

# Q&A

## VEX V5 Robotics Competition 2026-2027: Override

Tagged: GG5

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 [Regional Support Manager](#).
  - For VEX technical support, contact [support@vex.com](mailto:support@vex.com) or [sales@vex.com](mailto:sales@vex.com).
- For game questions, suggestions, or concerns outside of specific and official rules questions, contact [GDC@vex.com](mailto:GDC@vex.com)

---

### 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?

#### Answered by 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.

---

## 2971: Skills Replay

6-Dec-2025

GG5

Looking for clarification on GG5. In a Skills Attempts when a suspected Field control disconnect has "Disabled Robots" - there are no other robots to check for movement per GG5. When a robot disconnects or pauses during a skills run unexpectedly, should the team be given a replay attempt? Thanks

[<GG5>](#)

### Answered by committee

In a Match with a single Robot, it's more difficult to categorize issues as field-based or Robot-based. Event Partners and Head Referees should consider information from the Field Brain and Robot Brain alongside other information from the event when determining whether or not a replay might be warranted. Other considerations include, but are not limited to:

- Has the Robot had similar issues in previous Matches?
- Have there been similar issues with other Robots on this Field or other Fields?
- Is the Robot's radio surrounded by metal?
- Is there visible damage to the Field cable and/or connector?

Ultimately, the EP and Head Referee must make a judgment call based on all of this information. That judgment call should then guide similar rulings throughout the event.

---

## 2789: Long Goal Control Zone Tape Clarifications

15-Sep-2025

G3 GG5 T5

[<T5a>](#) Field Element tolerances may vary from nominal by up to  $\pm 1.0$ ".

On long goals for push back, tape is applied manually to define the control zone and may be applied onto goals by young and inexperienced volunteers like children. When taping the long goal control zone, I could see someone starting in the correct spot on the top of the goal (when fully assembled) but wrapping the tape around the goal in a way it slants away and back to the initial correct spot. In this plausible scenario, the long goal control zone would not match figure CZ-1 in Game-Specific Definitions. This brings up the first question,

1. Does the entire tape line define the planes to the long goal control zone (such that the control zone would not be confined to two vertical projections perpendicular to the field) or does just the outermost, correctly-aligned tape at the top of the long goal (the corner of the goal in this example where the volunteer started to apply tape) define the projections to the long goal control zone?

[<GG5>](#) **Match replays are allowed, but rare.** a. Match Affecting "Field fault" issues. i. Field Elements starting in incorrect positions, and out of the allowed tolerances (see [<T5>](#)[<T5>](#)).

[<G3>](#) **Use common sense.** When reading and applying the various rules in this document, please remember that common sense always applies in the VEX V5 Robotics Competition.

If the first question is the first answer and the applied tape for the long goal control zones appears off to those scoring the match (we are assuming the head referee(s) is here to keep calls like these consistent across an event), what should be done in the following,

2. The tape is with the 1" tolerance but is substantially offset (such as 3/4" offset, the entire width of the white tape itself) such that it has changed the state of a block being within the long goal control zone. The tape as is would not give benefit of the doubt the block could be in either state, it is well within one of the states inside or outside the control zone. The tape as it is defined in CZ-1 would give benefit of the doubt and decrease the certainty of calling the block in one state, the tape is not set for the referee to give benefit of the doubt for where the tape should be. The situation could also be flipped such that an unclear call would become clear when utilizing CZ-1's tape lines. Should the block be scored as is defined by the tape due to [<GG5>](#) or can [<G3>](#) be applied in egregious instances of tape technically within tolerance?
3. Take the same situation as 2 above but the tape is outside the 1" tolerance. Should the block be scored as is since the field has been that way all day, can [<G3>](#) be applied in verified instances of tape outside tolerance, or is a match re-play after fixing the field long goal tape lines required, not allowed, as outlined in [<GG5>](#)?
4. Does situation 2 or situation 3 apply differently if the scoring decision in question is match affecting?

### Answered by committee

Hi, Karson, and thanks for these questions!

We'll start by saying that the next game manual update will include an additional clause for rule [<T5>](#) that specifies the tolerance for those tape lines is +/- 0.25". This change is effective immediately.

When placing those tape lines, care should be taken to ensure that they align with the edge of the closed portion of the Goal (and repositioned as needed).

To address your specific scenarios:

1. If there is slight variance in tape alignment around a Goal, Head Referees should use the edges of the tape lines on the top surface of the Goal as a "tiebreaker."
2. Same answer as #1.
3. If (during or immediately following a Match) the Head Referee determines that a tape line is out of tolerance, and the incorrect tape position is determined to be Match Affecting, that Match should be replayed after the tape lines are repositioned to be within tolerance.
4. If the misaligned tape line did not affect the outcome of the Match, no replay is needed.