

Q&A

VEX V5 Robotics Competition 2026-2027: Override

Etichettato: SC8

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 of AWP Criteria](#)

[Robot Touching Beam Touching Stack](#)

[Touching a stack](#)

[<SC8> Clarification for direct contact with two or more scoring objects](#)

[Dose the Starting Pin seem as a Scoring Object](#)

[Could a scoring object or stack be contacted more than once](#)

[High Stake AWP](#)

[SG7 & SC8: Forcing Loss of AWP](#)

[Sc8 criteria for Autonomous win point](#)

[AWP requires the Alliance stake?](#)

[\[SC8\] Benefit Of The Doubt Inside The Base](#)

[Functional or Non-Functional](#)

[Own color ring leaving the field and AWP](#)

[SC8 - Using zip ties to touch ladder for AWP](#)

[SG1/SG5 question - Both robots touching the same preload to start match](#)

[Opponents scoring ring for AWP](#)

[AWP - Stakes and Mobile Goals on an Alliance's Side of the Autonomous Line SC8.2, T19.b](#)

[Does possession of a field object make the field object part of the robot](#)

[Clarification on Sc8](#)

[Does license plate not backed by any legal functional structure contacting ladder satisfy AWP criteria](#)

3154: Clarification of AWP Criteria

23-May-2026

SC8

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

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

[<SC3>](#)states:

Each Placed Pin can have one or two Scored halves.

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

Risposto da committee

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

3094: Robot Touching Beam Touching Stack

13-Feb-2026



SC8

We were at a competition last weekend and the judge said the 2 scenarios negated the stacks and counted as 2 points for touching the robot. My kids were devastated and would like clarity. SC8-b makes it sound like both stacks should have been full points (14) because they are NOT fully nested.

Scenario 1: Robot is holding beam and is hovering over 2 stacks. The beam is touching the stacks, but they are not fully nested.

Scenario 2: Robot is holding a beam on the floor, and the beam is touching both stacks.

[<SC8>](#)



Risposto da committee

All of the Pins in your scenarios should count as Connected, and each of the 2-Pin Stacks shown should be scored as a 2-color Stack.

None of the Pins are directly in contact with a Robot. The Beam in contact with a Robot is not fully nested to any of the Pins. None are leaning on or supported by a Scoring Object that is not part of the Stack or a Field Element that isn't listed in clause D of rule [<SC3>](#).

3053: Touching a stack

23-Jan-2026
SC8

At the end of a match if a robot happens to still be touching the top pin of a 3 stack, that negates the entire stack value since the 3 pins are nested together. If that stack value doesn't count because it is fully nested, does touching only the top pin of the 3 stack qualify for touching 2 game elements for the 2 points since the pins are nested? [<SC8>](#)

Risposto da committee

At the end of a match if a robot happens to still be touching the top pin of a 3 stack, that negates the entire stack value since the 3 pins are nested together.

That is correct. Per clause B of [<SC3>](#), none of those Pins count as Connected due to the Robot being in contact with the resulting Stack.

If that stack value doesn't count because it is fully nested, does touching only the top pin of the 3 stack qualify for touching 2 game elements for the 2 points since the pins are nested?

Per clause B of [<SC8>](#), a Robot that ends the Match in direct contact with a Pin that is fully nested with one or more additional Scoring Objects will receive 2 points for ending the Match in contact with Scoring Objects.

2994: <SC8> Clarification for direct contact with two or more scoring objects

13-Dec-2025

SC8

[<SC8>](#)

<SC8> A Robot will receive 2 points for ending the Match in contact with Scoring Objects in the following scenarios:

Can you please clarify the meaning of "direct" contact, for instance if a robot has an intake system that holds multiple scoring objects at a time, and said robot contains at least two scoring objects within its structure will this count toward the two points, or do scoring objects need to be located outside the robot structure and located in the field in order to be counted for this scoring item.

Risposto da committee

"Directly contacting" means the Robot is contacting the Scoring Objects with some part of itself (not contacting something else that is contacting the Scoring Objects). Any part(s) of the Robot can be used to meet this requirement, and the Scoring Objects can be inside and/or outside of the Robot.


In a very simple but similar non-robot example, if you're holding two chocolate chip cookies you're directly contacting those cookies. If you eat one of them, you're still directly contacting both cookies. :)

2759: Dose the Starting Pin seem as a Scoring Object

9-Aug-2025

SC8

In [<SC8>](#), a robot contact with two Scoring Object can get 2 points. If a robot contact with a blue Scoring Object on the Field, and a red Starting Pin which still on the Starting Pin Support, like the picture below, could this robot get this 2 points?



Risposto da committee

Yes.


2758: Could a scoring object or stack be contacted more than once

9-Aug-2025
SC8


In [<SC8>](#), the robot contacted more than two scoring object or one stack can get two points. If a scoring object or stack be contacted by two robots both, like these pictures below, could two robots get this 2 points both? Or ONLY ONE robot can gets it?

Picture 1: the left Robot contact with a blue Pin, the right Robot contact with a red Pin, and they contact with a yellow Pin both

Picture 2: a robot contact with the yellow Pin in two Pin Stack, another robot contact with the blue Pin in the same two Pin Stack



OnePlus 13 | *HASSELBLAD*
2025年8月9日 12:57 | Laevatein Scarlet



OnePlus 13 | *HASSELBLAD*
2025年8月9日 12:46 | Laevatein Scarlet

Risposto da committee

If a scoring object or stack be contacted by two robots both, like these pictures below, could two robots get this 2 points both? Or ONLY ONE can gets it?

There is no requirement that a Scoring Object be in contact with only one Robot to earn the points described in rule [<SC8>](#). Each of these Robots would receive 2 points for ending the Match in contact with Scoring Objects.

2603: High Stake AWP

5-Mar-2025

SC8

<SC8> The high stake counts to AWP?

Risposto da committee

A Ring Scored on the High Stake during the Autonomous Period of a Match will count toward completion of the first AWP criteria (Scored Rings).

Because the High Stake is not on either Alliance's side of the Autonomous Line, it does not meet the requirements to count toward the second AWP criteria (Stakes with Scored Rings).

2544: SG7 & SC8: Forcing Loss of AWP

16-Feb-2025

SC8 SG7

Hello GDC, I have a question on behalf of a referee regarding a situation that occurred at a recent local qualifying event.

Part 1: Primary Question and Rule Exception During the Autonomous period of a qualifying match, Blue1 crosses the autonomous line in a straight line and pushes Red1 into the Red Alliance Starting Zone. Prior to this action, Red1 had fully left the starting line and was not crossing the plane of the Starting Line.

<SG7>

<SG7> Don't cross the Autonomous Line. During the Autonomous Period, Robots may not contact foam tiles, Scoring Objects, or Field Elements which are on the opposing Alliance's side of the Autonomous Line. *Note: Scoring Objects, Wall Stakes, and portions of the Ladder that contact or are positioned above the Autonomous Line are not considered to be on either side, and may be utilized by either Alliance during the Autonomous Period.* **Violation Notes: • All Violations of this rule (Major or Minor) will result in the Autonomous Bonus being awarded to the opposing Alliance. See <SG8b> for a potential exception caused by Autonomous Line interactions. • Intentional, strategic, or egregious Violations, such as intentional contact with an opposing Robot while contacting the foam tiles on the opposing side of the Autonomous Line, will be considered Major Violations.**

Per rule SG7, Blue1 was given a Violation and Red alliance was awarded the Autonomous Bonus.

Rule SC8 states: <SC8>

<SC8> An Autonomous Win Point is awarded to any Alliance that ends the Autonomous Period with the following tasks completed, and that has not broken any rules during the Autonomous Period:

1. At least three (3) Scored Rings of the Alliance's color
2. A minimum of two (2) Stakes on the Alliance's side of the Autonomous Line with at least (1) Ring of the Alliance's color Scored
3. Neither Robot contacting / breaking the plane of the Starting Line
4. At least one (1) Robot contacting the Ladder

SC8 states that Autonomous Win Point is awarded at the end of the Autonomous Period. Therefore, in the scenario described, the Red alliance was **not** awarded AWP due to no longer meeting criteria point 3 "*Neither Robot contacting/breaking the plane of the Starting Line.*"

Question 1: For future similar situations, should the referee allow an exception and award AWP to an alliance that was forced into no longer meeting criteria point 3 by their opponent (given that they complete all other required AWP criteria)?

Part 2: Situation Context and Rule Application The match the above situation occurred in was one of the last qualifying matches in the day and the last one for these teams. Blue1 prior to this match had a functional and task completing autonomous program and never crossed the Autonomous Line. Given that AWP also factors into points for qualification rankings, the referee viewed this violation of SG7 as strategic and egregious. Per the violation note for SG7 that states: "Intentional, strategic, or egregious Violations, such as intentional contact with an opposing Robot while contacting the foam tiles on the opposing side of the Autonomous Line, will be considered Major Violations," the referee gave Blue1 a Major Violation and Disqualification at the end of the completed match.

Question 2: Would this be an correct interpretation of the violation notes for SG7?

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Risposto da committee

Question 1: For future similar situations, should the referee allow an exception and award AWP to an alliance that was forced into no longer meeting criteria point 3 by their opponent (given that they complete all other required AWP criteria)?

In this situation, if the Head Referee is certain that all AWP tasks were completed before the [<SG7>](#) Violation occurred, the Head Referee can still award the AWP. If the Head Referee is *not* certain that all tasks were completed before the [<SG7>](#) Violation, they cannot award the AWP.

Question 2: Would this be an correct interpretation of the violation notes for SG7?

This would be a reasonable interpretation of the [<SG7>](#) Violation Notes in this scenario.

2512: Sc8 criteria for Autonomous win point

6-Feb-2025

SC8

(https://www.robotevents.com/storage/game_manual/VEX_V5_Robotics_Competition_2024-2025_High_Stakes/rules/SC8.html) The criteria for autonomous win point has been defined differently at separate tournaments. We are looking simply for clarification if the alliance colored wall stake is a required criteria. Some have interpreted SC8 2. "with at least 1 ring of the alliances color scored as meaning 1 ring must be scored on the alliance colored stake."

Risposto da committee

"At least one Ring of the Alliance's color Scored on the Alliance's Wall Stake" is only a required Autonomous Win Point task for events that qualify directly to the World Championship (e.g., Event Region Championships and Signature Events).

[<SC8>](#) task 2 does not require one of the Stakes to be the Alliance Wall Stake, and it is possible to complete [<SC8>](#) task 2 using only Mobile Goal Stakes.

2493: AWP requires the Alliance stake?

1-Feb-2025

SC8

[<SC8>](#) At a local tournament our team did not receive AWP as the head referee interpreted sc8 2 criteria as requiring that one of the scored rings be on the alliance colored stake. The red1 scored 2 rings on a mobile goal and red2 scored 1 ring

on another mobile goal and red 1 touched ladder. Please clarify that any 2 stakes on our alliance side meets criteria 2.

Risposto da committee

We cannot and do not overrule decisions made by Head Referees at events. Per rule [<T1>](#), "Head Referees have ultimate and final authority on all gameplay and robot ruling decisions during the competition" (not the GDC).

That said, If a Drive Team Member believes a Head Referee has made an error during a Match, rule [<T3>](#) gives them the right to appeal the ruling. In the case of an incorrect Autonomous Bonus or AWP determination, we recommend that Drive Team Members get the Head Referee's attention before the Driver Controlled Period begins. A Drive Team Member should politely express that they disagree, and ask the Head Referee to recount based on the misunderstood or misapplied rule number.

2491: [SC8] Benefit Of The Doubt Inside The Base

1-Feb-2025

SC8

In a recent match, we had a robot complete all criteria for being awarded an AWP besides touching the base due to a ziptie managing to, very majestically, go in the hole that is used for securing the Ladder to the base. As referees we shown a flashlight and could not see any physical touch inside the base, but there was no way for us to tell.

Should we give benefit of the doubt in this situation that it might be touching something internally? I acknowledge this may never happen again, but it was extraordinary to have happen to begin with. I have attached an image from said match below.

[Reference image courtesy of 63975D](#)

Risposto da committee

Should this happen again, we'd advise Head Referees to give the Team the benefit of the doubt and consider this as having met the AWP requirement that a Robot be contacting the Ladder (assuming, of course, that the part used to 'contact' the Ladder isn't expanding beyond the horizontal expansion limits of rule [<SG2>](#)).

2490: Functional or Non-Functional

31-Jan-2025

SC8

[<SC8>](#)

Q&A 2248 states that non-functional elements, such as a license plate that is not backed by a functional structure, will not be considered in the context of SC8(4).

Q&A 2364 states that zip ties are functional elements that can be used to meet the criteria of SC8(4).

QUESTION: Is the head referee required to determine if a zip tie is, in fact, serving a function other than extending the robot's reach? (It seems counterintuitive that a required robot part like a license plate would not count as "contact" when an optional item like a zip tie would, especially if neither is serving any other function on the robot.)

QUESTION: Are the same criteria (functional/nonfunctional) used to determine if a part of the robot is "breaking the plane of the starting line" in the context of SC8(3) (and other rules regarding robot orientation vis-a-vis field boundaries)?

Risposto da committee

QUESTION: Is the head referee required to determine if a zip tie is, in fact, serving a function other than extending the robot's reach?

The game manual classifies a zip tie is a functional component. No judgment call is required.

As described in rule [<R9>](#), "Inspectors and Head Referees will have final say in what is considered "non-functional"" for components that aren't standard Robot parts.

QUESTION: Are the same criteria (functional/nonfunctional) used to determine if a part of the robot is "breaking the plane of the starting line" in the context of SC8(3) (and other rules regarding robot orientation vis-a-vis field boundaries)?

A non-functional decoration cannot help a Team achieve a game objective (e.g., completing an Autonomous Win Point task) but *is* a part of the Robot for the purposes of Robot sizing.

All non-functional decorations must fit within the Robot's starting and expanded size limits. If a non-functional decoration is contacting or breaking the plane of the Starting Line, that Robot has not completed that AWP task.

2387: Own color ring leaving the field and AWP

13-Dec-2024

SC8 SG4

In rule [<SC8>](#) regarding the scoring of Autonomous Win Points, one of the criteria is given as "has not broken any rules during the Autonomous Period". In [<SG4>](#), the title of "Keep Scoring Objects in the field" suggests that the removal of any ring from the field results in the loss of the AWP by SC8, but the text of the rule never mentions rings of the offending robot's own alliance, which suggests that the removal of a ring of the same alliance should not result in the loss of the AWP. We have had it ruled both ways at different competitions so far.

If a robot on the red alliance removes a red ring from the field, does that result in an automatic loss of AWP by SC8 and SG4?

Risposto da committee

Removing a Ring of your own Alliance color is not a Violation of [<SG4>](#), which applies only to Mobile Goals and to Rings of the opposing Alliance color. If a Robot on the red Alliance removes a red Ring from the Field, no rule has been broken.

2364: SC8 - Using zip ties to touch ladder for AWP

9-Dec-2024

SC8

If a team has zip ties sticking off of their robot and they use those zip ties to touch the ladder to meet requirement SC8-4 for AWP does that count as a team touching the ladder?

[<SC8>](#)

Risposto da committee

If a team has zip ties sticking off of their robot and they use those zip ties to touch the ladder to meet requirement SC8-4 for AWP does that count as a team touching the ladder?

Yes. A zip tie is a functional, legal Robot component and can be used to contact the Ladder to meet that criteria of the Autonomous Win Point. All zip ties must be either official VEX components or legal replacements that meet the criteria of clause J of rule [<R8>](#), and must fit within the size limits of [<SG1>](#), [<SG2>](#), and [<SG3>](#).

2352: SG1/SG5 question - Both robots touching the same preload to start match

6-Dec-2024

SC8 SG1 SG5

SG1-b states that to start a match a robot can be touching 1 preload and SG1-c states that they can not be touching any other robots. My question is can both robots be touching the same preload?

Scenario that I have seen is where robot 1 had no autonomous and robot 2 could complete all steps to get AWP by themselves minus robot 1 breaking the plane of the starting line. So they lined both robots up with both touching one preload. Robot 2 started the autonomous by more less pushing robot 1 off the line by pushing the preload that both robots were touching and then robot 2 went and completed the other 3 steps to get AWP. Is this allowed or a rule violation? [<SG1><SG5>](#)

Risposto da committee

Clause A of rule [<SG5>](#) requires that each Robot have a preload placed such that it is (bold added here for emphasis), "Contacting **one** Robot of the same Alliance color as the preload."

Each preload may only be in contact with one Robot, and each Robot may only be in contact with one preload.

2332: Opponents scoring ring for AWP

27-Nov-2024

SC8

[<SC8>](#)

[<SC8>](#) An Autonomous Win Point is awarded to any Alliance that ends the Autonomous Period with the following tasks completed, and that has not broken any rules during the Autonomous Period:

1. At least three (3) Scored Rings of the Alliance's color
2. A minimum of two (2) Stakes on the Alliance's side of the Autonomous Line with at least (1) Ring of the Alliance's color Scored
3. Neither Robot contacting / breaking the plane of the Starting Line
4. At least one (1) Robot contacting the Ladder

If BLUE1 scores one blue ring on a stake on the blue side of the Autonomous Line, BLUE2 scores one blue ring on a different stake on the blue side of the Autonomous Line, and RED1 also scores one blue ring on a different stake on the red side of the Autonomous Line. Neither blue robot is breaking the plane of the Starting Line and BLUE1 is touching the ladder.

It seems clear that this is an AWP for blue as tasks 1-4 were completed, correct? Or is it the intention that for the blue alliance to earn an AWP, the *blue alliance* needs to complete all of the tasks and since the blue alliance only scored two rings, it would not be an AWP?

Risposto da committee

It seems clear that this is an AWP for blue as tasks 1-4 were completed, correct?

You are correct. There is no requirement that all Scored Rings be Scored by that Alliance or on that Alliance's side of the Autonomous Line in order to meet the first AWP criterion.

2327: AWP - Stakes and Mobile Goals on an Alliance's Side of the Autonomous Line SC8.2, T19.b

25-Nov-2024

SC8 T19

[<SC8><T19>](#)

Please define "the Alliance's side of the Autonomous Line" for use in rules SC8.2 and T19.b.

As one of the conditions for an Autonomous Win Point to be awarded, SC8.2 requires

2. A minimum of two (2) Stakes on the Alliance's side of the Autonomous Line with at least (1) Ring of the Alliance's color Scored

T19.b requires a similar criteria to determine "Mobile Goals on their side of the Autonomous Line" in a 3-3 tied Elim match.

b. Any Elimination Match that ends in a tied score with no Scored Rings and no Robots that have Climbed to a Level may be decided by the quantity of Mobile Goals that are fully on each side of the Autonomous Line. The Alliance with a higher quantity of Mobile Goals completely on their side of the Autonomous Line, and not in contact with the Autonomous Line, at the end of the Match should be awarded the value of one (1) Scored Top Ring for that Match. If the Alliances have an equal number of Mobile Goals on their side of the Autonomous Line, a tiebreaker Match should be played.

For SC8 and T19, should the definition of Autonomous Line include both pair of lines making the boundary of their autonomous zone the edge of the tape line closest to them?

Autonomous Line – The pair of white tape lines that run across the field, and the space between those lines. See <SG7> for more information.

Or should an "Alliance's side of the Autonomous Line" be determined in the same way it is for SG7 violations where teams have up to the furthest edge of the tape line away from them?

Or should the guidance be the note from SG7 that says objects positioned over the Autonomous Line are "not considered to be on either side."

Or can scoring a ring on a stake that ends partially in both autonomous zones, for example a mobile goal that has fallen over, count toward AWP since the Stake would still technically be on their side of the Autonomous Line? In which case, if there is both a red and blue ring on the stake, can we count it for both? (Say yes.....please????)

I know you can't tell it in the picture, but the mobile goal is mostly over the red auton zone with the stake fully in the red auton zone. Does this mobile goal meet the criteria for AWP since the requirement is for the STAKE (PVC pipe and barb only) to be on the red side and not the entire MOBILE GOAL (includes hexagonal base)?



Look forward to the clarification of Autonomous Line for both SC8 (specifies STAKE) and T19 (specifies MOBILE GOAL) purposes. Thanks!

Risposto da committee

For a Mobile Goal and/or its Stake to count toward either the Autonomous Win Point criteria in rule [<SC8>](#) or the tiebreaker criteria in rule [<T19>](#), it cannot be positioned over any portion of the Autonomous Line and must be fully on the Alliance's side of the Autonomous Line.

The Game-Specific Definitions section of the game manual defines the Autonomous Line as:

The pair of white tape lines that run across the field, and the space between those lines.

Our response to [Q&A 2077](#) says that:

Any Mobile Goal Stake can potentially be used to satisfy the criteria, but only if the Mobile Goal ends the Autonomous Period fully on the correct side of the Autonomous Line.

The Note within rule [<SG7>](#) specifies that:

Scoring Objects ... that contact or are positioned above the Autonomous Line are not considered to be on either side ...

Clause B of rule [<T19>](#) specifies that tied Match with no Scoring actions may be decided by:

... the quantity of Mobile Goals that are fully on each side of the Autonomous Line.

2325: Does possession of a field object make the field object part of the robot

24-Nov-2024

SC8

[<SC8>](#) For scoring the autonomous win point, if a robot possesses a ring and at the end of the autonomous and the ring is in contact with the ladder but no other piece of the robot is in contact with the ladder is that considered contact to meet the last requirement for getting an autonomous win point (SC8)

Risposto da committee

Per the list of Autonomous Win Point requirements in rule [<SC8>](#), at least one Robot must be contacting the Ladder.

Transitive contact, including contacting the Ladder with only a Possessed Ring, does not satisfy that condition for the Autonomous Win Point.

2261: Clarification on Sc8

6-Nov-2024

SC8

[<SC8>](#) SC8-2 states a minimum of two (2) Stakes on the Alliance's side of the Autonomous Line with at least (1) Ring of the Alliance's color Scored. Does that mean that both stakes must have a ring scored on them or could a team score all 3 rings on one stake and then have another empty stake on their alliance's side of the field?

Example scenario:

Team 1 grabs stake and scores 3 red rings on that 1 stake. Team 2 drives and contacts ladder. No one touched 2nd stake that is already placed on Alliance's side of the field. Would they receive AWP since they have 3 rings scored, 2 stakes on their side of the field with 1 alliance ring scored and are in contact with the ladder?

Risposto da committee

At least one Ring of the Alliance's color must be Scored on each Stake that is used to meet the 2nd Autonomous Win Point criteria ([<SC8>](#)).

2248: Does license plate not backed by any legal functional structure contacting ladder satisfy AWP criteria

2-Nov-2024

R9 R10 SC8

[<SC8>](#) The fourth criteria says robot contacting ladder.

In R10 [<R10>](#)

License plates are considered non-functional decorations (per [<R9>](#)), and must fulfill all relevant Robot rules (e.g., they must fit within the 18" cube,

[<R9>](#)

Decorations are allowed. Teams may add non-functional decorations, provided that they do not affect Robot performance in any significant way or affect the outcome of the Match. These decorations must be in the spirit of the competition. Inspectors will have final say in what is considered "non-functional." Unless otherwise specified below, non-functional decorations are governed by all standard Robot rules. To be considered "non-functional," any guards, decals, or other decorations must be backed by legal materials that provide the same functionality.

Following the guidance of R10 and R9 we came to the conclusion that if the license plate was not there, there was no contact with the ladder.

That said, Grant might say I am overthinking it. If so, what additional considerations should we put into interpreting SC8.

Thank you.

Risposto da committee

Does license plate not backed by any legal functional structure contacting ladder satisfy AWP criteria?

No.