2 behind	125 cm
Pony Four-in-Hand		300 kg		
Horse Pair	4	<del>300</del> 330 kg <sup>1</sup>	1 behind	125 cm
Pony Pair		200 kg <sup>1</sup>		
Horse Single	4	150 kg	1 behind	125 cm
Pony Single		90 kg		

**Proposal from (Name of National Federation or MOU Stakeholder)**

**GER NF**

**Article No.–Article Name**

**Art. 940 Harness, carriage and horses**  
**Art. 940.4 Connecting straps**

**Explanation for Proposed Change. Specify the Criteria of the Periodical Rules Revision Policy**

Criterion No. 2 - Correction of inconsistencies, manifest errors, contradictions, etc.

The documents from 2021 do not contain the reasoning why the last sentence was added. It is not clear to us what is meant.

**Proposed Wording**

N/A.

**FEI Feedback**

Since the Article 940.1.1.2 and 1.2.2 prohibit the crossing of the swingletree, some Athlete attached the traces of the leaders together, this restricts the movement of the Horses and poses Welfare issue, which is why The following sentence "The swingletree/trace of the leaders may not be attached." was added.

**FEI Proposed Wording (if applicable)**

**N/A.**

<b>Proposal from (Name of National Federation or MOU Stakeholder)</b>
<b>AUT, GER</b>
<b>Article No.–Article Name</b>
<b>Art. 942 Safety</b>
<b>Explanation for Proposed Change. Specify the Criteria of the Periodical Rules Revision Policy</b>
<p><b><u>AUT:</u></b></p> <p>Driving is a “whole family sport”, in training at home as well as during Events. Why do we ban our children under 14 from being part of this, provided they use proper helmets and safety vests?</p> <p><b><u>GER:</u></b></p> <p>Criterion No. 3 - New/recently introduced rule(s) that has(ve) proven to be problematic in its implementation</p> <p>Driving is a sport that involves the whole family and may not lose its attractiveness for youth and young parents. Many Athletes who have small children would no longer compete internationally if they were not allowed to have their children on the carriage during training or warm-up. In our view, a ban is only required during competition. The Athlete bears the responsibility.</p>
<b>Proposed Wording</b>
<p><b><u>GER:</u></b></p> <p>Change new para 4 «During the On Site Preparation Period and the Period of Jurisdiction, no person under the age of 14 may be on a carriage (except for Children classes) « by</p> <p>«During a Driving-Event Children under 14 may be positioned on a carriage as passengers under the provisions of the Article 928.2.2 (helmet and back protector) «</p>
<b>FEI Feedback</b>
<p>This proposed change does not have the support of the FEI Medical Committee or FEI Board and does not fit into the Rules Revision Policy criteria criterion 3, and therefore cannot be considered for the Rule Changes.</p>
<b>FEI Proposed Wording (if applicable)</b>
<p>N/A.</p>

<b>Proposal from (Name of National Federation or MOU Stakeholder)</b>
<b>AUT, BEL, GER</b>
<b>Article No.–Article Name</b>
<b>Art. 948 Starting order</b>
<b>Explanation for Proposed Change. Specify the Criteria of the Periodical Rules Revision Policy</b>
<p><b><u>AUT:</u></b></p> <p>The Rules for the starting order in individual competitions looks quite fair, but for major team events, the starting order in Dressage and Marathon for the team members should be declared by the Chefs d'Equipe, like in all other FEI team championships and competitions.</p> <p><b><u>BEL:</u></b> <b>Criteria 6</b></p> <p>Drawing starting order dressage CAIO and CH needs to be looked at Advantage early starters? , disadvantage late start? , conflicts in teams Is a physical draw (as in WC qualifiers) not a reasonable , good and fair alternative?</p> <p><b><u>GER:</u></b></p> <p>In all other FEI disciplines, the Chef d'Equipe declares the starting order within the team. In Dressage and Marathon, the proven system of Eventing Article 532 should be used for team competitions.</p>
<b>Proposed Wording</b>
<p><b><u>GER:</u></b></p> <p>For the Marathon, the team with the best result after Dressage gets the last starting places in block B, D and F, the second best team gets the pre last Starting places in block B, D, F and so on. All Individual Athletes get their starting places in blocks A, C and E in reverse order of their Dressage ranking. The Chef d'Equipe determines which of the Team Athletes starts in position B, D and F.</p>
<b>FEI Feedback</b>
<p>This proposed change does not fit into any of the Rules Revision Policy criteria and therefore cannot be considered for the Rule Changes.</p>
<b>FEI Proposed Wording (if applicable)</b>
<p>N/A.</p>

**Proposal from (Name of National Federation or MOU Stakeholder)**

**AUS, AUT, BEL, GER, USA**

**Article No.–Article Name**

**Art. 950– The Arena**

**Explanation for Proposed Change. Specify the Criteria of the Periodical Rules Revision Policy**

**AUS:** *Criteria of the Periodic Rules revision Policy - 3. New/recently introduced rule(s) that has(ve) proven to be problematic in its implementation;*

Equestrian Australia supports the use of the 40m x 100m dressage arena for Pairs and Four-in-hand competitors.

Rationale:

- Grand Prix dressage rider competes in a 20 x 60 meter arena with 1 riding horse. A pair and team require 40 x 100 meter arena.
- Especially here in Australia where we have many amateur drivers, the larger arena allows for greater time to execute the required movements, by making the arena smaller, this would put greater pressure on both inexperienced drivers and horses.
- Internationally, 3\* venues are already equipped and landscaped to accommodate thus there is additional cost to the organising committee in order to make for this change on an already expensive sport.

**AUT:** An arena 40 x 80 is too small for 4-in-Hand turnouts compared to the dimensions of an arena 20 x 60 for just one horse in ridden Dressage. The foreseen figures for Pairs and 4-in-Hands to be driven in canter look extremely strange and have been described as inappropriate by many Driving experts worldwide.

**BEL:**

**Criteria 6**

We recommend to have the 80 x 40 arena ability for new test H4 to be tested before applying the definite change. Most of our H4 are not in favour of the small arena for this class

Side thought : canter in H2 – P2- P4- H4 , we think putting it on hold and removing it from 2023 test is a good decision

This will avoid stress, result in more safety, no need for extra grooms in training, more safety at training areas

Canter in pairs or fours are difficult to be judged – Safety is primordial

**GER:**

The size of the Dressage arena (40 x 80 m) should also apply to Para-Driving.

Several experts have already expressed their concern about the reduced dimensions of the arena for Pairs and Four-in-Hands. Our riding horses can perform in a 20 x 60 m arena. Why must two or even four Driving horses with a carriage cope with only 40 x 80 m?

**USA:**

The driven dressage tests written for Horse Four-in-hands & Horse Pairs are more appropriate for the larger 100m x 40m arenas. It is recommended to leave those classes in the full sized arena.

**Proposed Wording**

**AUS:**

The Dressage arena can be 80m x 40m or 100m x 40 m as specified at the top of the of the dressage test for Pairs and Four-in-Hand competitors.

Article 950 The Arena

1. The Driven Dressage arena ~~must~~ can be 80m x 40m or 100m x 40m, and laid out in accordance with the Annex 1.
2. Organisers must ensure that the arena is enclosed and that arrangements are in place so that spectators cannot approach closer than 5 metres from the edge of the arena.

**GER:**

40 x 80 m Dressage arena for all youth categories, Singles, all pony classes  
 40 x 100 m Dressage arena for Horses Pairs and Four-in-Hands

**USA:**

1. The Driven Dressage arena must be 80m x 40m for all classes **Pony classes and Single horse classes** and laid out in accordance with the Annex 1.

**1.1 The Driven Dressage arena must be 100m x 40m for all Horse Pair and Horse Four-in-hand**

**FEI Feedback**

The original aim of the change of the size of the arena is to reduce the time of the Dressage test and give more possibilities for organisers by providing smaller sizes of training arenas, saving time and costs in-between classes. This also reduces the total time for the competition, and can lead to the reduction of the dressage competition to one day, easing the workload on Athletes and Officials. The FEI also believes that the sizes of the Arena should be the same for all classes in order to help smaller organisers.

The total length of a Four-in-Hand Pony turnout is similar to the length of a Four-in-Hand Horses turnout.

In the CAI3\* B HP4 test, there is an extension of 40 meters. The extension on the 3\* HP2-HP4 is 61 meters, giving 21 more meters for the extension. The new deviation is 5 meters longer than in the previous test.

The 80x40m arena didn't reduce the sizes of the movements and the Dressage tests have been designed and tested in order to fit all classes.

**FEI Proposed Wording (if applicable)**

N/A.

<b>Proposal from (Name of National Federation or MOU Stakeholder)</b>
<b>GER NF</b>
<b>Article No.–Article Name</b>
<b>Art. 953.6 Dressage protocols</b>
<b>Explanation for Proposed Change. Specify the Criteria of the Periodical Rules Revision Policy</b>
<p>Criterion No. 2 - Correction of inconsistencies, manifest errors, contradictions, etc.</p> <p>In times of worldwide digitalisation, ways should be opened that Dressage protocols must NOT always be on paper.</p>
<b>Proposed Wording</b>
<p>6. Dressage protocols  <del>The official dressage protocols must always be on paper.</del></p> <p>Replace by wording of Dressage Rules Article 433.3:</p> <p><b>Art. 953.6. Paperless Judging</b></p> <p>6.1 The use of a paperless judging system is subject to FEI Approval and must be stated in the Event schedule.</p> <p>6.2 Only FEI approved paperless judging systems as per the FEI requirements posted on the FEI Website may be used.</p> <p>6.3 In any event, a paper version of the Dressage tests must be available to the Judges during competition as backup.</p> <p>6.4 The electronic judges' sheets will be made available to the Athletes in an electronic format via the FEI platform after the competition. The access to the Athletes' electronic judges' sheets is strictly personal.</p>
<b>FEI Feedback</b>
<p>The FEI will consider this for the next Full Rule Revision, as this doesn't fit into any of the Rules Revision Policy criteria.</p>
<b>FEI Proposed Wording (if applicable)</b>
<p>N/A.</p>

**Proposal from (Name of National Federation or MOU Stakeholder)**

**GER NF**

**Article No.–Article Name**

- 1. Controlled Warm-Up in
- Art. 959 Marathon General**
- Art. 960 The Course**
- Art. 963.3.6 Times**

**Explanation for Proposed Change. Specify the Criteria of the Periodical Rules Revision Policy**

Criterion No. 1 – Urgent repairs, i.e., changes in the Rules that cannot await because of their impact on the welfare of the Horses or the safety of the Athletes.

Criterion No. 2 - Correction of inconsistencies, manifest errors, contradictions, etc.

1. Controlled Warm-Up:

There is no sport in the world where penalties are given during the warm-up, i. e. before the actual competition starts. The rules for Stewarding for Warm-Up, like the ones for Dressage and Cones, should be completely sufficient.

For us, it is a contradiction if Athletes have to be at the start of Section A or the Controlled Warm-up at least 10 minutes before their published start time, but get penalties if they are there for too long, see Art. 963.4.1 and 5.1.

The extra work for controlling in the Warm-Up phase by an additional number of Stewards and time-keepers is unnecessary. The foreseen scenario for checking the “green card”, including necessary dismounting of a groom, is not described and could lead to unnecessary discussion about penalties.

2. Cool Down Phase

Art. 963.3.6: Why is there a time limit of 10 to 15 min. in the Cool Down Phase? What happens if after 15 minutes, an Athlete wishes to walk his turnout for some additional time?

**Proposed Wording**

- 1. Art. 960. 1.6.  
(and corresponding Articles)

As an alternative option to the use of Section A, OCs may offer a warm-up arena where all relevant rules in Driving for the Warm-Up apply. Each Athlete must be given at least 30 minutes to prepare for the competition, a resp. time table has to be established. There must be a warm-up obstacle in the warm-up arena, properly fenced with an entry and exit, supervised by a Steward, which may be used by the Athletes for approximately 2 Minutes.

- 2. Art. 963. 3.6.

The Turnout has to be present in the Cool Down Area for a minimum time of 10 (or more?) Minutes. The Athlete and his/her turnout may not leave the area before the in-harness examination, see Art. 935.4.1.

Art. 963.3.7.:

There are no penalties for exceeding the time in the Cool Down Area.

**FEI Feedback**

**Cool Down Area:**

Under [Criteria](#) 3 of the Rule Revision Policy, the FEI proposes the below wording regarding the cool down area. For further information regarding the cool down area, please refer to the [FEI Guidelines for Driving Events](#).

**FEI Proposed Wording (if applicable)**

960. 7 Cool Down Area

At the end of the Section B, a Cool Down area (Arena, Loop or track) of between minimum 800 m and maximum 1200 m in size must be installed. The In-Harness examination, as per Art 935.4 must be performed between ten and fifteen minutes after the Athlete has entered the cool down area. The Groom(s) may walk besides the Carriage, and additional support personnel may be present in this area. The only penalty that can be incurred in the Cool Down Area is Elimination, if the Athlete leaves the area before presenting their Horses. ~~An Athlete who fails to present their turnout at the Cool Down area will be Eliminated.~~ Brushing boots and bandages may be removed from the Horses. After the Horses have been examined and cleared by the Veterinarians, turnouts must leave the Cool Down Area.

2. Marathon sections:

LEVEL	Section A			Controlled warm-up	Section B			
	Distance km	Speed H	Speed P	Time	Distance km	Speed H	Speed P	# OBST
Championships	7-9	12-14	11-13	25 to 30 minutes	7-9	14	13	8
3* / 4*	5-9	12-14	11-13	25 to 30 minutes	5-9	14	13	6-8
2*	5-9	11-13	10-12	25 to 30 minutes	5-9	12-14	11-13	5-7
J + U25	4-6	11-13	10-12	25 to 30 minutes	4-5	12-14	11-13	5-6
CHILDREN	4-6		10-12	25 to 30 minutes	4-5		11-13	4-5
PARA	4-7	11-13	10-12	25 to 30 minutes	4-8	12-14	11-13	5-6

~~The Ppace in Section A, B and Controlled Warm-Up and Cool Down Area is free.  
In the cool-down area, turnouts must only walk.~~

**Proposal from (Name of National Federation or MOU Stakeholder)**

**BEL, USA**

**Article No.–Article Name**

**Art. 960 The Course – 7**

**Explanation for Proposed Change. Specify the Criteria of the Periodical Rules Revision Policy**

**Criteria 2**

An athlete should be at the inspection in cool down between 10 and 15 minutes after entering the area

Art 963 3.6 is mentioning a time limit of min 10 and 15 minutes: this can be seen as a window whereas an athlete should remain in the area , exceeding time limit results in elimination , so if an athlete remains in the area for 16 minutes, will he be eliminated .? We believe this is not intended with the rule .

Elimination will result if the athlete does not present the horse(s) at the check between 10 and 15 minutes.

Clarification or more clarified wording is recommended.

**USA:**

New/recently introduced rule(s) that have proven to be problematic in implementation

The in-harness inspection and Safety check before Marathon is performed by a Veterinarian to determine the fitness of the horses, however fitness can only be measured with exercise and recovery. The US Driving Sport Committee suggests revisiting the order of this inspection in the Marathon.

If the intent was to check for fitness, then the Committee suggests the inspection be moved to the Neutral area where recovery after Section A/Controlled Warm-up can be measured.

-----

The Cool Down area rules, as written, do not allow for the best horse welfare. The US Driving Sport Committee suggests the following changes, per Veterinary recommendation:

- **960.2** requires that "turnouts must only walk", but the intent should be to allow them to halt (stand still) and cool the horses as-needed, including with water. Veterinary studies show that in extreme heat situations, cold water allows for faster recovery of body temperature than just walking.

- **960.7** requires that the final in-harness examination "must be performed between ten and fifteen minutes" and also states that "An Athlete who fails to present their turnout at the Cool Down area will be eliminated". Our officials interpret this rule that if an athlete does not present their turnout to the in-harness examination exactly between 10-15 minutes, then they are eliminated (including if they are inspected early). If that is not the intent, it should be clarified.

It is recommended to clarify that water may be put on the horses to cool them, since it is specifically mentioned that boots may be removed but no other cooling activities are noted.

It is also recommended to allow horses to be unhooked from carriages to facilitate better cooling. *(if allowed, the in-harness inspection should be re-named)*

Important to clarify

Since the Cool Down area is not a competition section in the Marathon, it needs to be clarified what (if any) penalties can apply or NOT apply in the Cool Down. Which Officials are responsible for implementing any penalties or rules? What actions can the Vet take (i.e. if a horse is in distress, but competition is over) and what actions should the Judges (or Stewards) take? Obviously horse welfare will come first, but it should be confirmed that no results can be changed or penalties can apply in this area unless the athlete does not present to the Vet.

...

**964.5.2** states that "only Grooms may walk besides the carriage" in the Cool Down area, which is assumed at risk of penalty. If the intent is to allow grooms & support personnel to assist with horses, then this rule needs to be changed

### Proposed Wording

#### **USA:**

Proposed to move the in-harness inspection before Marathon to the neutral area before Section B (where this inspection was previously).

2 Marathon Sections :

(...)

Pace in Section A, B and Controlled Warm-Up is free.

In the cool down area, turnouts must only walk or halt.

7. Cool Down Area

At the end of the Section B, a Cool Down area (Arena, **or** Loop ~~or track~~) of minimum 800m and maximum 1200m must be installed. The In-Harness examination, as per Art 935.4 must be performed ~~between ten and~~ **within** fifteen minutes after the Athlete has entered the cool down area. **An Athlete who fails to present their turnout at the Cool Down area will be eliminated. The Groom(s) and support personnel may be walk besides the carriage in this area to assist with cooling the horse(s). Horses may be unhooked from carriages, brushing boots may be removed, and water may be applied as needed.** ~~An Athlete who fails to present their turnout at the Cool Down area will be eliminated. Brushing boots and bandages may be removed from the horses.~~

**7.1 The Marathon is complete at the end of Section B and no penalties apply other than elimination for failing to present at the Cool Down area.**

964 Dismounting in the sections

...

5.2 In the Cool Down area, only Grooms **or support personnel** may walk besides the Carriage.

### FEI Feedback

Please refer to previous comment.

### FEI Proposed Wording (if applicable)

Please refer to previous comment.

<b>Proposal from (Name of National Federation or MOU Stakeholder)</b>
<b>GER NF</b>
<b>Article No.–Article Name</b>
<b>Art 965.7.1 Timing (Marathon)</b> <b>Art 975.10.1. Timing (Cones)</b>
<b>Explanation for Proposed Change. Specify the Criteria of the Periodical Rules Revision Policy</b>
<p>Criterion No. 2 - Correction of inconsistencies, manifest errors, contradictions, etc.</p> <p>So far, the turnout was considered to have left the obstacle when the rear axle of the carriage has passed the finish line. Thus all incidents that have happened until then are counted for the obstacle.</p> <p>According to the new rules, the obstacle has been finished when the electronic timing system triggers. So if for example a groom is dismounting/falling off at the time the front horses trigger the timing, this would not be penalised as a fault at obstacle. It could also happen that the horses or the carriage trigger the timing device by mistake, when the driver is still on his way through the gates, and the competitor would then be eliminated.</p>
<b>Proposed Wording</b>
<p>Keep the wording that was used before the revision.</p>
<b>FEI Feedback</b>
<p>The FEI believes that this article should be kept as it is, as it is clearer.</p>
<b>FEI Proposed Wording (if applicable)</b>
<p>N/A.</p>

<b>Proposal from (Name of National Federation or MOU Stakeholder)</b>
<b>BEL</b>
<b>Article No.–Article Name</b>
<b>Art. 966 Judges</b>
<b>Explanation for Proposed Change. Specify the Criteria of the Periodical Rules Revision Policy</b>
<b>Criteria 2</b>
<b>Proposed Wording</b>
Wording in <b>Article 960 The Course – 3.3.1 is halt Article 966 is still mentioning rest</b>
<b>FEI Feedback</b>
Changed as per below.
<b>FEI Proposed Wording (if applicable)</b>
<p><b>Article 966 Judges</b></p> <p>4. Positions</p> <p>1.1. At the compulsory <del>rest</del><u>halt</u> before section B, when requested by a Steward, a Judge, <u>based on the Advice of the Veterinary Delegate</u>, shall decide whether the Horses are in a fit condition to continue the Competition, <del>such decision to be based on the advice of the Veterinary Delegate.</del></p>

<b>Proposal from (Name of National Federation or MOU Stakeholder)</b>
<b>GER NF</b>
<b>Article No.–Article Name</b>
<b>Art. 973.7 Obstacles; inspection of the course</b>
<b>Explanation for Proposed Change. Specify the Criteria of the Periodical Rules Revision Policy</b>
<p>Criterion No. 3 - New/recently introduced rule(s) that has(ve) proven to be problematic in its implementation</p> <p>If several competitions with different classes are run with different courses, 2 hours for the course inspection cannot realistically be observed. For example:          6 classes (P1, 2, 4, H1, 2, 4) with 25 competitors each = 600 minutes = 10 hours of competition + 6 x 2 hours course inspection = 22 hours only for the Cones competition</p>
<b>Proposed Wording</b>
<p>7.1 The course must be open for inspection at least one hour <del>and forty five minutes</del> before the start of the Competition. [...]</p>
<b>FEI Feedback</b>
<p>The Course Walk is open for all classes at the same time.</p>
<b>FEI Proposed Wording (if applicable)</b>
<p><b>N/A.</b></p>

<b>Proposal from (Name of National Federation or MOU Stakeholder)</b>
<b>AUT</b>
<b>Article No.–Article Name</b>
<b>Art. 974 Cones Competition Summary</b>
<b>Explanation for Proposed Change. Specify the Criteria of the Periodical Rules Revision Policy</b>
<p>The smaller width of cones in 4-in-Hand competitions will not produce better pictures in our sport - the Cones' results of all major events during the last years show in particular that there is no need for a change.</p>
<b>Proposed Wording</b>
N/A.
<b>FEI Feedback</b>
<p>The smaller width gives the opportunity to Course Designer to design flowing courses thus creating better competitions.</p>
<b>FEI Proposed Wording (if applicable)</b>
<b>N/A.</b>

<b>Proposal from (Name of National Federation or MOU Stakeholder)</b>
<b>GER NF</b>
<b>Article No.–Article Name</b>
<b>Art. 975.10.2 Judging Cones Competition; digital display</b>
<b>Explanation for Proposed Change. Specify the Criteria of the Periodical Rules Revision Policy</b>
Criterion No. 2 - Correction of inconsistencies, manifest errors, contradictions, etc.  What is the rationale behind having deleted “Whenever possible a digital display unit should be visible for the Athletes”? We consider it important for the Athlete to see his time and the countdown.
<b>Proposed Wording</b>
10.2. Electronic timing including a digital display must be used at all events.  Add: Whenever possible a digital display unit should be visible for the Athletes.
<b>FEI Feedback</b>
This article implies that an electronic timing digital display must be used, and the placement is free.
<b>FEI Proposed Wording (if applicable)</b>
<b>N/A.</b>

**Proposal from (Name of National Federation or MOU Stakeholder)**

**BEL NF**

**Article No.–Article Name**

**Art. 981 Summary of Penalties in Cones**

**Explanation for Proposed Change. Specify the Criteria of the Periodical Rules Revision Policy**

**Criteria 2**

In the summary penalties for not wearing protective headgear is 5.  
 Article 928 1.6 clearly states that is compulsory for an athlete and groom to wear fastened and agreed protective headgear.  
 So entering the arena without and putting it on before taking start is 5 penalties  
 Wearing only a hat is not being able to start ?

Clarification or modification of the summary is recommended

**Proposed Wording**

N/A.

**FEI Feedback**

Clarified as per below.

**FEI Proposed Wording (if applicable)**

Description	Ref. Art.	Fault Competition	Time Competition
<u>Athletes starting Cones course without protective headgear</u>	928.1	Elimination	Elimination
<u>Grooms starting Cones course without protective headgear</u>	928.1	Elimination	Elimination
Athlete entering arena without <u>fastened</u> protective headgear, jacket, gloves or apron.	928.1	5 penalties	5 seconds
Groom entering arena without <u>fastened</u> protective headgear, jacket or gloves.	928.1	5 penalties	5 seconds

<b>Proposal from (Name of National Federation or MOU Stakeholder)</b>
<b>GER NF</b>
<b>Article No.–Article Name</b>
<b>Art. 984 Conflict of Interest</b>
<b>Explanation for Proposed Change. Specify the Criteria of the Periodical Rules Revision Policy</b>
<p>Criterion No. 3 - New/recently introduced rule(s) that has(ve) proven to be problematic in its implementation</p> <p>The number of FEI Driving Officials worldwide is rather small. It goes without saying that the rules about conflicts of interest must be observed by all Judges. However, it should be possible that the Driving Committee allows exceptions on a case-by-case basis for Course Designers, TDs and Stewards.</p>
<b>Proposed Wording</b>
<p>3. The following persons may not be members of a Ground Jury or Officials at an Event:</p> <p>3.1. Athletes and Owners of Horses taking part in the Event.</p> <p>3.2. Chefs d’équipe, team Officials, regular trainers, employers and employees of Athletes. Note: regular trainers means training a Horse/ Athlete for more than three days in the six month period before an Event, or any training during a period of three months before an Event.</p> <p>3.3. Close relatives of Owners, Athletes, Chefs d’équipe or team Officials.</p> <p>3.4. Persons having a financial or personal interest in a Horse or Athlete taking part in a Competition.</p> <p>3.5. Person acting as Chef d’Equipe of national teams in the same class in the current year.</p>
<b>FEI Feedback</b>
<p>The FEI agrees with the above comment and proposes to remove altogether Article 984, as Conflicts of Interest are already covered in the General Regulations and this Article has proven to be problematic.</p>
<b>FEI Proposed Wording (if applicable)</b>
<p><b>Article 984 Conflict of Interest (also refer to Appendix H of the General Regulations FEI OFFICIALS’ CODE OF CONDUCT)</b></p> <p><del>1. FEI Officials may not officiate at FEI Events and also compete in FEI Events in the same classes on the same continent within the same calendar year.</del></p> <p><del>3. No person may be an official at an event if their duties will involve a conflict of interest.</del></p> <p><del>5. The following persons may not be members of a Ground Jury or Officials at an Event:</del></p> <p><del>3.7. Athletes and Owners of Horses taking part in the Event.</del></p> <p><del>3.9. Chefs d’Equipe, team Officials, regular trainers, employers and employees of Athletes. Note: regular trainers means training a Horse/ Athlete for more than three days in the six month period before an Event, or any training during a period of three months before an Event.</del></p> <p><del>3.11. Close relatives of Owners, Athletes, Chefs d’Equipe or team Officials.</del></p> <p><del>3.13. Persons having a financial or personal interest in a Horse or Athlete taking part in a Competition.</del></p> <p><b>3-15-3.1.</b> <u>Person acting as Chef d’Equipe of national teams in the same class in the current year. Please refer to Appendix H of the General Regulations FEI OFFICIALS’ CODE OF CONDUCT)</u></p>

<b>Proposal from (Name of National Federation or MOU Stakeholder)</b>
<b>FRA</b>
<b>Article No.–Article Name</b>
<b>Chapter XI Driven dressage</b>
<b>Explanation for Proposed Change. Specify the Criteria of the Periodical Rules Revision Policy</b>
<p>As you might renew the dressage tests for youth categories please consider the general remark below</p> <p>As a general comment we strongly believe shorter dressage tests (P1-H1 5min max, Multiples 6min max) have to be proposed. It would be very beneficial from many perspectives starting from organizational side. OC could have more drivers on their show, maximum number of turnout/day for judges could be increased, better entertainment for the public, possibility to add youth or YH classes in successful senior shows ...</p>
<b>Proposed Wording</b>
<b>N/A.</b>
<b>FEI Feedback</b>
<p>A new FEI Driving Dressage Test for Children has already been published and will be effective as of 01.01.2023.</p>
<b>FEI Proposed Wording (if applicable)</b>
<b>N/A.</b>

## B. Rules Proposals put forward by the FEI

<b>Article No.–Article Name</b>
<b>Art. 925.6 Entries World Driving Singles Championship for Para Driving</b>
<b>Explanation for Proposed Change. Specify the Criteria of the Periodical Rules Revision Policy</b>
<p>2. Correction of inconsistencies, manifest errors, contradictions, etc.</p> <p>In order to be consistent with the preceding Articles, the word “reserve” was changed to “spare”.</p>
<b>Proposed Wording</b>
<p>6. A <del>reserve-spare</del> Horse from the nominated list may be entered per national team. The Para Driving Athlete who uses the <del>reserve-spare</del> Horse will be eligible for the individual classification as well as for the team classification. The <del>reserve-spare</del> Horse can only be substituted once, not later than one hour before the start of Dressage, <del>through the FEI Entry System</del><del>the Organiser being notified in writing</del>.</p>

<b>Article No.–Article Name</b>
<b>Art. 928.2.2 Art 928.2.3</b>
<b>Explanation for Proposed Change. Specify the Criteria of the Periodical Rules Revision Policy</b>
<p>2 Correction of inconsistencies, manifest errors, contradictions, etc.</p> <p>In order to clarify when safety gear must be worn and what are the sanctions, the below Articles have been amended.</p>
<b>Proposed Wording</b>
<p>2.2 <del>During the Section A, Controlled Warm-Up, Warm-Up Obstacle and Section B,</del> Athletes and Grooms must wear securely fastened Protective Headgear, such Protective headgear must comply with the list of the applicable international testing standards published on the FEI website and a back/<del>body</del> protector <del>in all two sections of the Marathon that is in compliance with the applicable international testing standards</del>. Infringement will result in Elimination.</p> <p>2.3 <del>In addition</del><del>During the In-Harness Inspection, Halt area and Cool Down area,</del> failure to wear such Protective Headgear and back/<del>body</del> protector where and when required after being notified <del>by an Official</del> to do so <del>by an Official</del>, <del>shall will</del> result in a Yellow Warning Card<sub>7</sub> being issued to the Athlete.</p>

**Article No.–Article Name**

**Art. 935 .4.1 In-harness Examination**

**Explanation for Proposed Change. Specify the Criteria of the Periodical Rules Revision Policy**

2 Correction of inconsistencies, manifest errors, contradictions, etc.

Clarification on the sanction if a Horse is not presented to the In-Harness Examination

**Proposed Wording**

4.1 If a Horse entered in the Marathon is not presented at the In-Harness Examination, the Athlete must be eliminated before the start of the Section A/Controlled Warm-Up.

**Article No.–Article Name**

**Art. 937.2.2.**

**Explanation for Proposed Change. Specify the Criteria of the Periodical Rules Revision Policy**

7. Correction of inconsistencies, manifest errors, contradictions, etc.

The OC doesn't have any legal authority during a competition, and therefore has been removed from this article.

**Proposed Wording**

2.4 The ~~OC~~ Technical Delegate may refuse the use of a carriage, but must provide the reason for the refusal.

**Article No.–Article Name**

**Art. 940.3.1 1.Nosebands, ancillary equipment and blinkers**

**Explanation for Proposed Change. Specify the Criteria of the Periodical Rules Revision Policy**

1 Urgent repairs, i.e., changes in the Rules that cannot await because of their impact on the welfare of the Horses or the safety of the Athletes;

This addition is proposed in order to clarify a current issue happening during shows where Horse obtain the right to wear a Nose Net, but wear it only for one competition.

**Proposed Wording**

3. Nosebands, ancillary equipment and blinkers

3.1 Any nosebands, attachments or ancillary equipment which impede or are likely to impede the free intake of air into the nostrils of the Horse are not permitted. If the Horse has obtained the medical certificate to wear a nosenet, it must be used whenever a Horse is harnessed, ridden or lunged.

**Article No.–Article Name**

**Art. 940 Harness, carriage and Horses**

**Explanation for Proposed Change. Specify the Criteria of the Periodical Rules Revision Policy**

- 2 Urgent repairs, i.e., changes in the Rules that cannot await because of their impact on the welfare of the Horses or the safety of the Athletes;

Clarification on the use of Sheep’s Skin during events.

**Proposed Wording**

10.2 Leather, sheep's wool or similar material on the bridle is allowed, provided that the diameter does not exceed 3cm, to be measured from the horse.

**Article No.–Article Name**

**Art. 954.15 Stretching of the Frame**

**Explanation for Proposed Change. Specify the Criteria of the Periodical Rules Revision Policy**

- 2 Correction of inconsistencies, manifest errors, contradictions, etc.

In order to be consistent with the newly implemented Dressage Tests, the FEI proposes to modify the wording for this Movement, as there has been some confusion in regards to the wording.

**Proposed Wording**

15. Stretching the frame

Athletes lengthen the reins gradually to the Horse(s) using a guided hand, to encourage and enable the Horse’s neck to stretch forwards and downwards. As the neck stretches forwards and downwards, the Horse’s mouth should reach the horizontal line corresponding with, but not lower than, the top point of the shoulder. An elastic and consistent contact with the Athlete’s hands must be maintained and at no point should slack or loose rein be visible during the exercise. The same rhythm and impulsion will be maintained and the Horse should remain light in the shoulders with the hind legs well-engaged. As soon as stretching of the frame has been demonstrated, the Athlete will bring the Horse(s) back to the preceding head carriage by retaking the reins during which the Horse must accept the contact without resistance in the mouth or poll. ~~Letting the Horse take the reins, stretching both long and low — and forwards and downwards at least to the point of the shoulder over the back, while keeping the same rhythm and impulsion. The Athlete must keep the reins without losing the contact and bring the Horse back to the preceding elevation as soon as the stretching has been shown~~

<b>Article No.–Article Name</b>
<b>Art. 960.1.7</b> <b>Art. 964. 7.4</b>
<b>Explanation for Proposed Change. Specify the Criteria of the Periodical Rules Revision Policy</b>
<p style="text-align: center;">2 Correction of inconsistencies, manifest errors, contradictions, etc.</p> <p>In order to clarify the sanctions in the Warm-Up Obstacle in regards to grooms position and carriage overturning, the below wording has been corrected.</p>
<b>Proposed Wording</b>
<p>960. 1.7 Before the Start of Section B, a Marathon-type <u>warm-up</u> Obstacle <del>for preparation purposes,</del> made of any material and situated <del>in</del> a separated area, must be provided. Each Athlete may use <u>the Warm-Up</u> <del>that</del> Obstacle for <u>a maximum time of 2 minutes maximum.</u> <del>Grooms must be on the Carriage during the Warm-Up Obstacle, failure to comply will incur a Yellow Warning Card. Grooms may dismount when the turnout is standing still.</del></p> <p>964.7.3 If the carriage overturns <del>(either</del> on the <u>warm-up obstacle, Marathon</u> course or in an Obstacle<del>),</del> the penalty is Elimination and the Athlete may not continue on the Marathon.</p>

<b>Article No.–Article Name</b>
<b>Art. 961.4.1.</b>
<b>Explanation for Proposed Change. Specify the Criteria of the Periodical Rules Revision Policy</b>
<p style="text-align: center;">2 Correction of inconsistencies, manifest errors, contradictions, etc.</p> <p>Clarification on the compulsory gates marking.</p>
<b>Proposed Wording</b>
<p>4. Compulsory gates</p> <p>4.1. Obstacles include compulsory gates marked <u>with red and white signs lettered A up to F with red and white letters,</u> <del>which should be marked A up to F, indicating indicating the sequence and direction</del> in which they <u>gates</u> must be driven.</p>

<b>Article No.–Article Name</b>
<b>Art. 964.2 Error of Course</b>
<b>Explanation for Proposed Change. Specify the Criteria of the Periodical Rules Revision Policy</b>
<p>2 Correction of inconsistencies, manifest errors, contradictions, etc.</p> <p>Rewording for clarification.</p>
<b>Proposed Wording</b>
<p>2. Error of Course</p> <p>If an Athlete fails to pass through a compulsory turning flag (CTF) in the designated sequence, the Athlete may return to the point of error and drive the CTF, provided the Athlete has not driven the following CTF or the next Obstacle. An Athlete who fails to pass through a CTF <u>or a multiple CTF which is to be driven several times with different numbers,</u> in the published sequence and direction <u>as indicated on the Course plan</u> will be Eliminated, <del>(except multiple CTFs which are to be driven several times with different numbers).</del></p>

<b>Article No.–Article Name</b>
<b>Art. 965.7.3. Time Limit</b>
<b>Explanation for Proposed Change. Specify the Criteria of the Periodical Rules Revision Policy</b>
<p>2 Correction of inconsistencies, manifest errors, contradictions, etc.</p> <p>Rewording for clarification of the sanction when an Athlete exceeds the time allowed in a Marathon Obstacle.</p>
<b>Proposed Wording</b>
<p>7.3 The Time Limit for Athletes in <del>o</del>Obstacles is five minutes. If Athletes fail to complete the whole obstacle and pass the exit flags within the time limit, the <del>o</del>Obstacle <del>O</del>observer is to blow two blasts on a whistle indicating to the Athlete that the time limit has been reached. The Athlete <u>is eliminated,</u> must then vacate the obstacle as quickly as possible, <del>(with assistance if necessary,)</del> <u>and the Horses must be checked by the Veterinarian at the end of the Cool Down Area. The Athlete and</u> may not continue in the <u>Marathon</u> Competition.</p>

<b>Article No.–Article Name</b>
<b>Art. 965.8.2 Hold Ups</b>
<b>Explanation for Proposed Change. Specify the Criteria of the Periodical Rules Revision Policy</b>
<p>2 Correction of inconsistencies, manifest errors, contradictions, etc.</p> <p>Clarification on the Obstacle Observation Sheets.</p>
<b>Proposed Wording</b>
<p>8.2 One of the Assistant <del>ø</del>Obstacle Observers is to stop the Athlete at that point and start their stopwatch. As soon as the previous Athlete is clear of the obstacle and the <del>ø</del>Obstacle <del>ø</del>Observer approves a re-start, the Assistant <del>ø</del>Obstacle <del>ø</del>Observer will re-start the Athlete and inform <u>the Athlete</u> of the <u>duration of time</u> the Athlete <del>has been</del> <u>was</u> held. This <u>time <del>should</del> <del>must</del></u> be recorded in whole or half minutes <u>next to the Athletes Identification Number on the Obstacle Observation Sheets.</u></p>

<b>Article No.–Article Name</b>
<b>Art. 973.1.6</b>
<b>Explanation for Proposed Change. Specify the Criteria of the Periodical Rules Revision Policy</b>
<p>2 Correction of inconsistencies, manifest errors, contradictions, etc.</p> <p>Rewording and removing of the mention of the adjustment of the timing as it is not applicable.</p>
<b>Proposed Wording</b>
<p>1.6. An <u>O</u>exer will be composed of two pairs of cones in a straight line. The distance between the first set of cones and the second set will be between 1.5 and 3 metres, <u>at the <del>option</del> discretion</u> of the Course Designer. <u>The O</u>exer counts as a single obstacle and the <u>maximum penalty points for knocking down up to 4 balls is 3 penalty points in total.</u> <u>The maximum penalites per O</u>exer is three penalties, for hitting one to four <u>balls.</u> <u>The first set of cones will have the number of the obstacle and be marked with red and white signs</u> and the second set of cones will be marked with only red and white <u>signs.</u> <del>The first set of cones will have the number of the obstacle, the second set will only be marked with red and white flags.</del></p>

**Article No.–Article Name**

**Art. 981 / 928.1.6.**

**Explanation for Proposed Change. Specify the Criteria of the Periodical Rules Revision Policy**

2 Correction of inconsistencies, manifest errors, contradictions, etc.

Avoid any confusion in regards to penalties.

**Proposed Wording**

1.6 During Cones, it is compulsory for all persons to wear a properly fastened protective Headgear. Failure to comply results in immediate Elimination from the Cones competition. Such Protective headgear must comply with the list of the applicable international testing standards published on the FEI website. An Athlete and/or Groom who loses their Headgear or whose retention harness becomes unfastened during the course of their round must recover and replace it, or ~~in the case of the retention harness becoming unfastened must immediately~~ refasten it. In such case, the Jury will ~~ring sound~~ the whistle/bell and, stop the time, ~~thus incurring 5 penalties and the~~The Athlete will receive 5 penalties and ~~and must halt to~~ retrieve their Headgear and/or refasten the retention harness. An Athlete who continues with a retention harness incorrectly fastened or ~~not un~~fastened will be eliminated unless the circumstances rendered it unsafe for the Athlete to immediately stop immediately in order to correct the issue~~refasten the harness.~~

Description	Ref. Art.
Athlete entering arena without <u>fastened</u> protective headgear, jacket, gloves or apron.	928.1
Groom entering arena without <u>fastened</u> protective headgear, jacket or gloves.	928.1

**Article No.–Article Name**

**Art. 993 Para Driving Classifiers**

**Explanation for Proposed Change. Specify the Criteria of the Periodical Rules Revision Policy**

6. IOC, IPC, WADA, ASOIF and similar organisations' policies' implementation;

There was some discrepancy between the definition of a Classification Panel in the FEI Para Driving Rules and FEI Para Equestrian Classification Rules, so the Para Driving Rules were amended to refer to the Classification Rules.

The Classifiers levels were updated to reflect changes in the Classifiers Education system, with the following changes:

Trainee Classifier becomes Level 1 Classifier  
 Level 1 Classifier becomes Level 2 Classifier  
 Level 2 Classifier becomes Level 3 Classifier  
 New Level 4 Classifier is created.

**Proposed Wording**

**Article 993 Para Driving Classifiers**

1. Classification is carried out in line with the IPC Classification Code. For all CPEAIs and FEI Championships, a Classification Panel as defined in the FEI Para Equestrian Classification Rules must be present. The Classifiers must remain until the first appearance is completed of all Classified Athletes.

1.2. Championships

1.1. At least one (1) level ~~2~~ Chief Classifier and one (1) level ~~1~~ or above Classifier from different nations shall be appointed by FEI.

2. CPEAIs

2.1. For International Competitions the OC, in consultation with FEI, shall appoint at least one (1) level ~~3~~ Chief Classifier and one (1) level ~~1~~ or above Classifier.