

Otázky a odpov?di

VEX V5 Robotics Competition 2026-2027: Override

Welcome to the official VEX V5 Robotics Competition Question & Answer system, where all registered teams have the opportunity to ask for official rules interpretations and clarifications. This Q&A system is the only source for official V5RC rules clarifications, and the clarifications made here from the Game Design Committee (GDC) are considered as official and binding as the written [Game Manual](#) itself.

Please review the Q&A Usage Guidelines before posting. This system is only intended for specific V5RC game rules questions.

- For event, registration, or other competition support questions, please contact your [Program Support Manager](#).
 - For VEX technical support, contact support@vex.com or sales@vex.com.
- For game questions, suggestions, or concerns outside of specific and official rules questions, contact GDC@vex.com

Index

[Match Replays for Single Robot Disconnect](#)

[Clarification on regarding temporary restriction of Toggle movement using a C-Channel](#)

[Is the heat dissipation for motor legal?](#)

[R16 Vision Sensor Legality and legal parts list concerns](#)

[Legality of Legacy \(SMC\) Pneumatics](#)

[Legality of painted screw heads and anodized aluminum standoffs](#)

[Clarification on and regarding pneumatics with missing identification labels](#)

[Inquiry on Broadness of R23 Application](#)

[Inquiry on the Application of R23 Part \(a\) on COTS and Previously Anodized Parts](#)

[Legality of reinforced plastic - R24](#)

[2mm thickness plastic legal?](#)

[VEX Pressure Gauge must goes on the robot?](#)

[Clarification on Classification of Stacked Game Elements and Removal of Elements](#)

[SC2 Partially Covered = Scored / Invisible?](#)

[SC4 Don't touch my toggle ... where?](#)

[Clarification of AWP Criteria](#)

[Clarification of AWP](#)

[Position of Alliance Station with reference to loader position.](#)

[Match Load Placement Clarification](#)

[SG4\(a\) - Clarification on removal of deflected game objects](#)

[SG6 - Clarification on Possession vs Plowing](#)

[Substituting Colored Field Tape for White Tape](#)

3137: Match Replays for Single Robot Disconnect

14-May-2026

GG5

Point a-v of <GG5> states that a valid reason a match replay is (emphasis mine):

Field control disconnecting or Disabling **multiple** Robots. Note, this is sometimes confused with a Robot whose motors have overheated, or bent pins on a controller's competition port causing intermittent drop-outs. In general, any true Field fault will impact both Alliances simultaneously, not one Robot at a time.

The red box below the rule states:

Note: Communication or control issues affecting a single Robot are not considered eligible grounds for a replay.

Suppose that a single Robot experiences a field disconnect during a Match. That Robot is the only Robot affected by a disconnect during the Match. After the Match, the Head Referee examines the Smart Field Controller and determines that the disconnect was caused by bent pins in the port of the Smart Field Controller (in other words, the disconnect was caused by an issue beyond the control of the Team). The Head Referee is sure that no other issues with the smart cable, Controller of the affected Team, or their Robot, could have caused the disconnect. Is rule GG5 stating that the Match should NOT be replayed?

Zodpov?d?I committee

This would be more akin to a Field hardware failure than a communications or networking issue between the Robot and the Field affecting a single Robot.

This may be considered grounds for a replay at the discretion of the Event Partner and Head Referee.

3135: Clarification on regarding temporary restriction of Toggle movement using a C-Channel

14-May-2026

GG9 SC4

Rule Quote: <GG9>

Robots may not intentionally grasp, grapple, hook, attach to or otherwise Entangled with any Field Elements. Strategies with mechanisms that react against multiple sides of a Field Element in an effort to latch or hook onto said Field Element are prohibited. The intent of this rule is to prevent Teams from unintentionally damaging the Field and/or from anchoring to or otherwise Entangling themselves with the Field. Whenever possible, Head Referees should alert Teams to potential Violations before they happen to prevent actual Violations. If a Robot takes immediate action to avoid or resolve the issue, and if the Head Referee determines that the issue had no effect on the Match, no Violation should be recorded.

<SC4>

SC4> A Toggle is considered set to a color when it meets all of the following criteria at the end of the Match:
a. The Toggle must be fully seated, such that there is a face of the Toggle in contact and parallel with its mounts on the Field Perimeter at rest. (see Figure SC5-1) b. **The Toggle is not in contact with a Robot from either Alliance.**

Question: In the context of the current game, is it legal for a robot to position a piece of C-channel underneath the Toggle mechanism to prevent it from rotating?

The mechanism is not "clamped" or "grasped" in a way that prevents the robot from driving away (no permanent attachment), but the geometry of the C-channel effectively wedges the Toggle so it cannot be turned by an opponent. Does this "jamming" action constitute "attaching to a field element", or is it considered a legal defensive strategy provided the robot can move away freely?

Video I saw on youtube of this idea: <https://www.youtube.com/shorts/Kyow3GVag-0>

Zodpov?d?I committee

A Robot mechanism interacting with the Toggle as described is not inherently a GG9 violation.

Provided the Robot does not violate R18 and/or S1, this may be considered a legal gameplay interaction.

The Game Design Committee will continue to monitor Robot interactions with Toggles throughout the season, and this ruling may be subject to change if needed, based on observed gameplay.

3151: Is the heat dissipation for motor legal?

18-May-2026

R16

A.Is it legal to use active cooling devices for motor during the match? B.Is it legal to use active cooling devices for motor outside of the match? C.Is it legal to use passive cooling devices for motor? D.Is it legal to use thermal paste serves as an aid to heat dissipation for motor?

Zodpov?d?I committee

A) There is no rule explicitly preventing cooling devices during a match, however these devices must comply with all Robot Rules, including but not limited to R12, R16, R18, and R19.

B) There are no rules preventing cooling devices from being used before or after a Match.

C) There is no rule explicitly preventing cooling devices during a match, however these devices must comply with all Robot Rules, including but not limited to R12, R16, R18, and R19.

D) Thermal Paste is not legal for use in the VEX V5 Robotics Competition.

3157: R16 Vision Sensor Legality and legal parts list concerns

27-May-2026

R16

R16 states:

Any questions or concerns about legal parts should be directed to the official Q&A System on events.vex.com.

This is both a question and a concern. The VEX V5 vision sensor 276-4850 (sold by vex and used by teams for many years) is no longer listed in the [competition legal parts list](#).

I have several questions/concerns:

- Does this mean that the V5 vision sensor is no longer legal for use in V5RC? If so, why was this change made?
- What other previously legal parts have been removed from the list since last season? It's hard to find previous versions of the list because its updated on a continual basis, and there are zero changelogs whatsoever. So, in

order to determine what changed teams somehow must memorize the entire list and compare their memory to what is currently in the list.

- Why are changes to the list not at least announced so that teams can review their parts in use? As it stands, many teams are likely to find out for the first time at a tournament inspection that their parts are no longer legal, because a silent edit to a google doc was made without their knowledge.

Zodpov?d?l committee

This was a mistake. The 276-4850 Vision Sensor has been added to the VEX V5 Robotics Competition Legal Parts List.

3140: Legality of Legacy (SMC) Pneumatics

15-May-2026

R19

[<R19>](#) Rule R 19 lists several Non-VEX components that are allowed. In previous years, both the manual and the knowledgebase listed the specific SMC legacy pneumatics components that were legal for competition use. This year there is no mention of the legacy pneumatics in the manual at all. They are not listed as allowed parts in R 19, but there is also no mention of them not being allowed in R 18, so there is a bit of confusion. Several other rules in the manual (GG3, R25, R26, etc) specifically mention VEX pneumatics parts. Am I correct to assume that this means that the legacy SMC pneumatics components are not legal to use this year and the only legal pneumatic components are the VEX branded ones?

Zodpov?d?l committee

Legal VEX Parts are listed in the Legal Parts list linked in the Game Manual.

Components not included in that list are not legal for competition use.

3133: Legality of painted screw heads and anodized aluminum standoffs

14-May-2026

R23

[<R23>](#) reads:

Anodizing, painting, dyeing or changing the color of any legal VEX part is prohibited.

Our team has many RoboSource "Color Coded Star Drive Screws" where the screw heads have been painted by the vendor.

Related to this, we also have many RoboSource "Color-Coded Standoffs" which are anodized aluminum.

Technically, none of us painted or anodized the part ourselves - it came brand new painted and/or anodized from a well-known reputable vendor.

Are either or both of these two types of products legal?

Thank you!

Zodpov?d?l committee

R23a is intended to apply to parts made by VEX Robotics. It does not apply to commercially available hardware.

Provided the screws and standoffs meet the stated criteria in R22, these parts are legal for use in the VEX V5 Robotics Competition.

3136: Clarification on and regarding pneumatics with missing identification labels

14-May-2026

R23

[<R23>](#)

Decorations that cover or obscure identifying features of electronics and/or pneumatics parts are not legal. i. Teams will be asked to either replace the electronics and/or pneumatics part entirely, or remove the decoration if possible. ii. Identifying features include, but are not limited to, VEX logos, part numbers, and other distinctive colors or features of the part that allow an inspector to easily confirm it is a legal part.

Question: Over the course of normal use, the plastic protective wrapping/labeling on V5RC pneumatic reservoirs and cylinders can become frayed, damaged, or fall off entirely, removing the VEX logo and part number. If a pneumatic part is otherwise identical in form and function to an official VEX part but is missing its factory label/logo due to wear and tear, is it still considered legal for competition use and furthermore, what secondary identifying features should a team point to during inspection to "easily confirm" the part is legal if the primary logo is missing?

Zodpov?d?I committee

Normal wear and tear that damages factory-applied labels does not inherently make an otherwise legal pneumatic component immediately illegal.

Inspectors may use other identifiable characteristics of the part, such as its dimensions, construction, fittings, color, shape, or other distinctive features, to determine whether it is a legal VEX component. Comparing the part to a known-legal component with intact factory labels may help facilitate this process.

The easiest way to ensure inspection of these parts proceeds smoothly is to ensure that factory labels remain clearly visible to Robot inspectors whenever possible.

Teams should expect additional scrutiny if a part cannot be readily identified during inspection, and should understand that inspectors may deem a part illegal if they cannot reasonably verify that it is a legal VEX component.

3147: Inquiry on Broadness of R23 Application

17-May-2026

R23

Our team's questions are as follows, with two specific examples which we would like clarified.

(a) Rule [<R23>](#) states that "Decorations that cover or obscure identifying features of electronics and/or pneumatics parts are not legal." Identifying features are defined following this, with "Identifying features include, but are not limited to, VEX logos, part numbers, and other distinctive colors or features of the part that allow an inspector to easily confirm it is a legal part." In some cases, modifications to VEX parts which remove material may remove the presence of VEX logos, listed as an identifying part. These modifications are not necessarily due to decorations, but they do remove the VEX logo, and may be for either functional or aesthetic reasons otherwise legal. Will such modifications be legal in general in the future?

Now, we would like to ask about specific applications of this rule.

(b) Teams have cut VEX gears for many seasons now in order to reduce drivetrain space and weight. Cutting or modifying these gears as has been standard for past seasons would potentially remove VEX logos, an identifying part. Will cutting of

gears in ways that may remove the VEX logo be legal this season and in following seasons?

(c) Many teams have removed the vinyl wrapping on their air tanks and air cylinders. This does not affect the functionality of the air cylinder or air tank, and is usually made for aesthetic reasons or after damage to the vinyl wrapping. Removing the vinyl wrapping will remove VEX logos. Will air cylinders and air tanks with the vinyl wrapping removed be legal this season and in upcoming seasons? If not, how does VEX robotics plan to allow old pneumatics sets with these vinyl wrappings removed to be legal, if at all?

(d) Hypothetically, if a team was to remove the VEX logo from parts for little to no gain, like shaving off the VEX logo off new aluminum C-channels or sandblasting the surface of a VEX gear or sprocket, how would this be ruled?

(e) In the past, teams have been known to use rubber bands or zipties to connect the VEX V5 Smart Motor cap and body, in order to improve maintainability and serviceability in the middle of a competition. This is commonly referred to as allowing a motor to be "hotswapped". However, in some cases, these zipties or rubber bands can cover the VEX logo on these motors, which are electronic parts. Will such hotswapping setups be allowed in this season and onwards? If not, [<R23>](#) also states that the appropriate way to address this is to "remove the decoration if possible". Would this removal be only for inspection, or would it be for the duration of the competition? Broadly applied, since the intent of this rule is to aid in inspection, do restrictions on decorations potentially obscuring VEX identifying features apply only during inspection, or through the full duration of the competition?

(f) Finally, what are some general guidelines our team can apply to decide the legality of modifications which remove identifying features in the future? We ask this on an understanding that not every edge case can be covered here, but the manual is vague on these guidelines as well.

Zodpov?d?I committee

a. Please note that [<R23>](#) clause F applies to decorations that cover or obscure identifying features of *electronics* and/or *pneumatic parts*, and [<R28>](#) prohibits modifications to electronic or pneumatic components.

b. Gears are not considered electronic or pneumatic parts and are therefore not subject to [<R23>](#) clause F.

c. Teams should not intentionally remove or cover the labels/logos on their pneumatic cylinders or tanks. Regarding damaged or missing labels/logos, please see our response to [Q&A 3136](#).

d. Gears, sprockets, and C-channels are not considered electronic or pneumatic parts and are therefore not subject to [<R23>](#) clause F.

e. Rubber bands and/or zip ties used to secure V5 Smart Motor Caps would be considered functional parts. [<R23>](#) clause F specifically restricts non-functional decorations.

If you have any remaining questions that you believe we have not adequately addressed with the answers above, please feel free to submit a follow-up question.

3148: Inquiry on the Application of R23 Part (a) on COTS and Previously Anodized Parts

17-May-2026

R23

Our question relates to the application of [<R23>](#); specifically, [<R23>](#) part (a), stating that "Anodizing, painting, dyeing or changing the color of any legal VEX part is prohibited."

(a) The VEX manual clearly states that some commercial off-the-shelf parts are legal, as has been standard for past seasons. Some of these parts come in color; for example, some companies sell nuts which come in color, and many teams choose to use screws with colored heads to aid in identification of screw lengths. These COTS colored parts can be considered to be outside the category of "legal VEX part", as they are not manufactured by VEX. Will these parts be legal? Broadly applied, does legal VEX part apply only to parts sold and distributed by VEX Robotics, Inc.?

(b) i. Many teams in the past have used anodized metal parts like C-channels or dyed parts like gears. Before the 2026-27 season, these parts were **already dyed or anodized**. The language of [<R23>](#) states that the action of anodization/painting/dyeing/coloring is not legal, but it does not state that the use of previously anodized/painted/dyed/colored parts is illegal. This part of the rule was not present before the 2026-27 season. Does

<R23> forbid the action of anodizing, painting, dyeing, or changing the color of any legal VEX part from the 2026-27 season onwards, or is it meant to be applied in retrospect, overriding previous game manuals, thereby banning **all** parts that have been anodized, painted, dyed, or color-changed, including ones teams already owned, and that were previously legal?

(b) ii. This is a follow-up to (b) i. IF all anodized/dyed/painted/colored parts are banned. Does VEX have a plan to compensate or alleviate the financial burden on organizations which have a large amount of these parts? <R23> (a) was added to the rulebook without warning, and many teams operated under the expectation that these previously unambiguously legal parts would be continually reusable for future seasons, as is the intent with purchasing these parts; they are an investment towards students' education for the season the parts are bought in and many seasons following. How does VEX intend these teams to deal with the sudden financial burden of needing new parts?

Zodpov?d?I committee

Please see the following statement from VEX Robotics and the VEX Robotics Game Design Committee regarding R23a, alongside the June 4 Game Manual update.

<https://www.vexforum.com/t/a-message-from-vex-robotics-r23a-and-smc-pneumatics/146777>

If you still have any questions regarding rules clarifications, feel free to submit a follow-up question. For questions, suggestions, or concerns that go beyond rules clarifications/interpretations, please direct them to gdc@vex.com.

3129: Legality of reinforced plastic - R24

14-May-2026

R24

Rule <R24> governing custom plastics states: Legal plastic types are polycarbonate (Lexan), acetal monopolymer (Delrin), acetal copolymer (Acetron GP), POM (acetal), ABS, PEEK, PET, HDPE, LDPE, nylon (all grades), polypropylene, PTFE, and FEP.

Certain manufacturing styles, such as SRPP (Self-Reinforced Polypropylene) or SR-PET, use a woven structure of a specific polymer embedded within a solid base of that exact same polymer to increase strength. These materials do not contain any glass, carbon, or other foreign additives. They are made physically and chemically of 100% pure polymer. If a material is made entirely of a single plastic explicitly listed in <R24>, but utilizes this internal self-reinforced woven structure, is it considered legal provided it meets all other rule requirements (such as being non-shattering, staying within the maximum 0.070" thickness, and adhering to the individual piece limits)?

Zodpov?d?I committee

Note: This answer was revised on July 2, 2026.

In the July 2 game manual update, <R24> clause F was updated to include non-homogeneous plastics, such as woven (e.g., SRPP) and/or fiber-reinforced sheets, as prohibited materials.

3146: 2mm thickness plastic legal?

16-May-2026

R24

Do 2mm thickness plastic legal?

Zodpov?d?I committee

2mm Plastic is not legal, per R24.

Plastic thickness is limited to 0.070" (1.78mm)

A metric conversion will be added in the June 4 game manual update.

3152: VEX Pressure Gauge must go on the robot?

18-May-2026

R26

VEX Pressure Gauge on the e high pressure side count as part of the robot or it can arbitrary disassembly like a pump?

Zodpov?d?I committee

The VEX Pressure Gauge must be plumbed to the High Pressure side of the pneumatics system, and must remain on the robot during the match.

3153: Clarification on Classification of Stacked Game Elements and Removal of Elements

22-May-2026

SC2 SG9 SG10

In the rulebook, [<SG10>](#) states that "Placed Scoring Objects cannot be removed from neutral Goals.". [<SC2>](#) clearly identifies an example of a position a pin may take on a stack which is **not** Placed, shown in Figure SC2-2 (pin placed horizontally on a cup without either half of the pin being entirely contained within the concave portion of the cup).

We wanted to ask about the legality of the following:

- (a) Removing a Pin that is not Placed, such as a Pin positioned similarly to the one shown in Figure SC2-2.
- (b) Removing a Cup which is similarly balanced horizontally on top of other game elements without being placed.
- (c) Removing a Cup which is balanced on top of another Cup without a pin in between (or, similarly, a Pin balanced on a Pin with no Cups in between).
- (d) Removing a Placed cup which is not affecting the score of the game (ex. transparent part facing downwards, with no pins above, thereby not adding or subtracting points from the game).
- (e) If it would be a major violation to accidentally knock over protected scoring elements in an effort to reopen an alliance or neutral goal for scoring by removing a game element that was positioned on the goal but not Scored/Placed.
- (f) Rule [<SG9>](#) states that "Robots may not directly or indirectly interact with the opposing Alliance-colored Goals", and clarifies that this includes adding and removing scoring objects. Would stacking a horizontal game element as seen in Figure SC2-1, or any unplaced game elements as stated above count as interaction with these goals? By definition, this is not Placed, and it is not an action of descoring, but it forces the opposing alliance to take time to reopen their own alliance's goal for scoring.
- (g) If it would be a violation of [<SG6>](#) for one of these game elements to fall onto a bot already possessing 1 pin and 1 cup in the action of removing it from the goal.

Thank you so much!

Zodpov?d?I committee

Note: Rules [<SG2>](#), [<SG9>](#), and [<SG10>](#) have since been updated in later versions of the game manual. We have revised and reformatted your question to reflect that update and to make it easier to address your individual questions.

To answer questions (a), (b), and (c), [<SG10>](#) only applies to Placed Scoring Objects, so removing a Pin or Cup that is not Placed from on top of a neutral Goal would not be a Violation of [<SG10>](#).

(d) Removing a Placed Cup from a neutral Goal would be a Violation of [<SG10>](#), regardless of whether or not the Placed Cup affects the score of the Match.

(e) It's legal to remove Placed Scoring Objects from your own Alliance-colored Goals, whether accidentally or intentionally. However, a Robot action that results in the removal of Placed Scoring Objects from a neutral Goal would be a Violation of [<SG10>](#). This will escalate to a Major Violation if it's considered to be Match Affecting, if it's deemed by the Head Referee to be intentional and/or egregious, or at the Head Referee's discretion after committing repeat Minor Violations. (See Violation notes in Appendix C for more details.)

(f) Making contact with Scoring Objects stacked on an opposing Alliance-colored Goal would be considered interacting with that Goal, regardless of whether those Scoring Objects are Placed or not, which would result in an [<SG9>](#) Violation.

(g) If the Scoring Object falls into the Possession of a Robot that is already in Possession of 1 Pin and 1 Cup, the Robot would technically be in Violation of [<SG6>](#) for exceeding the Possession limit and must immediately stop all actions other than attempting to remove the excess Scoring Objects. The Robot would not be able to continue participating in gameplay until the excess Objects are removed from its Possession.

3175: SC2 Partially Covered = Scored / Invisible?

25-Jun-2026

SC2

Thanks all for Automate session June 22, nothing like breaking the game on our first spin - several questions ...

#5 Da Rules - SC2 A Pin is considered Placed if it meets all of the following criteria: i. The Pin is partially or entirely nested with a Goal, or with a Cup that is partially or entirely nested with another Placed Pin. ii. Each Goal and/or each half of a Cup nested with that Pin contains a maximum of one Pin half. (See Figure SC2-2.) b. A Cup is considered Placed if it meets the following criteria: i. The Cup is partially or entirely nested with a Placed Pin.

[<SC2>](#)

Da Question - SC 2 Placed scoring criteria has "partially" seated as a requirement unless specifically split – does count as scored, does this mean that the partially seated / gray cup that partially covers a colored pin is NOT scored while still being partially visible or?

Zodpov?d?I committee

[<SC3>](#) states:

"To count as Scored for the corresponding Alliance, the half of the Placed Pin must remain fully visible (i.e, cannot be partially or fully nested inside the opaque half of a Cup)."

A half of a Placed Pin that is partially nested inside the gray half of a Placed Cup is not considered fully visible, and will not be Scored.

3171: SC4 Don't touch my toggle ... where?

25-Jun-2026

SC4

Thanks all for Automate session June 22, nothing like breaking the game on our first spin - several questions ...

#1 Da Rule [<SC4>](#) [<SC4>](#) A Toggle is considered set to a color when it meets all of the following criteria at the end of the Match: a. The Toggle must be fully seated, such that there is a face of the Toggle in contact and parallel with its mounts on the Field Perimeter at rest. (see Figure SC5-1) **b. The Toggle is not in contact with a Robot from either Alliance.**

Da Question - Is the black bracket included in the "touch" of a toggle that would cause us to ignore the color of the toggle for scoring

Zodpov?d?l committee

The Toggle consists of all parts included in the assembly that spins and moves up/down within the slots of the metal brackets, but does not include the metal brackets themselves.

3154: Clarification of AWP Criteria

23-May-2026

SC8

In rule [<SC8>](#), the first two criteria for the Autonomous Win Point are listed as (emphasis mine):

1. At least seven (7) Pins **Placed** for your Alliance (does not include Pins scored in Quadrants on the opposing side of the Autonomous Line)
2. At least three (3) Goals each contain at least two (2) Pins **scored** for your Alliance (does not include Goals in Quadrants on the opposing side of the Autonomous Line)

[<SC3>](#)states:

Each Placed Pin can have one or two Scored halves.

If a Pin (not in a Quadrant on the opposing side of the Autonomous Line) meets the definition of Placed but not the definition of Scored, does it count as "Placed for your Alliance" when regarding criteria 1 of the Autonomous Win Point?

Zodpov?d?l committee

AWP criteria were revised in the June 4 Game Manual update, clarifying that Pins must be Scored, not just Placed, in order to meet these requirements.

3179: Clarification of AWP

30-Jun-2026

SC8

Hello, [<SC3c>](#): "Each visible yellow half of a Placed and Owned Pin counts as a Scored yellow Pin, earning points for the Alliance that Owns the Pin." [<SC8>](#): An Alliance earns the Autonomous Win Point if it has "7 Pins scored for your Alliance."

Our question is about the meaning of "Pins scored for your Alliance" in [<SC8>](#).

Since [<SC3c>](#) explicitly states that an owned yellow Pin is scored for the Alliance that owns it, does it count toward the seven Pins required for the Autonomous Win Point?

For example:

Blue Alliance has 5 blue Pins and 2 yellow Pins that are owned by Blue because the corresponding Toggle is set to Blue. Does this count as 7 Pins scored for Blue, satisfying the <SC8> requirement?

Could the GDC clarify whether "7 Pins scored for your Alliance" in <SC8> includes owned yellow Pins, or if it refers only to Alliance-colored (blue/red) Pins?

Zodpov?d?I committee

"Pins Scored for your Alliance" includes both Scored Alliance-colored Pins and Scored yellow Pins that are owned by your Alliance, and they count toward AWP requirements as long as those Scored Pins are not in Quadrants on the opposing side of the Autonomous Line.

The blue Alliance has 5 Scored blue Pins and 2 Scored yellow Pins that are owned by blue because the corresponding Toggle is set to blue. Does this count as 7 Pins Scored for blue, satisfying the AWP requirement?


Yes, that's correct.

3161: Position of Alliance Station with reference to loader position.

7-Jun-2026

SG11

[<SG11>](#)



The Driver's Station appears to be about a foot from the field and a foot from the end of the field. It would be difficult for a drive team member to stay in the driver's station as drawn and interact with the loader as intended. Are Event Partners

allowed to change the Driver's Station so that it is against the field and goes to the end of the field?

Thanks!

Zodpov?d?I committee

The Alliance Station tape lines, as depicted in the Game Manual, are not intended to represent exact dimensions or positioning relative to the rest of the field.

We do not provide exact dimensions or positioning for the Alliance Stations since they are typically not critical to gameplay, which provides EPs more leeway when taping off these areas. However, these tape lines should always be placed such that Drive Team Members can reasonably view and interact with the Field from within the Alliance Station during a Match, so the tape lines should extend far enough for Drive Team Members to reach the Loaders with relative ease.

We recognize that this is not made clear in the game manual, so we're planning to incorporate this guidance in the July 2 game manual update.

3164: Match Load Placement Clarification

16-Jun-2026

SG11

<SG11>

In rule SG11 it states "introduce" refers to the moment when a Drive Team Member has released a Scoring Object into a Loader." However, point b of SG11 states "A Match Load Scoring Object may not be contacted by a Robot prior to being introduced into a Loader." Since the only definition of matchloading is when someone releases a game object into a loader, is it legal for a robot to be sitting under a raised loader and a driveteam member releasing a game object into the loader and it falls directly into the robot without it first touching the ground?

Zodpov?d?I committee

Yes, it is legal for a Scoring Object released into a Loader to fall directly into the Robot. There is no requirement for Match Load Scoring Objects to contact the Floor after being introduced.

3170: SG4(a) - Clarification on removal of deflected game objects

23-Jun-2026

SG4

<SG4>

When preparing to referee/score-keep a scrimmage recently, I came across a particular scenario regarding clause A of <SG4>. The first sentence of Clause A states:

If a Scoring Object is leaving the Field (as determined by the Head Referee), but is deflected back into the Field by a Drive Team Member, field monitor, ceiling/wall, or other external factor, it should still be considered "out of the Field" and removed by a Scorekeeper Referee or Head Referee.

My question regarding this clause is if the game element in question does indeed leave the field, as determined by the Head Referee, and is deflected back into the field via an external factor, **but comes to rest in a hard to reach area such as close to or within the midfield** (emphasis mine):

A) Are the Scorekeepers or Head Referee still expected to reach into the field during a match to attempt to remove the game element and reintroduce it back as described in main body of <SG4>?

B) If Yes to A, then how would this be applied to raised fields where mobility to reach into the field is already extremely limited to roughly the first tile or two from the perimeter wall?

C) If No to A, since the objective of the game does not involve any form of tossing or launching of the game elements, would this be left as a Minor/Major Violation ruling based on the listed violation notes and/or a violation of <GG4>, Hands out of the Field, as listed in the latter sentence of Clause A?

I would appreciate the GDCs clarification in proceeding given such a scenario. Thank you!

Zodpov?d?I committee

Note: In version 1.0 of the game manual, <SG4> has been updated such that Scoring Objects that have been deflected back into the Field are no longer considered "out of the Field."

A) No. There is no need to remove these Scoring Objects since they are no longer considered "out of the Field."

B) N/A

C) In the event a Scoring Object is leaving the Field but gets deflected back into the Field by a Drive Team Member, it would most likely be considered incidental contact and would not result in a <GG4> Violation. It would only result in a <GG4> Violation if the contact was deemed to be intentional.

3166: SG6 - Clarification on Possession vs Plowing

18-Jun-2026

SG6

<SG6>

SG6 limits Possession to a maximum of one (1) Pin and one (1) Cup, and SG6a clarifies that Plowing multiple Scoring Objects is permitted.

Appendix B defines Possession as a status where "a Robot's change in direction would result in controlled movement of the Scoring Object," typically requires at least one of the following:

- the object is fully supported
- moved in a preferred direction inside a concave face...
- held against the Floor or a Field Element.

Plowing is defined as intentionally moving an object in a preferred direction with a flat or convex face or **with another Scoring Object** (emphasis mine).

Consider a stack consisting of several Pins and Cups. A Robot uses a concave mechanism such as a claw, to grab a single Scoring Object at the bottom of that stack. The bottom cup or pin is contacting the robot and meets the definition of possession, however the remaining pins and cups only meet the first dot point, and is "moving with another Scoring Object."

Is the Robot considered to be Possessing only the single Scoring Object it has directly grasped, with the remaining stacked objects treated as plowed? Or, because the Robot's change in direction results in controlled movement of every object in the stack, is the Robot considered to be Possessing all of those Pins and Cups placing it in Violation of SG6 once the count exceeds one Pin and/or one Cup?

Zodpov?d?I committee

If a Robot picks up a stack of Pins and Cups by grabbing only the bottom Scoring Object in that stack, the Robot's change in direction would result in controlled movement of every Scoring Object in that stack. Therefore, the Robot is

considered to be in Possession of every Scoring Object in that stack, and the Robot would incur an [<SG6>](#) Violation if this results in Possessing more than one Pin and/or more than one Cup.

3138: Substituting Colored Field Tape for White Tape

14-May-2026

T6

[<T6>](#) states (emphasis mine):

Fields may be repaired at the Event Partner's discretion. All competition Fields at an event must be set up in accordance with the specifications in Appendix A and/or other applicable Sections. **Minor aesthetic customizations or repairs are permitted, provided that they do not impact gameplay** (see [<T4>](#)).

An example of a permissible modification to the Field listed in the rule is:

Using non-VEX electrical tape to add required lines to the Field

Would substituting the red and blue tape lines that define the Load Zones with white tape lines be a permissible modification to the Field?

Zodpov?d?I committee

Note: This answer was revised on July 2, 2026.

Following the addition of SG13 Load Zone protections in the July 2 game manual update, using white tape lines in place of red/blue tape lines for the Load Zones is no longer a permissible Field modification under [<T6>](#).

Event Partners must use red and blue tape lines for the Load Zones to denote which Alliance they belong to. This helps referees identify SG13 violations that may occur involving Robots in and around opposing Alliance Load Zones.