

Q&A

VRC 2023-2024: Over Under

Tagged: SC5

Welcome to the official VEX 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 VRC Over Under 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 VRC Over Under rules questions.

- For event, registration, or other competition support questions, please contact your [REC Foundation 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

[Corner Goal Bonus Score](#)

[Matching Goal Bonus for One Stack \(only\) on Standoff \(SC5/SC6/SE6\)](#)

[Floor Goal White Outline Parameter Check](#)

[A upside-down stack on standoff goal](#)

[Each Stack Placed on the Standoff Goal, all get 10-Point Bonus?](#)

[how much score is two 3 color stacks connected to a beam sitting on a Standoff Goal](#)

[Does touching the Standoff Goal invalidate the stack?](#)

[Matching Goal Bonus](#)

[What the entirely within for Floor Goal](#)

[Three, three colored stacks connected to a beam and placed in a matching triangle goal](#)

[Define entirely within goals](#)

[Interaction between Beam, Floor goal and Standoff Goal](#)

[Do these stacks can get standoff goal bonus](#)

[Compressing the Ball for Rapid Load](#)

[Passing with a robot getting fixed](#)

[<SC5> Pass criteria - is scoring a ball required for a pass?](#)

[\[SG11\]\[SC5\] 50/50 Placed Mobile Goal Status](#)

[Mobile Goal scored in corner with rings still in the corner.](#)

[Further Clarification of Independent Contact and Scoring](#)

[SG11, Placement, and Stuck Robots](#)

3108: Corner Goal Bonus Score

24-Feb-2026

SC5

Hello, In the provided image, Question: According to rule <SC5>, a Stack is considered "Placed in a Goal" if it is entirely within the outline that defines the Goal and meets specific height/stability requirements. Rule <SC3> further states that a Stack is built up from the Floor.

Does a Stack that is contacting the PET sheet (the floor lining) within a Goal Zone fulfill the requirement for being "Placed in a Goal"? <SC5>



Answered by committee

For the purposes of clauses cii and ciii of rule <SC5>, the PET sheet inside a Square or Triangle Goal is synonymous with the Floor inside the Goal.

However, per the definition of Square Goal, "Each Square Goal is bordered by the inside of the Field Perimeter and the inside edges of the VEX IQ pieces connected to the Floor."

If a Stack is resting partially on the VEX IQ pieces connected to the Floor around the Square Goal, then the Stack does not meet the requirements of clause cii of rule <SC5> and cannot be considered "entirely within the Square Goal." Contact with the PET sheet alone is not enough to meet this requirement, and the Stack in your example is not Placed in the Square Goal.

3100: Matching Goal Bonus for One Stack (only) on Standoff (SC5/SC6/SE6)

20-Feb-2026

SC5 SC6

<SE6 Clarification> In the case of a **single stack** being placed on the standoff, does the bottom pin need to be Yellow/Orange to get the matching goal bonus, or does *any* stack placed on the standoff get the Matching Goal Bonus regardless of what color pin is actually in contact with the standoff (e.g. if the bottom pin is red, does it still get the matching goal bonus)? It seems the connected pin should be matching the floor goal/standoff since being placed on the standoff is its own points, but all scoring examples I can find of single stacks all seem to have pictures of only yellow being in contact with the standoff, so the color bonus has applied. Thank you for clarification, as this would be especially important in skills tallying where it is more likely that the pin "attached" to the standoff would be a different color. Thank you.

<SC5> (Stack is on Standoff, no Beam involved) <SC6> (Bottom pin of stack does *not* match floor goal/standoff color)

Answered by committee

<SC6> A Stack earns a Matching Goal bonus when one or more of the following criteria is met:

- a. The Stack is Placed in a Goal with a color that matches the bottom Pin in that Stack.
- b. The Stack is Connected to a Beam

Each Stack can earn a maximum of one (1) Matching Goal bonus.

In order for a Stack consisting of only Pins to earn the Matching Goal bonus, the bottom Pin in the Stack must match the color of the Goal it is Placed in. For example, a Stack of Pins Placed on the Standoff Goal will earn the Matching Goal bonus if the bottom Pin is orange.



If the Stack is Placed on the Standoff Goal and also Connected to a Beam, the color of the bottom Pin in the Stack does not matter because the Stack has already earned the Matching Goal bonus for being Connected to a Beam.


3069: Floor Goal White Outline Parameter Check

1-Feb-2026

SC5

<SC5> Today I had a very close call (which I stand by as I used the same vertical view edge standard all day, but this was by far the closest call that had to be made), but I wanted to submit a Q&A review request in case RECF wants to clarify further. A stack was on the floor goal but the white line was clearly not visible when using a vertical reference view. However, from approximately somewhere around a 35-45 degree angle off vertical (to the right side of the stack), the white line could be seen under the edge of the pin due to pin edge curvature. Since SC5-c-i does indicate that the Stack must be "entirely within the center outline that defines the Floor Goal", my interpretation is that this is a vertical edge line upwards and that the edge of the bottom pin was not within that vertical edge projection (e.g., had something solid been introduced to define the white edge, the bottom pin would have clearly been an obstruction to that object). Unfortunately, I didn't realize I didn't get a picture of the angle at which the white line could be actually be seen, but I've included pictures from a couple different viewing angles so you can see just how close it was. So, (even though I don't have the picture of the visibility of the white line under the pin edge), the clarification I am asking for is if a vertical view edge standard is the correct interpretation, or does RECF want to allow for the white line being visible from any possible viewing angle, even if the bottom pin circumference would not be fully inside a vertical edge projection of the white outline. (Please note: This is not a question about the stacked pins being within the an infinite vertical volume, as that has already been determined in Q&A 2755 and was not the issue in this case--this is strictly in relation to the circumference of the base pin not being fully within what would be a vertical edge).





Answered by committee

... the clarification I am asking for is if a vertical view edge standard is the correct interpretation, or does RECF want to allow for the white line being visible from any possible viewing angle, even if the bottom pin circumference would not be fully inside a vertical edge projection of the white outline.

Based on the construction and depth of the "fins" on the bottom of each Pin, a top down view provides the best viewing angle when determining whether a Stack is fully within the Floor Goal.

Head Referees may have to make a judgment call, and should ensure that all similar calls during that event use the same, consistent logic. If the Head Referee decides that a Stack's position is too close to call, that Stack should count as Placed in the Floor Goal.

3004: A upside-down stack on standoff goal

26-Dec-2025

SC5

If a upside-down stack place on the standoff, like the picture below, does this stack consider as CONNECT TO the standoff goal to the 10 points bonus?



OnePlus 13 | *HASSELBLAD*

2025年12月21日 17:43 | Laevatein Scarlet

Answered by committee

Note: Our answer to this question was revised on January 22, 2026. We apologize for the confusion this topic has generated, and we will attempt to further clarify this topic in the January 29 game manual update.

[Q&A 3009](#) expands clause D of rule [<SC3>](#) to count a nested Stack that is resting on **any part of the Standoff Goal** in a way that is more “up and down” than sideways to count as roughly vertical.

The Stack in this example meets the requirements of all clauses of [<SC3>](#), and should be scored as follows, for a total of 7 points:


- Two Connected Pins (one point each = 2 points)
- One 2-color Stack (5 points)
- Because the Stack is not Connected to the Goal, it cannot receive a Matching Goal bonus or points for being Connected to the Standoff Goal

2919: Each Stack Placed on the Standoff Goal, all get 10-Point Bonus?

14-Nov-2025

SC5

[<SC5>](#) <SE7>show an example of standoff goal bonus. Today I got another standoff case. standoff connected to a red/blue pin, then bean and stacks. how to count the case?



Answered by committee

Thanks for your question, Jason.

Your example is scored very similarly to <SE7>, but with one fewer Connected Pins (-1 point) and one 3-color Stack reduced to a 2-color Stack (-10 point change). The total score for the pictured scenario would be 110 points.

The color of the bottom Pin in this scenario does not affect how it is scored. The Stack on the bottom of this structure already gets the Matching Goal bonus because it's Connected to a Beam, and each Stack can only earn one Matching Goal bonus (even if it meets both criteria simultaneously).


2894: how much score is two 3 color stacks connected to a beam sitting on a Standoff Goal

2-Nov-2025

SC5 SC6

We believe in the picture below, it should 84 points since it has 4 pins, 1 connected beam, 2 three color stacks, 2 stacks connected to a beam, 2 stacks on standoff goal. But we were repeatedly deny this score in our school's league and need to explain a lot for this situation. Can you help me to clarify it and use it as an example in the game manually. thanks.

[<SC6>](#) [<SC5>](#)



Answered by committee

Hello, Team 84W, and thanks for your question.

We agree. This example is worth a total of 84 points, as follows:

- 4 Connected Pins at 1 point each = 4 points
- 1 Connected Beam = 10 points
- Two 3-color Stacks at 15 point each = 30 points
- Two Stacks with a Matching Goal Bonus at 10 points each = 20 points

- Two Stacks Placed on the Standoff Goal at 10 points each = 20 points
-

2792: Does touching the Standoff Goal invalidate the stack?


16-Sep-2025

SC5

[<SC5>](#)

Does the Standoff Goal count as a goal (which can be touching a robot) or part of the stack (which cannot be touching the robot) for the purposes of scoring?

In the example below the robot is touching the standoff but NOT touching the stack.



Answered by committee

Hello, and thanks for your question, Team 42000B!

The Standoff Goal includes all pieces of the orange plastic structure in the center of the Field, and Goals are not considered parts of Stacks. Contacting a Goal has no impact on scoring.

We hope this helps!

2779: Matching Goal Bonus

10-Sep-2025

SC5

[<SC5>](#)

SC5 says you can have a maximum of 3 stacks in the triangle shaped goal. Does that mean you can get 3 separate matching goal bonuses from 3 stacks in the same corner goal?

Answered by committee

That is correct.


As stated in [<SC6>](#), "Each Stack can earn a maximum of one (1) Matching Goal bonus." Using your example, each of the 3 Stacks in the Triangle Goal that meet one or more of the criteria listed in [<SC6>](#) will earn a Matching Goal bonus.

2768: What the entirely within for Floor Goal

31-Aug-2025

SC5

In this situation, this Stack is partly on the white outline of Floor Goal, but not beyond it at all, so does this Stack meet "entirely within" in [<SC5.c>](#)?



OnePlus 13 | *HASSELBLAD*

2025年8月31日 16:38 | Laevatein Scarlet



OnePlus 13 | *H A S S E L B L A D*
2025年8月31日 16:38 | Laevatein Scarlet

Answered by committee

The Floor Goal includes the white outline, so this Stack is entirely within the Goal.

2756: Three, three colored stacks connected to a beam and placed in a matching triangle goal

7-Aug-2025
SC5

(https://events.vex.com/storage/game_manual/VEX_IQ_Robotics_Competition_2025-2026_Mix_Match/rules/SC5.html) Rule SC5A states, "A Stack is considered Placed in a Goal at the end of the Match if it meets all of the following criteria. a. There are at least two (2) Connected Scoring Objects in the Stack. b. No part of the Stack is contacting a Robot. **** c. The Stack meets one of the following criteria:**** i. The Stack is entirely within the center outline that defines the Floor Goal (maximum of four (4) Stacks). ii. The Stack is entirely within a Square Goal (maximum of one (1) Stack per Goal). **** iii. The Stack is entirely within a Triangle Goal (maximum of three (3) Stacks per Goal).**** iv. The Stack is Connected to the Standoff Goal or (via a Beam) to another Stack that is Placed on the Standoff Goal (maximum of one (1) Stack without including a Beam, or three (3) Stacks if all share a Beam).

Per SC5ciii The maximum number of stacks in a Triangle Goal is three and they must be entirely within the goal. Per the definition of a Goal each Triangle Goal is bordered by the inside of the Field Perimeter and the inside of the PVC pipe that spans the corner of the Field. (1) Are the borders of the Triangle Goal infinitely vertical? If so, (2) is it possible for three stacks to be connected to a Beam and placed in a Triangle Goal and be entirely within the Goal? And, if so, (3) how would you score three, three colored stacks connected to a Beam and placed in a Matching Goal?

Answered by committee

The Triangle Goal is defined as that section of the floor, so only the one or two Stacks that are in contact with the floor would qualify as being Placed in that Goal. Being Placed in a Matching Goal shares a bonus with being Connected to a Beam (see [SC6](#)), so although those Stacks could count as being in a Matching Goal it won't change the score of the Match.

2755: Define entirely within goals

7-Aug-2025

SC5 SC6

<SC5c> requires a stack to be "entirely within" a goal to be considered placed in a goal. This is a prerequisite to score the matching goal bonus in <SC6>.

Any stack of two or more pins will rarely be perfectly vertical. Each pin in the stack may be a millimeter or two to the side. Included is a picture of a stack of six pins since it shows this shifting more drastically than a stack of two or three. The stack is pushed into the corner of the triangle goal in a way that the bottom pin is flush with the floor wall and the inside edge of the pipe - clearly within the goal. Each pin shifts further and further toward the outside of the field and crosses the floor wall. The triangle goal is defined by the inside of the floor wall and the inside of the pipe. However, the stack crosses this vertical plane as it gets taller.

Is this stack "entirely within" the floor goal if it crosses the vertical plane of the floor goal boundary?

Similar situations could be created with the square goal and floor goal where the bottom pin is within the boundary but successively stacked pins shift outside the vertical perimeter.



Answered by committee

The goals (other than the Standoff Goal) are defined as sections of floor, not vertical projections. If the lowest Pin in the Stack is entirely within the Goal's defined section of floor (i.e., not propped up on the PVC or perimeter that surrounds a Triangle or Square Goal, or not extending beyond the defined edges of the Floor Goal) the Stack meets the criteria of [SC5](#) clauses Ci-iii.

2717: Interaction between Beam, Floor goal and Standoff Goal

12-Jul-2025

SC5 SC6


In [SC6](#), it states:

A Stack earns a Matching Goal bonus when one or more of the following criteria is met: a. The Stack is Placed in a Goal with a color that matches the bottom Pin in that Stack. b. The Stack is Connected to a Beam.


Additionally [SC5c](#), states

The Stack meets one of the following criteria: i. The Stack is entirely within the center outline that defines the Floor Goal (maximum of four (4) Stacks). ii. The Stack is entirely within a Square Goal (maximum of one (1) Stack per Goal). iii. The Stack is entirely within a Triangle Goal (maximum of three (3) Stacks per Goal). iv. The Stack is Connected to the Standoff Goal or (via a Beam) to another Stack that is Placed on the Standoff Goal (maximum of one (1) Stack without including a Beam, or three (3) Stacks if all share a Beam).

Given these Rules, how would the 2 scenarios below be scored?



the standoff
n be considered
f goal due to an



Lastly, SC5c also states that there is a maximum of 4 stacks in the floor goal, if a robot would push 3 more stacks into the floor goal, would any of the stacks be not considered within the floor goal given the results of the above 2 scenarios?

Answered by committee

Thank you for your questions. Clause c.iv of rule [SC5](#) will be revised as follows in the next game manual update to clarify how Stacks can qualify as Placed in the Standoff Goal.

The Stack is above the Standoff Goal in one of the following configurations:

- The Stack is Connected to the Standoff Goal
- The Stack is Connected up from a Beam that is Connected to the Standoff Goal
- The Stack is Connected up from a Beam that is part of another Stack that is Connected to the Standoff Goal

Because the rightmost Stack in each of your Scenarios is built "down" from the Beam rather than "up" from the Beam, it is not considered Placed in the Standoff Goal, it *is* considered Placed in the Floor Goal, and it will count toward the maximum number of four Stacks that can be Placed in the Floor Goal.

As a result, your scenario 1 would be scored as:

- 8 Connected Pins
- 1 Connected Beam
- 3 three-color Stacks
- 3 Matching Goal bonuses
- 1 Stack Placed on the Standoff Goal

Your scenario 2 would be scored as:

- 11 Connected Pins
- 1 Connected Beam
- 1 two-color Stack
- 3 three-color Stacks
- 4 Matching Goal bonuses
- 2 Stacks Placed on the Standoff Goal

2714: Do these stacks can get standoff goal bonus

12-Jul-2025

SC5

In [<SC5>](#).c.iv, the stacks connected to another placed stack via Beam will be placed on standoff goal too. And with [<SC5>](#).b, a stack that is contacting a robot will not be placed, so the stack below than beam not placed to the standoff goal. I'd like to know, in this moment, does the beam and two stacks that above the beam placed on standoff goal, could it get the standoff goal bonus . [Example Image]

Answered by committee

This follows similar logic to [<SE9>](#). The Pins in the Stack that is in contact with the Robot do not qualify as Connected to each other, to the Beam, or to the Standoff Goal (see [<SC3>](#) and [<SC5>](#)).

As a result, the two remaining Stacks are not considered Placed in the Standoff Goal because they no longer meet the conditions of clause c.iv of rule [<SC5>](#).

This example would be scored as:

- 4 Connected Pins
- 1 Connected Beam
- 2 three-color Stacks
- 2 Matching Goal bonuses
- 1 Robot in contact with Scoring Objects at the end of the Match

2577: Compressing the Ball for Rapid Load

26-Feb-2025

S1 SC5

There are teams that are trying to compress the ball to a point of being near flat to Rapid Load directly under their Rubberband roller so that when the ball reforms to its correct dimensions of the intake roller. This also can run the risk of an EP needing replacement objects due to the high stress on the seams of the ball and students running the risk of breaking the ball in the middle of the run.

Sc5 the ball can NOT be in motion to be legally rapid loaded would this action count as motion of the ball?

"Note: Although it is not required, Robots are highly recommended to remain some distance away from the Ball entirely until the Loader's hand has clearly been removed. This will make clauses "B" and "C" abundantly clear to Head Referees, and help them to verify clauses "A" and "D".

The revised intent of this rule is that the human Loader should not impart any motion to a Rapid Load Ball. However, because Balls are round, it is possible that they may move slightly after being placed by the Loader. This incidental and unintentional motion is acceptable, and there is no need to retrieve and reload the Ball in this scenario."

<S1> Stay safe, don't damage the Field. If, at any time, the Robot operation or Team actions are deemed unsafe or have damaged any Field Elements or Balls, the offending Team may be Disabled and/or Disqualified at the Head Referee's discretion. The Robot will require re-inspection before it may again take the Field.

Answered by committee

... would this action count as motion of the ball?

No.

The strategy you describe does not directly violate any rules in the game manual, although Teams that use it should not receive the benefit of the doubt if it's not abundantly clear to a Head Referee that the Ball is being Loaded in compliance with clauses A-D and F of rule [<SG5>](#).

Additionally, Teams risk Violations of [<S1>](#) if their actions damage Balls (e.g., cause stitching to break) with this or any other strategy.

Note: This strategy may be restricted in the April 2, 2025, game manual update pertaining to the VEX Robotics World Championship.

2546: Passing with a robot getting fixed

17-Feb-2025

G10 SC5

[<G10>](#)

When a robot needs assistance while on the field a student must:

1. Put their controller down
2. Remove any balls in their possession (getting "controlled" by robot)
3. Assist the robot as necessary
4. Replace the robot in a legal starting position

G10 does not currently require that the robot is removed from the field while assisting it, whether that is reattaching pieces, putting wheels back on etc.

[<SC5>](#)

A pass is counted after:

1. Both robots have independent contact with the ball
2. The ball having met the above criteria has not already been counted for a pass
3. The ball has not been "rapid loaded"

SC5 does not currently exclude robots that are being assisted through G10 from receiving a pass.

Here are a couple important scenarios to consider:

1. Should a pass be counted if the robot still driving on the field grabs a new ball from the load station and pushes it into the robot getting fixed?
2. Should that same pass as described above still count if the robot is moved into the ball by the drivers that are fixing the robot? (My thoughts right now are that 1 should count but that 2 would be in violation of G10 based on the violation notes describing possible exploitation of this action)
3. Should a pass be counted if a robot being assisted touched a ball before being assisted but was not controlling it when enacting G10, and the robot still driving then goes over and touches the ball?
4. Should teams be required to remove their robots from the field if they are fixing something over a length of time?

The questions I'm posing revolve around the specificity of G10, and whether or not robots are treated the same while being assisted or not. I believe that 1 and 3 should be considered passes, and that 2 would be violating G10.

Answered by committee

Robots being handled during a [G10](#) interaction are effectively "out of play." Robot contact with a Ball during a [G10](#) interaction should not count toward a Pass.

As described in the Violation Notes for [G10](#), "Strategically exploiting this rule may be considered a Minor Violation or Major Violation at the Head Referee's discretion." This would include intentionally moving the Robot to affect game play during a Robot reset.

Your scenario 3, in which the Robot was contacting the Ball before being handled through [G10](#), could still be recorded as a legal Pass.

Teams are not required to remove their Robots from the Field during [G10](#) or [RSC8](#) interactions.

2504: <SC5> Pass criteria - is scoring a ball required for a pass?

4-Feb-2025

SC5

[SC5](#) states that "An Alliance receives credit for a Pass once both Robots independently contact a Ball before it is **Scored or leaves the Field**."

Question: is it required for a ball to be scored or leave the field before it counts for a pass?

For example, during the last seconds of a match

- Robot 1 makes independent contact with the ball
- The ball is passed to robot 2
- Robot 2 makes independent contact with the ball
- The timer expires before the ball is scored or leaves the field

Should this ball be counted as passed?

Answered by committee

The intent of this language in rule [SC5](#), "before it is Scored or leaves the Field," is to require both Robots to make independent contact with the Ball during the same Rapid Relay "cycle" in order to count as a Pass. This is further explained in [SC5](#) clause B, stating that "any previous Robot contact and/or Pass tracking is 'reset'" for a Ball when that Ball is Scored or leaves the Field.

In your example, a Pass should be recorded for that Ball since both Robots made independent contact with the Ball during the same Rapid Relay "cycle" (that period of time after the Ball is Loaded and before the Ball is Scored or leaves the Field). The Pass is counted at the moment independent contact has been made with both Robots. As

| such, there is no requirement for the Ball to be Scored or leave the Field in order to complete the process of a Pass.

2492: [SG11][SC5] 50/50 Placed Mobile Goal Status

1-Feb-2025

SC5 SG11

Right before the protected period, blue1 is slightly tilting the goal away from their robot in the positive corner on the opposite side of the field in a way that is indeterminable from a head referee and some scorekeeper referee's points of views if the mobile goal is placed but it can be reasonably assumed the goal could be placed. At 30 seconds they drive away and the goal slightly drops from the tilt, causing concern it might have been lifted.

Should a mobile goal always be considered not placed unless confirmed placed similar to [Q&A 2122](#), or should we give benefit of the doubt in the situations that could be considered 50/50 calls?

Answered by committee

It is impossible to issue a blanket answer beyond what is written in the Game Manual that encompasses all possible situations based on a snapshot description of a hypothetical Match, Robot, mechanism, or interaction. This determination and ruling must be made by the Head Referee based on the context of the Match.

2384: Mobile Goal scored in corner with rings still in the corner.

12-Dec-2024

SC5

[<SC5>](#) During one of our matches, RED1 puts a mobile goal with blue rings in the negative corner, however there is still the 4 rings that began in the corner present. The mobile goal's edge (Not base) is over the tape line. Would this goal be considered scored? It does break the plane of the corner, however there are still rings in the corner.

Answered by committee

If the Mobile Goal meets all the criteria of [<SC5>](#), then it is considered Placed in the Corner. There is no requirement that the Corner be otherwise empty.

2361: Further Clarification of Independent Contact and Scoring

8-Dec-2024

SC5

[<SC5>](#) [<2220>](#) [<2286>](#) [<2305>](#) In our recent competition we ran into a understanding of this rule that I would like clarified.

One team, robot 1, spit the ball at another team so that it bounced off robot 2 and considered that a pass then robot 1 got the ball and scored.

Technically they both independently contacted it. Can the first robot get the ball again to score. Would this count as one goal and one pass?

In this same competition, Robot 1 attempts to score but misses then Robot 2 picks up that ball and counts it as a pass and then scores. Would this count as one goal and one pass?

Answered by committee

One team, robot 1, spit the ball at another team so that it bounced off robot 2 and considered that a pass then robot 1 got the ball and scored. Technically they both independently contacted it. Can the first robot get the ball again to score. Would this count as one goal and one pass?

Yes.

In this same competition, Robot 1 attempts to score but misses then Robot 2 picks up that ball and counts it as a pass and then scores. Would this count as one goal and one pass?

Yes.

If each Robot has contacted the Ball (at any time between that Ball being Loaded and leaving the Field) while the other Robot is *not* contacting the Ball, they have achieved a Pass.

2330: SG11, Placement, and Stuck Robots

27-Nov-2024

SC5 SG11

During a game, BLUE1 became stuck on a ring while holding a mobile goal. The robot was inside the positive corner. The mobile goal was also stuck on a ring and was within the volume of the positive corner (they were attempting to place it), but was not touching the ground. They were stuck there for 45 seconds, including the 15 seconds of positive corner protection. Here were the rules questions that arose from this:

1. Was the mobile goal considered in the positive corner since it was not contacting the floor tiles or the tape?
2. Was BLUE1 in violation of SG11 if they did not operate their mobile goal grabbing mechanism to attempt to drop the goal after SG11 takes effect? Would operating the mechanism have made this an SG11 violation?
3. The mobile goal not being placed meant this was not a match affecting violation but if the goal would have been considered placed, it would have been match affecting. Given that this was not match affecting, should this have been a minor violation or a major violation?

Answered by committee

1. Was the mobile goal considered in the positive corner since it was not contacting the floor tiles or the tape?

If the Mobile Goal was not touching the Floor or a white tape line, then that Mobile Goal did not meet all of the criteria to be considered Placed in a Corner. See [<SC5>](#) clause A.

2. Was BLUE1 in violation of SG11 if they did not operate their mobile goal grabbing mechanism to attempt to drop the goal after SG11 takes effect? Would operating the mechanism have made this an SG11 violation?

As described above, the Mobile Goal was not Placed. Because BLUE1 kept the Mobile Goal raised and never dropped it, there was no [<SG11>](#) Violation in this scenario. If BLUE1 had operated their mechanism and dropped the Mobile Goal, resulting in the Mobile Goal becoming Placed in a Positive Corner during the [<SG11>](#) protection period, then BLUE1 would have intentionally violated [<SG11>](#) resulting in a Major Violation and Disqualification for the Match.

3. The mobile goal not being placed meant this was not a match affecting violation but if the goal would have been considered placed, it would have been match affecting. Given that this was not match affecting, should this have been a minor violation or a major violation?

| Because there was no Placed Mobile Goal in your scenario, there was no Violation of [<SG11>](#).