

# Q&A

## VEX V5 Robotics Competition 2026-2027: Override

Tagged: SG10

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)

## Index

[Using Scoring Objects to Exceed Expansion](#)

[Tipping the Opponent's Platform is Illegal?](#)

[Scoring on Opponents Platform](#)

[Pushing Disabled Opponent Underneath Their Platform](#)

[Using tallest Neutral Mobile Goal to impede opponents gameplay](#)

[Is it allowable to push Game Objects under your opponent's platform?](#)

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

[Long Goal Blocking](#)

[Guidance on SG10 - goalkeeping](#)

[Reaching Into Goal Without Scoring During Driver Control](#)

[SG 10 Violation Notes - 10pt Match affecting consideration](#)

[Clarification on Q&A 2826](#)

[Definition of Offensive Directly Contradicts <SG10a>](#)

[<GG9> <GG15> <GG17> <SG10> Priority Call for a Head Referee](#)

[Touching blocks fully under enclosed section of long goal](#)

[Detached Robot Parts Impeding Goals <GG8> <GG9> <SG10>](#)

[Clarification on Major / Minor for GG9](#)

[Clarifications regarding SG10 & GG9](#)

[Clarification on GG9 and SG10 Regarding Goalkeeping](#)

[Clarification on <SG10> and Q&A 2791](#)

---

## 909: Using Scoring Objects to Exceed Expansion

1-Nov-2021

SG2 SG10

Hello,

SG2

Robot expansion is limited once the Match begins. Per <G4>, at the beginning of a Match, each Robot must be smaller than a volume of 18" (457.2 mm) long by 18" (457.2 mm) wide by 18" (457.2mm) tall. Once the Match begins, Robots may expand, but no horizontal dimension can exceed 36" (914.4 mm) at any point during the Match. See Figure 24.

Note: This is intended to be a linear, horizontal, "point-to-point" limit, measured across an expanded Robot. It is not a 3D volume, and it does not "rotate" with the Robot.

Note 2: If a Head Referee is uncertain whether a Robot has momentarily expanded beyond this limit, they may ask the Team after the Match to replicate the Robot's state and check for compliance using a tape measure, VRC Expanded Sizing Tool, or other linear measuring device.

Minor violations of this rule that do not affect or interfere with the Match will result in a warning. Match Affecting offenses will result in a Disqualification. Teams that receive multiple warnings may also receive a Disqualification at the Head Referee's discretion

SG10

Use Scoring Objects to play the game. Scoring Objects may not be used to accomplish actions that would be otherwise illegal if they were attempted by Robot mechanisms (e.g., Interfering with an opponent's Autonomous routine per <SG4>.)

The intent of this rule is to prohibit teams from using game objects as "gloves" to loophole any rule that states "a Robot may not [do some action]". This rule is not intended to be taken in its most extreme literal interpretation, where any interaction between a Scoring Object and a Robot needs to be scrutinized with the same intensity as if it were a Robot.

---

With 2 bar mobile goal lifts, teams have found they can hold the tall neutral goal so the pole is parallel to the ground and can increase the effective length of their robot. My interpretation is because of the SG10 note, this would only be illegal if it's used intentionally.

Is using a Scoring Object to increase the Robots horizontal length past 36" legal? What should a Referee look for to determine if an action violates <SG2> through <SG10>?

Thank you for your time!

### Answered by committee

Is using a Scoring Object to increase the Robots horizontal length past 36" legal? What should a Referee look for to determine if an action violates <SG2> through <SG10>?

Holding a Scoring Object such that the horizontal length of Robot + Scoring Object exceeds 36" is not, by itself, illegal. In the strictest interpretation of SG2 + SG10, it could be considered a "minor violation of this rule that does not affect or interfere with the Match".

However, you are correct that it is riding the edge of a very slippery slope. This scenario could escalate if the Scoring Object was used to accomplish an action that would be otherwise illegal if attempted by a greater-than-36" Robot mechanism. Examples could include, but are not limited to:

- Defending or Trapping an opponent
- Hoarding
- Manipulating a Platform

At this point, the standard SG2 review would be used to determine the penalty, i.e. if the violation was Match Affecting or not.

---

## 898: Tipping the Opponent's Platform is Illegal?

25-Oct-2021

SG3 SG10

Hello,

SG3

Platforms are “safe” during the endgame. During the last thirty (30) seconds, Robots may not contact the opposing Alliance’s Platform.

a. For the purposes of this rule, contact is considered “transitive” through other Robots and Scoring Objects. For example, contacting an opposing Robot who is contacting their own Platform would be considered a violation of this rule.

b. For the purposes of this rule, <G13> supersedes rule <G14>. Any Robot which is contacting its own Platform during the last thirty (30) seconds, provided that no other rules are being violated, will automatically receive the “benefit of the doubt”. Therefore, any contact with this Robot will be considered a violation, regardless of intent.

c. Per <SG10>, using a Scoring Object to contact the opposing Alliance’s Platform during the last thirty (30) seconds would be considered a violation of this rule. Placing a Scoring Object underneath the opposing Alliance’s Platform, such that it inhibits the opposing Alliance’s ability to utilize the Platform during the last thirty (30) seconds, would also be considered a violation of this rule.

SG10

Use Scoring Objects to play the game. Scoring Objects may not be used to accomplish actions that would be otherwise illegal if they were attempted by Robot mechanisms (e.g., Interfering with an opponent’s Autonomous routine per <SG4>.) The intent of this rule is to prohibit teams from using game objects as “gloves” to loophole any rule that states “a Robot may not [do some action]”. This rule is not intended to be taken in its most extreme literal interpretation, where any interaction between a Scoring Object and a Robot needs to be scrutinized with the same intensity as if it were a Robot.

Field Element Definition

The foam field tiles, field perimeter, white tape, Platforms, and all supporting structures or accessories (such as driver station posts, field monitors, etc).

Scoring Object Definition

A Ring or Mobile Goal.

Q&A 813 <https://www.robotevents.com/VRC/2021-2022/QA/813> “bolded portion” is SG3 C

The intent of this rule is to prohibit Teams from preventing their opponents' Platforms to become Balanced during the last thirty (30) seconds of the Match. The intent of the bolded portion is to prohibit Teams from using Scoring Objects to do so.

Q. I assume that if a team was to accidentally cause a Scoring Object to end up underneath the opposition Platform, if they were able to remove this before the last 30 seconds there would be no risk of an SG3 violation.

A. This would generally be a correct interpretation, yes.

it would not be feasible for a Head Referee to track which Alliance was last in contact with all Rings and Mobile Goals around the field.

If faced with this situation, we would recommend that Head Referees ask questions such as the following to guide their decision: How did the Mobile Goal get under the Platform? Has the Team in question received prior warnings or violations? Why did the red alliance not attempt to Balance the Platform? Does G13 and/or G14 apply (for either Alliance)?

It has been established that placing game objects underneath the opponents platform, if it inhibits the opponents from using the platform in the final 30 seconds, would be a violation of SG3 C if a referee verifies that it happened.

This brings up the scenario of tipping an opponent platform that already has a Scoring Object on it. It is legal to contact the opposition's Platform before the last 30 seconds, but illegal to leave a Scoring Object contacting the platform during the final 30 seconds.

When tipping a Platform before the final 30 seconds, Scoring Objects are being moved to the base of the Platform, in a similar place to where a Mobile Goal starts the match. If these Scoring Objects aren't removed before the final 30 seconds, this is potentially a violation of SG3 C through SG10.

Does SG10 include using a Field Element to move Scoring Objects? Does this change if a Scoring Object is used to move the Field Element that interacts with Scoring Objects?

Thank you for your time!

(Is the text under SG10 meant to be in a red box?)

### Answered by committee

The v2.2 Game Manual update included revisions to rule <SG3> which we feel address this question. We recommend reviewing the full text of <SG3>, including the "red box" clarifications, for more information. Notably, the following example was added:

Some example applications of this rule, and their intended penalties, are as follows:

[...]

- Tipping an opponent's Platform, which has Mobile Goals already on it, prior to the last 30 seconds.

? No violation/penalty, provided that no other rules are violated

If this does not answer your question, please feel free to rephrase and re-submit.

## 897: Scoring on Opponents Platform

25-Oct-2021

SG3 SG10

Hello,

SG3

Platforms are “safe” during the endgame. During the last thirty (30) seconds, Robots may not contact the opposing Alliance’s Platform.

a. For the purposes of this rule, contact is considered “transitive” through other Robots and Scoring Objects. For example, contacting an opposing Robot who is contacting their own Platform would be considered a violation of this rule.

b. For the purposes of this rule, <G13> supersedes rule <G14>. Any Robot which is contacting its own Platform during the last thirty (30) seconds, provided that no other rules are being violated, will automatically receive the “benefit of the doubt”. Therefore, any contact with this Robot will be considered a violation, regardless of intent.

c. Per <SG10>, using a Scoring Object to contact the opposing Alliance’s Platform during the last thirty (30) seconds would be considered a violation of this rule. Placing a Scoring Object underneath the opposing Alliance’s Platform, such that it inhibits the opposing Alliance’s ability to utilize the Platform during the last thirty (30) seconds, would also be considered a violation of this rule.

SG10

Use Scoring Objects to play the game. Scoring Objects may not be used to accomplish actions that would be otherwise illegal if they were attempted by Robot mechanisms (e.g., Interfering with an opponent’s Autonomous routine per <SG4>.)

The intent of this rule is to prohibit teams from using game objects as “gloves” to loophole any rule that states “a Robot may not [do some action]”. This rule is not intended to be taken in its most extreme literal interpretation, where any interaction between a Scoring Object and a Robot needs to be scrutinized with the same intensity as if it were a Robot.

Field Element Definition

The foam field tiles, field perimeter, white tape, Platforms, and all supporting structures or accessories (such as driver station posts, field monitors, etc).

Scoring Object Definition

A Ring or Mobile Goal.

Q&A 813 <https://www.robotevents.com/VRC/2021-2022/QA/813> “bolded portion” is SG3 C

The intent of this rule is to prohibit Teams from preventing their opponents' Platforms to become Balanced during the last thirty (30) seconds of the Match. The intent of the bolded portion is to prohibit Teams from using Scoring Objects to do so.

Q&A 816 <https://www.robotevents.com/VRC/2021-2022/QA/816>

Q. I assume that if a team was to accidentally cause a Scoring Object to end up underneath the opposition Platform, if they were able to remove this before the last 30 seconds there would be no risk of an SG3 violation.

A. This would generally be a correct interpretation, yes.

it would not be feasible for a Head Referee to track which Alliance was last in contact with all Rings and Mobile Goals around the field.

If faced with this situation, we would recommend that Head Referees ask questions such as the following to guide their decision: How did the Mobile Goal get under the Platform? Has the Team in question received prior warnings or violations? Why did the red alliance not attempt to Balance the Platform? Does G13 and/or G14 apply (for either Alliance)?

It has been established that placing game objects underneath the opponents platform is illegal if a referee verifies that it happened, it would be a violation of SG3 C.

Is placing a Scoring Object on the opponents Platform a violation of SG3 C?

Thank you for your time!

### Answered by committee

**Edit 2021-12-07:** The v2.2 Game Manual update included the following revision to rule <SG3>, which we believe answers this question more thoroughly than the original answer. We recommend reviewing the full text of <SG3>, including the “red box” clarifications, for more information.

Point “d” applies to Robot actions prior to the last thirty (30) seconds of the Match:

d. Placing a Scoring Object on or under the opposing Alliance’s Platform, at any point during the Match is considered a minor violation of this rule that, at a minimum, will result in a warning.

i. If the placement is accidental, and immediately rectified (i.e. the Scoring Object is immediately removed), then this violation will be considered a warning.

ii. If the placement is intentional and / or not immediately rectified, as judged by the Head Referee, then it will be considered a violation.

iii. Repeated, strategic, and / or egregious warnings may also escalate to a violation, at the Head Referee’s discretion.

[...]

Violations of this rule which do interfere with gameplay will result in a Disqualification, regardless of whether the interference was Match Affecting or not.

Note: If point “d” has escalated from a warning into a violation, then it will automatically be considered a violation which has interfered with gameplay, i.e. will result in a Disqualification.

So, with this new verbiage in mind:

Is placing a Scoring Object on the opponents Platform a violation of SG3 C?

Yes, in version 2.2 and onward, placing a Scoring Object on the opponent's Platform is considered a violation of SG3-d.

## 896: Pushing Disabled Opponent Underneath Their Platform

25-Oct-2021

SG3 SG10

Hello,

SG3

Platforms are “safe” during the endgame. During the last thirty (30) seconds, Robots may not contact the opposing Alliance’s Platform.

a. For the purposes of this rule, contact is considered “transitive” through other Robots and Scoring Objects. For example, contacting an opposing Robot who is contacting their own Platform would be considered a violation of this rule.

b. For the purposes of this rule, <G13> supersedes rule <G14>. Any Robot which is contacting its own Platform during the last thirty (30) seconds, provided that no other rules are being violated, will automatically receive the “benefit of the doubt”. Therefore, any contact with this Robot will be considered a violation, regardless of intent.

c. Per <SG10>, using a Scoring Object to contact the opposing Alliance’s Platform during the last thirty (30) seconds would be considered a violation of this rule. Placing a Scoring Object underneath the opposing Alliance’s Platform, such that it inhibits the opposing Alliance’s ability to utilize the Platform during the last thirty (30) seconds, would also be considered a violation of this rule.

---

Robot 1&2 - Red

Robot 3&4 - Blue

Robot 1 becomes disabled due to a battery unplugging and cannot move. Robot 3 or 4 pushes robot 1 so they are underneath the platform while the platform is unbalanced, and makes no attempt to move them. Robot 2 platforms, and meets all definitions of Elevated except for the Platform contacting Robot 1.

Is this a violation of SG3 A regardless of intention?

Thank you for your time!

### Answered by committee

Robot 1 becomes disabled due to a battery unplugging and cannot move. Robot 3 or 4 pushes robot 1 so they are underneath the platform while the platform is unbalanced, and makes no attempt to move them. Robot 2 platforms, and meets all definitions of Elevated except for the Platform contacting Robot 1.

Is this a violation of SG3 A regardless of intention?

This hypothetical scenario is missing several key points of context that make it difficult to provide a concrete answer. For the sake of simplicity, we are going to assume the following points. If this does not align with your intended question, please feel free to rephrase and re-submit.

- The Platform in question is the red one
- Red Robot 1 contacted the red Platform while it was being pushed by the blue Robot
- The interaction happened during the last 30 seconds

With this context, the interaction would be considered a violation of SG3-a on the blue Robot, for transitive contact with the red Platform.

The Platform would not be considered Balanced, due to it being in contact with a Robot who is contacting the field tile. Therefore, Robot 2 would not be considered Elevated.

Violations of this rule which do not interfere with gameplay, such as bumping into the Platform and then driving away, will result in the opposing Alliance receiving credit for one additional Elevated Robot at the end of the Match. (Alliances may still only receive points for a maximum of two Elevated Robots).

Violations of this rule which do interfere with gameplay, such as preventing a Platform from becoming Balanced, will result in a Disqualification, regardless of whether the interference was Match Affecting or not.

This would be considered a violation of SG3 that interfered with gameplay, as the violation prevented the Platform from meeting the definition of Balanced. Therefore, the blue Robot would receive a Disqualification.

---

## 806: Using tallest Neutral Mobile Goal to impede opponents gameplay

10-Jun-2021

SG6 G12 SG10

The tall Neutral Mobile Goal tips over in more than 3/4 of the matches played. It is unstable, even without Ringles on the branches. Given that once there are Ringles on the branches, a robot will be disqualified if they tip that goal over and the impact of the descoring was match effecting, many teams will choose to avoid the risk of disqualification by tipping the Neutral Mobile Goal over early in the game. Some creative teams might even accidentally tip it over onto an opponents robot. With the branches hanging out the way they do, we have seen that it is likely that a robot on the receiving end of the tipped Mobile Goal will then drag that Mobile Goal around with it for the rest of the match. Is there any penalty for knocking over the tall Neutral Mobile Goal before there are any Ringles on it?

### Answered by committee

Given that once there are Ringles on the branches, a robot will be disqualified if they tip that goal over and the impact of the descoring was match effecting

Before getting to the root questions being asked, we wanted to note that this assumption is incorrect. Rule SG6 partially reads as follows, with a portion bolded for emphasis:

<SG6> Rings on the Alliance Mobile Goal are "safe". Strategies intended to remove **Rings which are Scored on or in an opposing Alliance Mobile Goal** are prohibited.

Neutral Mobile Goals are not covered by SG6, as noted in [this Q&A](#) post

Is there any penalty for knocking over the tall Neutral Mobile Goal before there are any Ringles on it?

There are no rules preventing this, thus it is legal.

Some creative teams might even accidentally tip it over onto an opponents robot. With the branches hanging out the way they do, we have seen that it is likely that a robot on the receiving end of the tipped Mobile Goal will then drag that Mobile Goal around with it for the rest of the match

Although you use the word "accidentally", this hypothetical scenario is getting very close to invoking SG10, which reads as follows:

<SG10> Use Scoring Objects to play the game. Scoring Objects may not be used to accomplish actions that would be otherwise illegal if they were attempted by Robot mechanisms (e.g., Interfering with an opponent's Autonomous routine per <SG4>.)

The intent of this rule is to prohibit teams from using game objects as "gloves" to loophole any rule that states "a Robot may not [do some action]". This rule is not intended to be taken in its most extreme literal interpretation, where any interaction between a Scoring Object and a Robot needs to be scrutinized with the same intensity as if it were a Robot.

Using a Mobile Goal to damage an opposing Robot could be considered a violation of G12, just as if the action were done with a Robot mechanism.

---

## 803: Is it allowable to push Game Objects under your opponent's platform?

10-Jun-2021

SG3 SG10

The rules do not seem to protect the area under your opponent's platform. Objects under the platform can deny your opponent the ability to drive a robot onto their platform, and they can prevent a platform from being balanced. The rules do not seem to prevent this defensive strategy.

### Answered by committee

**Edit 2021-12-07:** The v2.2 Game Manual update included the following revision to rule <SG3>, which we believe answers this question more thoroughly than the original answer. We recommend reviewing the full text of <SG3>, including the "red box" clarifications, for more information.

Point "d" applies to Robot actions prior to the last thirty (30) seconds of the Match:

d. Placing a Scoring Object on or under the opposing Alliance's Platform, at any point during the Match is considered a minor violation of this rule that, at a minimum, will result in a warning.

i. If the placement is accidental, and immediately rectified (i.e. the Scoring Object is immediately removed), then this violation will be considered a warning.

ii. If the placement is intentional and / or not immediately rectified, as judged by the Head Referee, then it will be considered a violation.

iii. Repeated, strategic, and / or egregious warnings may also escalate to a violation, at the Head Referee's discretion.

[...]

Violations of this rule which do interfere with gameplay will result in a Disqualification, regardless of whether the interference was Match Affecting or not.

Note: If point "d" has escalated from a warning into a violation, then it will automatically be considered a violation which has interfered with gameplay, i.e. will result in a Disqualification.

---

## 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!

### Answered by 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.

---

## 3115: Long Goal Blocking

28-Feb-2026

SG10

I am looking for a little more clarification of Q3024.

1. Is it legal for a robot to indefinitely block the end of a goal, thus preventing any blocks from being scored or descored, by a. not contacting any part of the goal itself but within an inch of the end of a goal b. by placing something over the goal such as a piece or custom plastic, that touches the goal
2. Is it legal for a robot to indefinitely block the open section above a long goal, thus preventing the descoring of blocks, if the robot a. does not come in contact with any part of the goal b. is touching the goal itself such as with a piece of custom plastic

Thanks!

### Answered by committee

1. Is it legal for a robot to indefinitely block the end of a goal, thus preventing any blocks from being scored or descored, by a. not contacting any part of the goal itself but within an inch of the end of a goal b. by placing something over the goal such as a piece or custom plastic, that touches the goal

Yes.

2. Is it legal for a robot to indefinitely block the open section above a long goal, thus preventing the descoring of blocks, if the robot a. does not come in contact with any part of the goal b. is touching the goal itself such as with a piece of custom plastic

Yes.

---

## 3040: Guidance on SG10 - goalkeeping

16-Jan-2026

SG10

Could I please get some guidance on how to practically referee the goalkeeping part of SG10 ?

[<SG10>](#) says:

A Robot can only reach into any open portion of a Goal to legally move Blocks (e.g., into or out of the Control Zone or the entire Goal). If a Head Referee sees a Robot that is Goalkeeping in the Driver Controlled Period of a Head-to-Head Match, that Robot should be verbally warned away and should receive an SG10 Violation if it remains.

This reads as "the second a referee tells a robot to get out of the goal, they **have** to give a minor violation to that robot". Very often I've given and seen other refs give the verbal command for robots to get out of the goal but almost never have I seen that result in a violation. I think practically referees have handled it by telling a robot to get out of a goal and then giving a fair/reasonable amount of time for the robot to exit the goal. If the robot complies then there is no violation and if the robot stays in for too long or them staying has some sort of game score changing consequence then they get a violation.

1. Is "the second a referee tells a robot to get out of the goal, they **have** to give a minor violation to that robot" the correct interpretation/practical application of SG10 Goalkeeping?
2. Is "telling a robot to get out of a goal and then giving a fair/reasonable amount of time for the robot to exit the goal. If the robot complies then there is no violation and if the robot stays in for too long after being told to leave or them staying has some sort of game score changing consequence then they get a violation" the correct way to handle refereeing the goalkeeping part of SG10
3. Are referees supposed to wait until a robot has been in the goal for too long and then verbally tell the robot to get out of the goal and give them the violation?
4. Is giving a verbal warning a requirement to getting the violation or can a robot get a goalkeeping violation even if the referee didn't tell them to get out of the goal in that moment?
5. I've also seen a couple teams try to stay in the goal as long as possible and until the referee tells them to leave so they can try to maximize their time in the goal. Do you have any advice or guidance for how to handle this scenario? It seems different than a team accidentally staying in the goal for a little too long as this scenario feels like intentionally trying to wait until they are getting the violation or just accepting the violation as a trade for being in the goal longer.

### Answered by committee

As stated in the portion of [<SG10>](#) quoted in your question, the Robot should receive an [<SG10>](#) Violation **if it remains after being warned away by the Head Referee**. If the Robot reacts and moves after being warned, it's not a Violation; this is in the spirit of Head Referees helping Teams avoid Violations, and Teams should get a brief opportunity to fix the problem before being penalized.

1. No.

2. Partially. "telling a robot to get out of a goal and then giving a fair/reasonable amount of time for the robot to exit the goal. If the robot complies then there is no violation and if the robot stays in for too long after being told to leave." is more accurate.
3. No. Referees must give a verbal warning as soon as Goalkeeping is observed.
4. Referees must give a verbal warning (just like Holding).
5. The Referee should give a verbal warning as soon as Goalkeeping is observed, at which time the Robot must cease Goalkeeping or incur a Violation. Version 3.0 of the game manual includes additional penalties for repeated violations, and goes into effect on February 5, 2026.

## 3018: Reaching Into Goal Without Scoring During Driver Control

6-Jan-2026

SG10

During the Driver Control period, if a Robot uses a static or passive mechanism (such as a piece of plastic or metal) that reaches into an open portion of a Goal, as shown below, and the Robot is not actively scoring or descoring Blocks, but the mechanism physically blocks Blocks from entering or exiting the Goal, preventing either Alliance from legally changing the score, does this constitute Goalkeeping under the Goalkeeping definition and <SG10>, and therefore result in a violation, regardless of whether the Robot is capable of scoring or is in possession of a Block? <SG10>

Given that <SG10> clarifies that reaching into any open portion of a Goal while not attempting to change the score through legal means is prohibited, should this interaction be ruled a Goalkeeping violation? Additionally, based on Q&A 2791, Keeping your mechanism there while the Robot isn't actively moving Blocks inside the Goal is considered anchoring, should maintaining this mechanism inside the open portion of the Goal as shown in the image below, thereby continuously denying access and preventing legal scoring or descoring be ruled as Goalkeeping and a violation?

Many thanks.



### Answered by committee

We'll start by saying that the Robot in your image does not appear to be reaching into any open portion of the Goal, and its actions do not meet the definition of Goalkeeping or an <SG10> Violation.

However, if that or any other Robot is reaching into the open portion of a Goal while not attempting to change the score of the Match, it counts as Goalkeeping and is a Violation of <SG10> if it remains there after being warned away

by the Head Referee.

The guidance in Q&A 2791 was overridden by later updates to the game manual, in which [<GG9>](#) and [<SG10>](#) were revised and separated to provide a clearer different between reaching into the Goal and becoming anchored as a result.

---

## 3012: SG 10 Violation Notes - 10pt Match affecting consideration

2-Jan-2026

[SG10](#)

Hello GDC - Happy 2026 / Thanks for your feedback and guidance

**The Rules ...**

[<SG10>](#)

Q&A References = 2879 (discusses SG10 and implements a 10pt MA consideration)

**The PROBLEM** – Blue robot violates SG10 with regards to having a mechanism inside and stationary in the long goal impeding scoring of Red Robot, OR a Blue robot Violates SG10 by reaching into the enclosed section interacting with a scored cube, etc. ... this occurs multiple times in the same match ... lets say 2-3 times

**The QUESTION** - In the Example above - Is the Is the 10pt Match affecting consideration 10 per match where a violation occurs (only 10pt above) OR to be considered a 10pt cumulative per violation assessment in the same match. (20-30pt above)

Thanks again for your time and consideration

Drew Marston

**Answered by committee**

The 10-point consideration described in the Violation Note should only be applied once (not 10 points per offense), regardless of how many [<SG10>](#) Violations they accrue during a Match.

---

## 2996: Clarification on Q&A 2826

17-Dec-2025

[SG10](#)

[<SG10>](#)

Hello GDC,

Within Q&A 2826, it is given a scenario where Robot[A] and Robot[B] are in a “standstill”, with both robots attempting to descore. In this case both robots are given an [<SG10>](#) violation as both would be considered “Goalkeeping”. Another scenario is given where Robot[A] is not inside the goal while Robot[B] is, and Robot[B] is given the violation.

Our question is if Robot[A] is scoring and Robot[B] is concurrently “descoreing” that same goal (blocks are considered moving in all scenarios) would Robot[A] and/or/neither Robot[B] be given an [<SG10>](#) violation in the following:

- Scenario A: Robot[A] is unable to score due to blocks being pushed toward it from the long goal by Robot[B], not allowing Robot[A] to remove the blocks from its systems into the goal
- Scenario B: Robot[A] is able to output the blocks from its systems but the blocks being scored fall out of Robot[A] onto the floor due to the force applied from Robot[B]
- Scenario C: Robot[A] is able to output the blocks from its systems and some blocks are able to make it inside the goal, but the extra blocks being scored fall out of Robot[A] onto the floor due to the force applied from Robot[B]

- Scenario D: Robot[A] is able to score blocks, yet the blocks are instantly removed from the goal due to the descoring of robot[B]

Thank you for your time.

### Answered by committee

- A & B. If Robot A is reaching inside an open portion of a Goal while not adding or removing Blocks to/from the Goal and/or Control Zone, it meets the definition of Goalkeeping and should be warned away by the Head Referee. If it remains, it should get a Minor or Major Violation.
- C & D. If Robot A is adding Blocks to the Goal, it is not Goalkeeping.

---

## 2975: Definition of Offensive Directly Contradicts <SG10a>

7-Dec-2025

GG9 GG14 GG15 SG10

<GG9> Don't hook your Robot to the Field, and don't get Entangled. <GG14> Don't destroy other Robots. <GG15> Offensive Robots get the "benefit of the doubt" when judgment calls are required. <SG10> Don't reach inside enclosed sections of Goals, and no Goalkeeping. Definition of "Offensive" and "Defensive"

The definition of "Offensive" states that "Changing the status of a Field Element or scoring object that acts as a multiplier or scoring bonus for their Alliance", which I will interpret as attempting to push your Alliance's colored Blocks into the Control Zone for an additional 10 points.

<SG10a> states that "Reaching inside the open top portion of a Goal to affect Blocks within that Goal is an inherently Defensive position, and will not get the benefit of the doubt (<GG15>) if judgment calls are required."

Scenario 1: Red 1 is attempting to push their Blocks into the Control Zone of the Long Goal with their wing/arm mechanism. Blue Alliance currently controls the Control Zone, so Blue 2 is pushing back towards Red 1. During this altercation, Red 1 tips backwards and is rendered unable to move for the rest of the match. Blue Alliance ends up winning the match. What would be the call by the refs here?

Would it be: A. A disqualification for the Blue Alliance, because the attempt to push blocks is an "Offensive" move and will get the benefit of the doubt for <GG15>, and Blue receives the DQ for <GG14>. B. Neither Alliance will receive disqualifications because Red 1's wing/arm mechanism inside of the Long Goal is an "inherently Defensive" position according to <SG10a>, therefore they will not receive the benefit of the doubt for <GG15>, and Blue does not receive a DQ for <GG14>.

Scenario 2: Red 1 is attempting to push their Blocks into the Control Zone of the Long Goal with their wing/arm mechanism. Blue Alliance currently controls the Control Zone, so Blue 2 is pushing back towards Red 1. During this altercation, Blue 2 tips backwards and is rendered unable to move for the rest of the match. Red Alliance ends up winning the match. What would be the call by the refs here?

Would it be: A. A disqualification for the Red Alliance, because the presence of the wing/arm mechanism inside of the Long Goal is an "inherently Defensive" position according to <SG10a>, and will not get the benefit of the doubt for <GG15>, and Red receives the DQ for <GG14>. B. Neither Alliance will receive disqualifications because Red 1's wing/arm mechanism inside of the Long Goal is an "Offensive" move and will get the benefit of the doubt for <GG15>, Blue 2's tipping is regarded as regular match play, and Red does not receive a DQ for <GG14>.

### Answered by committee

***This answer was revised on January 14, 2026, after further consideration by the GDC.***

<GG15> should only be applied as a "tiebreaker" when a judgment call is required, for example when multiple Teams have committed simultaneous Violations that overlap and impact each other. Categorizing Robot actions as Defensive or Offensive is unnecessary in most cases. In our opinion, neither of your scenarios requires a judgment call or application of rule <GG15>.

Additionally, we cannot comment absolutely on hypothetical scenarios. The ultimate decision in your scenarios would be determined by the Head Referee(s) at the Match, based on the larger context of the Match.

**In both of your scenarios, Robots tip as an incidental side effect of normal gameplay. No Offensive/Defensive judgment call is required, and no Teams should receive [<GG14>](#) Violations.**

---

## 2969: [<GG9>](#) [<GG15>](#) [<GG17>](#) [<SG10>](#) Priority Call for a Head Referee

5-Dec-2025

[GG9](#) [GG15](#) [GG17](#) [SG10](#)

Good Evening GDC,

After some discussion, we are looking to determine if a Head Referee should focus first on an [< SG10 >](#) violation or on a potential hold [< GG17 >](#) of the robot committing the [< SG10 >](#) violation.

For an example:

- RED1 goes to descoring a goal and inserts its arm into the open section as allowed, with no current violations of [< SG10 >](#)
- With the new definitions of defensive and offensive on 12/4, RED1 becomes defensive ("descoring in a way that doesn't increase points for the Robot's own Alliance")
- BLUE1 goes over to prevent the descoring of the blocks in the goal
- RED1 has their arm still in the open section of the goal and claims that they are being held "pinned" by BLUE1 (in this instance, they no longer are actively moving blocks in the goal, thus they are now goalkeeping)

If RED1 were to remove their arm from the open portion of the goal, a hold count would be started instantly in this situation because it is clear to the Head Referee that RED1 wants to leave the area now, rather than stay there and continue descoring objects.

If RED1 is not actively moving blocks, they are in violation of [< SG10 >](#) and need to remove their arm from the goal immediately as they are goalkeeping.

The question becomes is should a hold count be started by the Head Referee immediately when this situation occurs, or should RED1 remove their arm from the goal first to remedy the [< SG10 >](#) violation?

The assumption is that the [< SG10 >](#) violation should be resolved first due to RED1 above being the defensive robot, getting no "benefit of the doubt" from [< GG15 >](#), as written in [< SG10a >](#).

Thank you for your time, Cowboy

### Answered by committee

In your scenario, BLUE1 is playing more Defensively than RED1 (BLUE1 is making no attempt to move Blocks), so the Holding should be considered before any possible Goalkeeping.

RED1 is reaching into the Goal and actively moving blocks, and BLUE1 moves in to hold them. A Holding count should begin immediately. BLUE1 can legally hold RED1 for a 3-count before they must separate.

If BLUE1 backs off after a 3-count, and RED1 removes their arm from the Goal when they're able, neither Robot should get a Violation.

If BLUE1 continues Holding beyond a 3-count, they should get a [<GG17>](#) Violation.

If RED1 is Goalkeeping after blue departs, RED1 should get an [<SG10>](#) Violation.

---

## 2923: Touching blocks fully under enclosed section of long goal

17-Nov-2025

[SG10](#)

[<SG10>](#)


Many teams have deployed an arm that reaches into the long goal as they drive toward the enclosed portion of the goal to score/descore blocks.

1. Some of these arms have an angled insert so they definitely touch a block that is within the fully enclosed portion of the long goal. (see picture)
2. Even a perfectly vertical insert, when they come to the end of the open part while pushing a block, would touch a block that is fully enclosed. (see picture, not a great angle of the photo, but the block is completely in the enclosed section while be touched by a vertical insert at the end of the open portion of the long goal).
3. Many of these robots are driving fast which would cause the vertical insert to touch a block in the enclosed portion as the robots crash hard into the enclosed portion and the momentum causes it to rock backwards.

All three of these interactions seem to violate "<SG10> Don't reach inside enclosed sections of Goals. Robots are not permitted to directly contact Blocks that are fully within enclosed sections of Long Goals." Is this interpretation correct?

If any or all of these are a violation, following the violation flow chart, how do we determine if this is match affecting?





### Answered by committee

Hi, Steve, and thanks for this question!

Technically, if a Robot is touching a block that's fully inside the closed part of a long goal and the Head Referee knows it, it's an [<SG10>](#) Violation. That said, as you've noted this is often a quick action and a difficult judgment call. If a Head Referee isn't certain that a Robot has contacted Blocks inside the Goal, and no Scoring Objects moved in a way that makes it clear that a Violation has occurred (i.e., their action didn't move Blocks inside the closed part of the Long Goal), it can probably be ignored. The Head Referee should, however, alert the Team to the close call so they can modify their game play to avoid later Violations.

Regarding how to determine whether a Violation was Match Affecting, that's addressed in bold near the bottom of our response to [Q&A 2879](#).

---

## 2921: Detached Robot Parts Impeding Goals [<GG8>](#) [<GG9>](#) [<SG10>](#)


16-Nov-2025

[GG8](#) [GG9](#) [SG10](#)

Relevant rules: [<GG8>](#) [<GG9>](#) [<SG10>](#)

Hello GDC,

If part of a Robot were to accidentally detach inside a Goal and impede the movement of Blocks, would this be considered one of the rare violations of GG8 that should escalate to a Major Violation and/or a Violation of GG9? Image shows an example.



### Answered by committee

A Robot part that **accidentally** detaches inside a Goal and impedes the movement of Blocks is a Minor Violation of [<GG8>](#). As stated in the [<GG8>](#) note,

Note: Parts which become detached unintentionally are a Minor Violation, are no longer considered "part of a Robot," and should be ignored for the purpose of any rules which involve Robot contact or location (e.g., Scoring) or Robot size.

---

## 2879: Clarification on Major / Minor for GG9

28-Oct-2025  
GG9 SG10

### [<GG9>](#)

The text for GG9 says:

Major Violations of this rule should be rare, as Robots should never be designed to intentionally violate it.

If a robot is designed in such a way that it could violate it would that raise to the level of a Major Violation?

For example, suppose a robot's descoring mechanism is not vertical but comes at an angle such that no "hard stop" prevents the mechanism from breaking the plane of the tape (designating the enclosed portion of the Long Goal). Does the design alone infer a "robot designed to intentionally violate it", or would a conversation with the team be necessary to determine "intent"? One could imagine different treatment of a team who's mechanism starts off at an angle versus a team who's mechanism becomes bent as a result of gameplay.

Followup: Does having a descore mech inside the Long Goal (which automatically classifies the robot as "defensive" based on a different Q&A) while not actively moving blocks lead to:

1. The referee issuing a warning to the robot to not do that, either by moving or retracting the descore mech
2. Is failure to comply with the warning an instant Major, or does it need to go thru the Match Affecting logic?
3. If Match Affecting, should only a Long Goal flip be considered? E.g. 10 points, or 20 points, or 20 points plus 3x the number of blocks there?

One more edge case. <https://www.robotevents.com/V5RC/2025-2026/QA/2837> says that if a robot has a part "inside" the enclosed portion of the Long Goal at the end of auton, that is not a violation. Is the answer the same or different if a robot has a part inside the enclosed portion of the Long Goal at the end of driver control?

### Answered by committee

Thanks, 355U, for these questions.

We'll start by saying the first Violation note for rule [<GG9>](#) (Robots shouldn't be designed to intentionally violate it) will be removed---it was misleading and inaccurate for this game. That change is effective immediately, and has a big impact on your questions, which we'll now address.

If a robot is designed in such a way that it could violate it would that raise to the level of a Major Violation?

A design that could violate a rule under certain conditions does not necessarily mean that the Team intends to violate that rule. The important part is how the Team ensures compliance within the rules during the Match. Many rules can be violated by designs that can and should pass Robot inspection; this does not mean that those Teams should not pass inspection, or automatically receive Violations in a Match. They must instead understand the possibilities, and ensure they operate their Robot in a manner that does not violate the rule during a Match.

Does having a descore mech inside the Long Goal (which automatically classifies the robot as "defensive" based on a different Q&A) while not actively moving blocks lead to the referee issuing a warning to the robot to not do that, either by moving or retracting the descore mech?

If a referee sees a Team with any part of their Robot inside of the volume of the Goal while not actively moving Blocks, they should immediately warn the Team and ask them to move their Robot or remove the part of their Robot from inside of the Long Goal. This warning is instead intended to help the Team avoid a Violation.

Is failure to comply with the warning an instant Major, or does it need to go thru the Match Affecting logic?

If the Team ignores that warning and remains inside the Goal while not actively moving Blocks, they should be issued a Minor or Major Violation based on whether or not the Violation is Match Affecting.

If Match Affecting, should only a Long Goal flip be considered? E.g. 10 points, or 20 points, or 20 points plus 3x the number of blocks there?

The December 4 game manual update will include the following guidance for considering whether an [<SG10>](#) Violation is Match Affecting, and this guidance is effective immediately. **An [<SG10>](#) Violation should be considered Match Affecting if the Team responsible ties or wins the Match by 10 point or less.**


Regarding your final question, we believe you've slightly misquoted/misinterpreted the ruling in Q&A 2837, which states that (bold added for emphasis), "a Robot can keep a mechanism in the **open** part of a Goal during Autonomous Periods and Robot Skills Matches with no Violation." The logic for the end of the Match is slightly different, however, because the Robot is directly under the Team's control. Referees must consider the Robot's actions before the timer hits zero, whether the Team was warned to leave the Goal before the end of the Match, and whether they had time to react before the Match ended. This one has to remain a judgment call based on the context of the Match.


As many other Q&A's ask regarding what does or does not count as an open portion of the goal, we are seeking further clarification for what exactly is considered the pen section as the goal. As [<SG10>](#) says, "A Robot can only reach into any open portion of a Goal to move Blocks"


We would like to know what exactly is defined as the open portion of the goal, and a few scenarios regarding interactions with the goal and preventing the movement of blocks, specifically in the long goals.

We have read QNA 2845 and are looking for further clarification on ways a robot can interact with a long goal.

1. What is considered the open portion of the goal, specifically at the end of the goal, is it the vertical plane at the end of the goal that extends upwards, or does it end at the top of the open portion of the end of the goal.
2. Does the robot in any of the 4 images below meet the criteria for being considered "Reached into the goal," as outlined by sg10.
3. If a robot is parked against the back of the goal with a de-score mechanism/scoring as seen in the pictures to prevent the opposing alliance from manipulating the location of balls in the long goal, would that robot receive a sg10 violation due to being in the "open portion" of the goal.







Thank you so much for reading our Q&A, Team 2550R

### Answered by committee

Hello, Team 2550R, and thanks for these questions.

1. We are unable to clarify the meaning of "inside the Goal" beyond our answer to [Q&A 2845](#).
2. Your 3rd image shows a Robot that is inside the Goal; the others probably aren't, but #2 will be hard for a Head Referee to recognize easily, and has some risk.
3. A Robot that remains in a stationary position at the end of a Goal, with no mechanisms protruding into that Goal, probably wouldn't receive an <SG10> or <GG9> Violation. However, you're relying on the Head Referee's visual perspective and this action has some risk.

If you're playing purely defensively in close proximity to a Goal (e.g., sitting still and not moving Blocks), you are at risk of a <GG9> or <SG10> call based on the Head Referee's physical perspective at the Field.

---


## 2845: Clarification on GG9 and SG10 Regarding Goalkeeping

10-Oct-2025  
SG10

Hello GDC Team, There seems to be some debate online about the recent Game Manual update concerning rules GG9 and SG10, which aim to prevent goalkeeping using an arm or mechanism that hooks inside the Goal. Rule <SG10> states: "A Robot can only reach into any open portion of a Goal to move Blocks (e.g., into or out of the Control Zone or the entire Goal)." My question is: where exactly does the restriction apply when referring to an "open portion of the Goal"? Would a robot with a hood-style mechanism like those seen in a lot of design (see picture linked) be considered as anchoring to the field if it stays parked in front of the Goal to prevent the opposing team from descoring? Or is "inside a Goal" only meant to refer to the open area above the blocks? We are aware of other q&a answers that are kind of answering that question. The main objective of this Q&A is to give a real guideline to follow for referee to prevent different interpretation at different events since the rule and other q&a are very open to anyone interpretation. Thank you very much for your time and


clarification.

Best regards, Team DKFNX



**Answered by committee**

Thanks, DKFNX, for this question. We hope that the image and answer attached below will help clarify our intent for [<GG9>](#), [<SG10>](#), and Robots that reach inside the open portions of Goals. We'll update our response to the related [Q&A 2837](#) to reflect this revised guidance.



A Robot is reaching inside the open portion of a Goal if any part of the Robot is extending into the portions of the Goal that are highlighted in this image. If moving the Robot without lifting any mechanisms could cause it to bump into the inside face of a Goal or pull against any part of the plastic portion of a Goal, it has likely reached inside that Goal. If it wouldn't, it's probably isn't reaching inside that Goal.

Regarding the example in your photo: no part of the Robot is within the portions of the Goal that are highlighted in our image, so it is not reaching inside the Goal and is not in Violation of rules [<GG9>](#) or [<SG10>](#).

## 2837: Clarification on <SG10> and Q&A 2791

5-Oct-2025

SG10

Some robots have mechanisms that fit within the open end of a Goal, such as in the first photo. If the mechanism sits within the volume of the open part of the Goal, is it considered "reaching into a goal"?


If it is considered reaching into the goal, would this violate SG10 and Q&A 2791 if the robot is trying to outtake a block into the goal, but is not successful, such that the block is rolling in the robot? In other words, if the robot is moving a block but the block is not in the goal?

What if the robot has stopped moving and is not trying to score a block?


If autonomous ends with part of the robot inside the end of the Goal, would that be a rule violation leading to the loss of autonomous?

If the mechanism is being held above the goal and is not in the volume of the goal, such as in the second photo, is it correct that this is not "reaching into a goal"?

1.



2.



**Answered by committee**

**Note:** Our answer to the first question in this post was revised on October 16, 2025, to reflect the revised guidance in [Q&A 2845](#).

Thanks for these questions, Sophia!

We'll start by saying that the October 9 game manual update will provide some additional clarification of these rulings, including clarifications for the Autonomous Period of a Head-to-Head Match. Our answer to [Q&A 2826](#) also provides some related clarification.

If the mechanism sits within the volume of the open part of the Goal, is it considered "reaching into a goal"?

If part of a Robot is inside of any part of a Goal, it is considered to be reaching into that Goal. See [Q&A 2845](#) for an illustration that clarifies this answer. It's difficult to tell whether the Robot in your first picture is or is not within the volume highlighted in that illustration. Teams must understand that a Head Referee's implementation of the rules is based on their physical perspective at the Field; if a Head Referee asks them to move their Robot away from the Goal, usually the best response is to comply and avoid a potential Violation.

If it is considered reaching into the goal, would this violate [<SG10>](#) and [Q&A 2791](#) if the robot is trying to outtake a block into the goal, but is not successful, such that the block is rolling in the robot? In other words, if the robot is moving a block but the block is not in the goal? What if the robot has stopped moving and is not trying to score a block?

Both of these scenarios would violate [<GG9>](#) and/or [<SG10>](#).

If autonomous ends with part of the robot inside the end of the Goal, would that be a rule violation leading to the loss of autonomous?

No. A Robot can keep a mechanism in the open part of a Goal during Autonomous Periods and Robot Skills Matches with no Violation.

If the mechanism is being held above the goal and is not in the volume of the goal, such as in the second photo, is it correct that this is not "reaching into a goal"?

If no part of a Robot is inside of a Goal, the Robot isn't reaching into that Goal.