

Q&A

VEX V5 Robotics Competition 2026-2027: Override

Etichettato: GG9

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 or sales@vex.com.
- For game questions, suggestions, or concerns outside of specific and official rules questions, contact GDC@vex.com

Indice

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

[Forcing an opponent to become 'stuck'](#)

[Guarding long goal in regards to GG9](#)

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

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

[GG9 Grasp, Grapple, Hook, Attach To, Latch, Clamp, React, and Anchor Clarification Question](#)

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

[Clarification on GG9 and GG16: Anchor/Entangled with Goal](#)

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

[Clarifications regarding SG10 & GG9](#)

[GG9 Standoff - How long until robots are allowed to move blocks. Follow up on 2826](#)

[What is Considered Actively Moving Blocks? <GG9> <SG10> <Q&A2791>](#)

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

14-May-2026

GG9 SC4

Rule Quote: <GG9>

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

<SC4>

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

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

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

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

Risposto da committee

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

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

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

3121: Forcing an opponent to become 'stuck'

4-Mar-2026


GG9 GG14 GG16 GG18

Is it legal for a RED robot to intentionally push BLUE onto blocks in an attempt to get them 'stuck' and unable to move for the rest of the game. Or is this a <GG18> and <GG14> violation?

Similarly, how should refs rule interactions where RED forces BLUE to become 'stuck' to field elements, e.g:

- Wedged between the bottom of the long goal and the foam tiles
- Temporarily unable to move out of the gaps in the bottom of the long goal (part of the robot is inside of the red circled area)
- Otherwise unable to move away from the park zone or a loader

Would this count as forcing an opponent to become entangled with the field, taking into account <GG9>, <GG14>, and <GG16>?



Risposto da committee

There is no rule that prohibits pushing a Robot onto Blocks, against a Goal, into a Loader, or into the Park Zone unless it's determined to be part of a strategy specifically intended to damage an opposing Robot. If a Robot becomes entangled as a result of one of these interactions, it should generally be considered incidental to gameplay and no Violations should be awarded.

3024: Guarding long goal in regards to GG9

7-Jan-2026

GG9 GG15 GG16

<GG9>

In a recent event a team has guarded the long goal as seen in the video: https://youtu.be/PwN6XGxEceQ?si=_kBUQ9-GerNa1IW6&t=42

The front of the teams chassis contacts the orange portion of the long goal(circled in red) and the team has a metal channel that blocks balls from being descored as well as at times contacts the transparent plastic portion of the long goal(circled in green). [Screenshot 2026-01-07 234540.pdf](#)

These two points of contact with the long goal make it essentially impossible for the team to be removed from there position which prevent other teams from descoring or changing the control zone when they guard the goal.

My question is:

1. Is it considered anchoring and by extension a violation of GG9 to guard a goal in this manner?
2. Is any position of guarding the long goal that prevents the ability to moved away by an opponent robot by being in contact with multiple points of the long goal considered anchoring regardless of whether it is in the open portion of the long goal?
3. if a team eventually becomes stuck or entangled in that position due to contact with an opposing robot should GG16 apply in this scenario?
4. if there is a scenario where it is contentious whether or not a team does qualify for anchoring in this manner should GG15 apply as the team that is guarding the long goal is in a inherently defense position?

Risposto da 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 ruling must be made by the Head Referee based on the context of the Match.

Head Referees should consider the specific language in rule [[GG9](#)] when making their decision, and ensure that their logic is applied consistently across all Matches and Robots at the event. If they are working with other Head Referees at the event, they should attempt to ensure that all Head Referees at that event have agreed on that interpretation.

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](#).

Risposto da 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

Risposto da 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.

2961: GG9 Grasp, Grapple, Hook, Attach To, Latch, Clamp, React, and Anchor Clarification Question

4-Dec-2025

GG9

<GG9><GG9> "Robots may not intentionally grasp, grapple, hook, attach to or otherwise Entangle with any Field Elements. Strategies with mechanisms that react against multiple sides of a Field Element in an effort to latch or clamp onto said Field Element are prohibited. The intent of this rule is to prevent Teams from unintentionally damaging the Field


and/or from anchoring to or otherwise Entangling themselves with the Field.” Firstly, would it be possible to define each of the terms used in the ruling, seeing as they lack clarity. Grasp, Grapple, Hook, Attach To, Latch, Clamp, React, and Anchor are not defined within the rulebook. Merriam Webster defines clamping as, “to put securely in place or in a desired position.” Going from this definition, at what point is a robot using an aligner which resists a change in motion imparted from another robot considered in violation of GG9? Is the robot in violation for just aligning to the goal, as it is in a desired position? What specific physical conditions, or restrictions of motion, would a robot have to be in violation of GG9? Could the Game Design Committee come up with a clearer definition for each of the aforementioned terms, as the current definitions are too vague to be consistently applied correctly by head referees?

Below are a couple of examples of potential GG9 violations: Double Triangle Shaped Aligner: Bird’s Eye View:



Does having multiple robot mechanisms at different heights interacting with a goal change the ruling?

Different Types of Aligner: Flexwheels and V-Shape Aligner: Top Down View:






V Shaped Aligner and Triangle Aligner:



mechanisms of a robot that contribute to a stronger hold on a goal, lead to a violation, even if individually they do not fully constrain the robot?

Intake Flex Wheel Interaction: Forwards View:



Flexwheels Friction Holding On the Goal:




Flexwheels On Inside and Outside Edges of a Goal:




If flexwheels friction fit to the inside of the goal tower, is the robot in violation of GG9? What if, instead, the robot has flexwheels on both sides of the goal tower? Is there a difference in ruling based on distance between two flex wheels?

Goal Aligner Angles: Less than 90 Degrees Between the Aligner and Goal:



90 Degrees Between the Aligner and Goal:



At what angle would an aligner to the goal tower become a GG9 Violation? Is there a change in ruling if there is an offset between the center triangle and the outside v-shape?

Motion: Is there a point at which motion is constrained enough to be considered "anchored?" I.e. A robot that can only be moved by being hit at one or two axes. How about a robot that fully constrains themselves angularly?

Purpose of clarification The vagueness of GG9 definitions has inevitably led to design gray areas. Vagueness has created perceived harms in fairness. Gray areas have also degraded the purpose of the game as when teams stick to a goal all game and are difficult or nearly impossible to remove, this creates a strong incentive for teams to play the game wholly passively. In our experience, head referee rulings have been inconsistent and we believe a clarification would vastly improve matches by making GG9 ruling outcomes more consistent and clearly defined. We understand we are asking quite a few questions; However we believe clarifications to GG9 are crucial at this time, so we thank you so much for your time.

Risposto da committee

The key words in [<GG9>](#) are "grasp, grapple, hook, attach, latch, and clamp."

Some of your examples do that, others don't. Mechanisms that "hug" the goal are more likely to be ruled as [<GG9>](#) Violations than mechanisms that go "inside of the V" at the base of the Goal.

It is impossible to issue blanket answers beyond what is written in the game manual that encompass all possible situations based on snapshot descriptions of a hypothetical Robot, mechanism, or action. Final rulings must be made by Head Referees based on the context of the Match.

However, absent any other case-by-case context or extenuating circumstances, we can provide some very general thoughts on the images and descriptions in your question.

1. Multiple Robot mechanisms interacting with a Goal at different heights: This one will vary widely by actual Robot build, and isn't easily categorized. Because the top mechanism in your image is inside the Goal, this specific example may be at risk of a [<GG9>](#) violation if the Robot is pushed sideways (see our related ruling in [Q&A 2845](#)).
2. Multiple mechanisms of a Robot contribute to a stronger hold on a Goal: In general, a "stronger hold on a Goal" is likely to be viewed by a Head Referee as hugging or hooking onto that goal and has a very high risk of being called as a [<GG9>](#) Violation.
3. Flex wheels that friction fit inside of the Goal tower: We'd generally consider this as a mechanisms that goes "inside the V" of the Goal with a low risk of being called as a [<GG9>](#) Violation.
4. Flex wheels on both sides of the Goal tower: this is more likely to be viewed as hugging the Goal, and has a very high risk of being called as a [<GG9>](#) Violation.

At what angle would an aligner to the goal tower become a GG9 Violation? Is there a change in ruling if there is an offset between the center triangle and the outside v-shape?

We can't answer this one, and each Team will have to choose the level of risk they're willing to take. See #s 2 & 4 above.

Is there a point at which motion is constrained enough to be considered "anchored?"

For the purposes of the game manual, anchored essentially means "cannot be moved by external influences." A Robot that is only "inside of the V" of a Goal is very different from one with mechanisms that surround a Goal.

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.



Risposto da 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.

2907: Clarification on GG9 and GG16: Anchor/Entangled with Goal

10-Nov-2025
GG9 GG16

The violation notes under GG9 state that

“If a Robot is reaching inside the open top portion of a Goal, it is that Team's responsibility to ensure that the Robot doesn't become anchored to the Goal when approached by other Robots. [<GG16>](#) will not apply during related interactions, and a Robot that becomes anchored while reaching into the open top of a Goal will receive a [<GG9>](#) Violation no matter how they became anchored.”

Are there any situations in which GG16 can apply when a team is interacting with a goal?

For example: a red robot is not near the long goal; a blue robot pushes a red robot into the goal and red becomes anchored as a result. Would GG16 apply or would the violation notes under GG9 supersede GG16?

Risposto da committee

Thanks, Paige, for your question!

The Violation Note you've referenced only applies in scenarios where a Robot is already reaching into the open top of a Goal when other interactions begin.

In your scenario, in which a blue Robot pushes a red Robot across the Field and into an anchored position at a Goal, the blue Robot has Violated rule <GG16> by pushing the red Robot into a potential penalty. The blue Robot should receive, at minimum, a minor <GG16> Violation.

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 descoring 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 descoring 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?

Risposto da 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 descoring 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 descoring 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.

2864: Clarifications regarding SG10 & GG9

20-Oct-2025



GG9 SG10



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 open portion of 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

| Risposto da 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.

2859: GG9 Standoff - How long until robots are allowed to move blocks. Follow up on 2826

17-Oct-2025

GG9

Hi GDC,

Following up on answer 2826 regarding "two Robots pushing against each other in a 'standoff' with no Blocks moving" and "a Robot should receive a Major Violation if their mechanism adds or removes Blocks to or from the Control Zone and/or Goal as they depart".

Is there guidance on how long or how far the robot needs to drive away from the goal to re-engage and decore the blocks?

[<GG9>](#)

Risposto da committee

Thanks for your question, Nevin.

If the Robot removes its mechanism from the Goal to avoid a [<GG9>](#) or [<SG10>](#) Violation, there is no requirement that it drive away from that Goal or remain "out of the Goal" for any specific amount of time before returning to that Goal to add or remove Blocks.

2826: What is Considered Actively Moving Blocks? <GG9> <SG10> <Q&A2791>

27-Sep-2025

GG9 SG10

Hello GDC,

Point 1 of [Q&A2791](#) states

Reaching into a Goal to move Blocks isn't anchoring or a <GG9> Violation. Keeping your mechanism there while the Robot isn't actively moving Blocks inside the Goal is considered anchoring, and is a <GG9> Violation.

Point 2 of [Q&A2791](#) states

If a Head Referee sees a Robot that has reached into a Goal and stayed there while the Robot isn't actively moving Blocks inside the Goal, that Robot should be verbally warned away and issued at least a Minor Violation.

My question is, what is considered “actively moving”? Is an attempt at moving Blocks enough to be considered actively moving Blocks, or should there be visible movement of the Blocks? Consider the following example:

Red 1 reaches into an open section of a Goal to move blocks, Blue 2 counters by attempting to move blocks from the opposite direction without reaching into the goal. A stalemate occurs where both robots are both actively pushing on the blocks, but there is currently no movement of the Blocks. Should Red 1 receive a Violation of [<GG9>](#) since Red 1 “isn't actively moving Blocks inside the Goal” per point 2 or is the attempt at moving blocks enough to be considered actively moving?

Risposto da committee

Thanks for these questions, Nathan! We hope our answers will boost the consistency of related calls at events around the world.

My question is, what is considered “actively moving”? Is an attempt at moving Blocks enough to be considered actively moving Blocks, or should there be visible movement of the Blocks?

For the purposes of this rule, actively moving Blocks inside the Goal in an effort to change the score of the Match (i.e., adding or removing Blocks from a Goal or a Control Zone) should qualify as movement. Holding the position of Blocks that are already in a Goal or Control Zone should not.

A stalemate occurs where both robots are both actively pushing on the blocks, but there is currently no movement of the Blocks.

In your scenario, one Robot is reaching into the open section of a Goal and the other is not. The Robot that is not reaching inside the Goal is not in Violation of [<GG9>](#) or [<SG10>](#). If the Blocks aren't changing position in the Goal based on the actions of the Robot that is reaching inside the Goal, that Robot will receive an [<SG10>](#) Violation if it remains inside the Goal.

However, if both Robots in your scenario were reaching inside the Goal in attempts to move Blocks within the Goal (i.e., two Robots pushing against each other in a 'standoff' with no Blocks moving), both Robots would receive [<SG10>](#) Violations if they remain within the Goal without moving Blocks. In this case, a Robot may receive a Major Violation if their mechanism adds or removes Blocks to or from the Control Zone and/or Goal as they depart.